DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H22-0696-20**	**Applicant:**	**Sennen Homes Ltd.**
Proposal:	Residential Development - Erection of 6 dwellings - approved under H22-1145-19. Amendments to layout and design		
Location:	87 Moulton Chapel Road Cowbit Spalding		
Terminal Date:	23rd September 2020		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
04	Approach to Flood Risk
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The site received reserved matters approval for 6 dwellings on 27 January 2020 (ref. H22-1145-19).

This application is to:
i) Retain an existing frontage IDB drain;
ii) Amend the roofing material to a Russell Pennine Double Pantile - Terracotta;
iii) Amend plot 2, including an additional first floor element at the rear, alterations to the fenestration/layout and positioning the garage 6 metres further back to enlarge the patio area.

Site Description

The site (some 0.46 ha) is located on the southern side of Moulton Chapel Rd some 320 metres to the east of the A16 roundabout. The eastern section is occupied by buildings and is presently a builders/electrical contractor's yard and the western section is a grassfield. A shallow drain runs along the site's frontage.

History

H22-1045-17 - Outline - Residential development (6 plots), SNG Electrical Ltd, 87 Moulton Chapel Rd, Cowbit - Refused 29 January 2018 . Allowed on appeal on 7 September 2018.

H22-1145-19 - RM - Residential development - erection of 6 dwellings - Approved 27 January 2020.

Planning Considerations

Section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (introduced by S190 of the Planning Act, 2008) makes it possible to apply for a non-material amendment to existing planning permissions.

The Council has therefore introduced a system whereby 'minor amendments' to a scheme can be considered as a way of allowing the planning system to respond in a reasonable and flexible manner to small changes to an approved scheme without seeking a fresh application.

South Holland District Council's "Development Control Procedure Note: Non-Material Amendments to Planning Permissions" indicates that non material amendments will be approved subject to the following criteria being met:

1. There would be no alteration to the application site boundary (red edge).
2. The amendment would not conflict with Development Plan Policies or other Government Guidance.
3. The proposal would not exacerbate concerns raised by third parties at original planning application stage.
4. The proposed change would not be contrary to a condition on the original approval.
5. The approved footprint/siting of the building will not be moved materially and will not have a material impact on a neighbour.
6. The height of the building or extension would not be increased.
7. The amendment would not result in any potential overlooking of any neighbouring property.
8. The amendments must not result in a fundamental change in the design of the building.
9. The proposal does not amount to new works or elements not considered by any Environmental Statement submitted with the application.

The criteria set out above are designed to prevent amendments being accepted that would have a detrimental impact upon neighbours or amenity in the wider public interest.

Assessing the proposal against the above:

1. No alterations are proposed to the site boundary;
2. The proposed alterations would not conflict with the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019;
3. The revisions would not exacerbate concerns raised by any third party;
4. The amendment would not be contrary to any condition imposed;
5. No building would be moved;
6. The ridge height of any dwelling would not be increased;
7. No potential overlooking would arise as a result of the amendment that would justify neighbours being re-consulted;
8. The alterations wouldn't fundamentally alter the design of the development;
9. No Environmental Statement was submitted.

Conclusion

The proposal satisfactorily complies with the criteria of South Holland District Council's "Development Control Procedure Note: Non-Material Amendments to Planning Permissions" and, as such, is acceptable as a Non-Material Amendment.

Additional Considerations

Public Sector Equality Duty

In making this decision the Authority must have regard to the public sector equality duty (PSED) under s.149 of the Equalities Act. This means that the Council must have due regard to the need (in discharging its functions) to:
A. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
B. Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. This may include removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; taking steps to meet the special needs of those with a protected characteristic; encouraging participation in public life (or other areas where they are underrepresented) of people with a protected characteristic(s).
C. Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.

The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The PSED must be considered as a relevant factor in making this decision but does not impose a duty to achieve the outcomes in s.149. It is only one factor that needs to be considered, and may be balanced against other relevant factors.

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case will have a disproportionately adverse impact on a protected characteristic.

Human Rights

In making a decision, the Authority should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as South Holland District Council to act in a manner that is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights. The Authority is referred specifically to Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property).

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case interferes with local residents' right to respect for their private and family life, home and correspondence, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general public interest and the recommendation is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.