DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H04-0541-20**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs G Askew**
Proposal:	Extension to Agricultural Building		
Location:	Bridge Farm Bridge End Causeway Donington		
Terminal Date:	5th August 2020		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Schedule 2, Part 6, Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is an agricultural determination application for a proposed extension to an agricultural building at Bridge Farm, Bridge End Causeway, Donington.

The proposed extension will measure 12 metres in length by 6 metres in breadth, have an eaves height of 2.8 metres and a maximum apex height of 3.8 metres.

The walls will be constructed from wood and concrete with a grey ondulene roof to match the existing adjacent building. The purposed of the building is to provide a dry storage area for agricultural implements and hay.

Site Description

The proposal is outside of defined settlement limits and is therefore designated as being located in the the open countryside. The surrounding area is predominately rural and is characterised by non-nucleated linear development of varying ages and design.

History

H04-1184-07

Full - Alterations and two-storey rear extension to dwelling - Withdrawn - 21 November 2007.

H04-1633-07

Full - Alterations and two-storey rear extension to dwelling - Approved - 25 January 2008.

H04-1009-18

Full - Single storey extension to existing house, including downstairs bathroom, bedroom, snug and boot/wash room - Approved - 27 November 2018.

Consultation Responses

No consultations are made for an Agricultural Determination Application.

Planning Considerations

Compliance with the General Permitted Development Order

The proposal complies with the Class of Part 6 because:

B.1
(a) the development would be carried out on a separate parcel of land forming part of the unit which is more than 0.4 hectares in area;
(b) the external appearance of the premises would not be materially affected;
(c) no part of the development would be within 25 metres of a metalled part of a trunk road or classified road;
(d) it does not consist of, or involve, the carrying out of any works to a building or structure used or to be used for the accommodation of livestock or the storage of slurry or sewage sludge where the building or structure is within 400 metres of the curtilage of a protected building;
(e) it does not relate to fish farming
(f) the purpose of the extension is not a biomass boiler or an anaerobic digestion system.

B.2
(a) the height of any building would not be increased;
(b) the cubic content of the original building would be not increased by more than 10%;
(c) no part of any new building would be more than 30 metres from the original building;
(d) it does not consist of the extension or provision of any agricultural building on an established agricultural unit (as defined in paragraph X of Part 3 (changes of use) of this Schedule) where development under Class Q or S of Part 3 (changes of use) of this Schedule has been carried out within a period of 10 years ending with the date on which development under Class B(a) begins;
(e) the development does not involve the extension, alteration or provision of a dwelling;
(f) no part of the development would be carried out within 5 metres of any boundary of the unit;
(g) the ground area of the building being extended by virtue of Class B(a) does not exceed 465 square metres.

The details submitted comply with Class B of part 6 in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended).

Conclusion

There are no reasons why additional details would be needed in this case, so further planning consent is not required. The details submitted comply with Class A of part 6 in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended).

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.