DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H04-1054-20**	**Applicant:**	**Mr M Coulam**
Proposal:	Tractor and Implement storage shed		
Location:	Pasture Farm Westdale Drove Donington		
Terminal Date:	19th January 2021		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

12 - Acheiving well-designed places.

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	1	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
BLACK SLUICE INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a full planning application for a tractor and implement storage shed at Pasture Farm, Westdale Drove, Donington. The proposal seeks to provide a shed that is open on the eastern elevation and constructed from Yorkshire boarding with nature grey fibre cement sheets for the roof. The footprint of the building is 9 metres deep, 18 metres wide, with a 3.5 metre eaves height and a 5.2 metre maximum apex height.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposal site is outside of defined settlement limits in the open countryside. The proposal is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3 and located in a "Danger for Most" hazard area, with a maximum predicted flood depth of 1 metre on the 2115 South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping. As the proposal is not a habitable building, there is not a need to raise finished floor levels to address potential flood risk.

HISTORY

H04-0647-10

Full - Reinstatement of dwelling, including repairs - Approved - 05 January 2011.

H04-0706-10

Full - Proposed cattle shed - Approved - 18 October 2010.

H04-1102-16

Full - Cattle Shed Extension - Approved - 30 November 2016.

H04-0928-20

Agricultural Determination - Tractor Shed - Withdrawn - 21 October 2020.

H04-0947-20

Agricultural Determination - Proposed Livestock Building - Approved - 17 November 2020.

H04-1078-20

Full Proposed Livestock Shed - Currently undecided as of 12 January 2021.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

LCC - County Highways & SUDS Officer

No objections - This proposal is for a tractor and implement storage shed and the access and parking arrangements remain unchanged. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board

No objections - Provides soakaway and watercourse advice.

Councillor Walsh

No objections

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Assessment against SELLP Policy 2 - Development Management

This proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 2 titled - Development Management. This policy states:

"Proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to:
1. size, scale, layout, density and impact on the amenity, trees, character and appearance of the area and the relationship to existing development and land uses;
2. quality of design and orientation;
3. maximising the use of sustainable materials and resources;
4. access and vehicle generation levels;
5. the capacity of existing community services and infrastructure;
6. impact upon neighbouring land uses by reason of noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion;
7. sustainable drainage and flood risk;
8. impact or enhancement for areas of natural habitats and historical buildings and heritage assets;
9. impact on the potential loss of sand and gravel mineral resources."

When assessed against the above relevant criteria the following can be observed:

1. The size, scale, layout and density is considered to be appropriate for the site. No trees are affected by the proposal. The shed is to the rear of a livestock building and does not impact the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

2. The orientation suits the use of the site and the design protects tractors from the elements whilst allowing easy access.

3. The proposed materials are in keeping with the character of agricultural buildings in the area.

4. The proposed won't impact access and vehicle generation levels.

6. The proposal will not impact neighbouring land uses from noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion.

7. The proposal is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3 and located in a "Danger for Most" hazard area, with a maximum predicted flood depth of 1 metre on the 2115 South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping. As the proposal is not a habitable building, there is not a need to raise finished floor levels to address potential flood risk.

The proposal is considered to accord with SELLP Policy 2.

Assessment against SELLP Policy 3 - Design of New Development

This proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 3 titled - Design of New Development. This policy states:

All development will create distinctive places through the use of high quality and inclusive design and layout and, where appropriate, make innovative use of local traditional styles and materials. Design which is inappropriate to the local area, or which fails to maximise opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area, will not be acceptable.
Development proposals will demonstrate how the following issues, where they are relevant to the proposal, will be secured:
1. creating a sense of place by complementing and enhancing designated and non designated heritage assets; historic street patterns; respecting the density, scale, visual closure, landmarks, views, massing of neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area;
2. distinguishing between private and public space;
3. the landscape character of the location;
4. accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, public rights of way and cycle ways;
5. the provision of facilities for the storage of refuse/recycling bins, storage and/or parking of bicycles and layout of car parking;
6. the lighting of public places;
7. ensuring public spaces are accessible to all;
8. crime prevention and community safety;
9. the orientation of buildings on the site to enable the best use of decentralised and renewable low-carbon energy technologies for the lifetime of the development;
10. the appropriate treatment of facades to public places, including shop frontages to avoid visual intrusion by advertising, other signage, security shutters, meter boxes and other service and communication infrastructure;

11. residential amenity;
12. the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resistant and flood-resilient design and sustainable drainage systems (SuDS);
13. the use of locally sourced building materials, minimising the use of water and minimising land take, to protect best and most versatile soils;
14. the incorporation of existing hedgerows and trees and the provision of appropriate new landscaping to enhance biodiversity, green infrastructure, flood risk mitigation and urban cooling;
15. the appropriate use or reuse of historic buildings.

When assessed against the above relevant criteria the following can be observed:

1. The proposal is for an agricultural building on an agricultural site. It is considered that a sense of place is not affected.

3. The proposal is to the rear of an existing building so the landscape character of the area is not affected.

11. Residential amenity is not impacted by the proposal as there are no other dwellings within 300 metres of the proposal.

12. The proposal is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3 and located in a "Danger for Most" hazard area, with a maximum predicted flood depth of 1 metre on the 2115 South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping. As the proposal is not a habitable building, there is not a need to raise finished floor levels to address potential flood risk.

The proposal is considered to accord with SELLP Policy 3.

PLANNING BALANCE

The proposal is in keeping with the built character of the surrounding area and meets the needs of the site without impacting the amenity of the occupants or surrounding area.

CONCLUSION

The recommendation is one of approval.

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.