

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H06-1134-25 **Applicant:** Horizon Agricultural Machinery Ltd

Proposal: Siting of office block in connection with existing agricultural engineering business - retrospective (previously approved under H06-0259-14)

Location: Clifton'S Bridge Fishergate Sutton St James

Terminal Date: 2nd February 2026

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
07	Improving South East Lincolnshire's Employment Land Portfolio
29	The Historic Environment
33	Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

Section 6 - Building a strong, competitive economy
 Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
 Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
 Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
 Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE	0	0	0	1

BOARD				
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	1	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a full application for the siting of an office block in connection with existing agricultural engineering business. The office has been on site since approximately 2014, where it was granted a temporary permission for a period of five years under H06-0259-14. The office block measures 10m by 11.9m. It is a two-floor building, with a maximum height of 6.7m. It is a pre-fabricated, grey clad building of little note.

Site Description

The site is located outside of any of the settlement boundaries outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The site is a commercial/ agricultural yard within a rural area, approximately 950m north of Sutton St James. A large residential dwelling with significant boundary treatments is located to the front of the site.

Relevant History

H06-0259-14 - Full - Erection of two steel frame portal buildings and use of land for stationing of portable office accommodation, storage containers and associated infrastructure in connection with agricultural engineering business - Approved 16/06/14.

H06-0539-14 - NMA - Erection of two steel frame portal buildings and use of land for stationing of portable office accommodation, storage containers and associated infrastructure in connection with agricultural engineering business approved under H06-0259-14. Amendments to include extending cladding to base of Shed 2 - Approved 23/07/14.

H06-0556-14 - Condition Discharge - Details of external materials, landscaping, fencing along western boundary and surface water disposal (Conditions 3, 6, 8 and 11 of H06-0259-14) - Approved 27/08/14.

H06-0770-24 - Full - Use of Land for the Parking, Loading and Unloading of Vehicles Associated with the Adjacent Business - Approved 12/09/24

Other Sites

H09-0501-23 - Full - Erection of Agricultural Machinery Assembly Facility, Research and Training Facility, Ground Mounted Solar Array and Associated Infrastructure - Approved 19/06/24.

Consultation Responses

The responses received from consultees during the initial consultation exercises, which can be viewed in their entirety through the South Holland website, can be summarised as follows:

Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority

No objection - This proposal is for Siting of office block in connection with existing agricultural engineering business - retrospective (previously approved under H06-0259-14) and the access and parking arrangements remain unchanged; therefore, it is considered that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Gedney Parish Council

"Council support this application"

Environmental Protection

"No comments regarding land contamination or environmental protection."

Public Representations

This application has been advertised in accordance with the Development Procedure Order and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In this instance, no letters of representation have been received.

Key Planning Considerations

Evaluation

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The adopted South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, adopted March 2019 (SELLP), is the development plan for the district, and is the basis for decision making in South Holland. The relevant development plan policies are detailed within the report above.

The policies and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, 2024 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

Principle of Development

Principle of Development - Policy Context

Spatial Strategy

Policy 1 of the SELLP sets out the settlement hierarchy in respect of delivering sustainable development, which meets the social and economic needs of the area whilst protecting and enhancing the environment; in order to provide enough choice of land for housing to satisfy local need, whilst making more sustainable use of land, and to minimise the loss of high-quality agricultural plots by developing in sustainable locations and at appropriate densities.

Policy 1 expresses this sustainable hierarchy of settlements, ranking the settlements deemed to be most sustainable in descending order. The most sustainable locations for development are situated within the 'Sub-Regional Centres', followed by 'Main Service Centres'. Lower down the hierarchy are areas of limited development opportunity including Minor Service Centres, with areas of development constraint comprising 'Other Service Centres and Settlements'. The countryside is at the bottom of the settlement hierarchy and represents the least sustainable location.

The site is located outside of any defined settlement boundaries and can therefore be considered in the Countryside for the purposes of Policy 1. The wording of the Policy is clear that this designation is based principally on the settlement boundaries outlined in the relevant inset maps, rather than alternative considerations on the ground such as the built form of the area.

In this context, Policy 1 states "In the Countryside development will be permitted that is necessary to such a location and/or where it can be demonstrated that it meets the sustainable development needs of the area in terms of economic, community or environmental benefits."

Employment Space

Despite being associated with an agricultural business, the application form has identified that the use is Class E. Therefore, the use would be classified as employment space.

Where a proposal involves the creation of a new employment site, Policy 1 is supported by Policy 7.

Policy 7 directs development of new employment opportunities to the allocated employment sites listed within this policy. Where this is not possible, Policy 7 provides the following:

"New employment development/businesses or the extension of an existing business outside the above allocated employment sites will be supported provided that the proposal involves the re-use of previously-developed land or the conversion/re-use of redundant buildings. Where it can be demonstrated that no suitable building capable of conversion/re-use is available or the re-use of previously-developed land is not available or is unsuitable, proposals on non-allocated sites may be acceptable provided:

- a. the development does not conflict with neighbouring land uses;
- b. there is no significant adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area;
- c. the design is responsive to the local context;
- d. there will be no significant adverse impact on the local highway network;
- e. there will be no significant adverse impact upon the viability of delivering any allocated employment site;
- f. proposals maximising opportunities for modal shift away from the private car are demonstrated; and
- g. there is an identified need for the business location outside of identified employment areas on the Policies Map".

Paragraph 4.2.11 expands upon this stating:

"National planning policy supports the conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings in the Countryside for economic development. Therefore, the provision and expansion of Other Employment Sites, including those in the Countryside, will be supported where it can be demonstrated to be sustainable and consistent with the requirements of Policy 7. However, the desire to promote rural employment must be balanced with the need to protect the existing character of the Countryside."

The relevant national planning policy here would be Paragraph 88 of the NPPF, which is discussed in greater detail below.

Given the existing use of the site as agricultural land, the site would not be considered 'previously developed land' in accordance with the definition contained within the NPPF.

Annex 2 of the NPPF defines previously developed land as follows:

"Previously developed land: Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes: land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill, where provision for restoration has been made through development management procedures; land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape".

The site is not allocated as an employment site within Policy 7, or the accompanying inset maps. Whilst the building is already in situ, this siting is in effect without permission; and therefore, the proposal would not constitute the reuse of an existing building.

As such, the proposal would be assessed under criteria a-g of Policy 7.

Supporting a Prosperous Rural Economy

Paragraph 88 of the NPPF concerns the creation of business uses within rural areas. Paragraph 88 states that "Planning policies and decisions should enable:

- a) the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed, new buildings;
- b) the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses;
- c) sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside; and
- d) the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship."

Principle of Development - Assessment

As outlined previously, the site is within the Countryside. Therefore, development would only be permissible if it was necessary in this location or if it would suitably contribute to the development needs of the area.

The office block is utilised in conjunction with the wider commercial-agricultural business. The office handles the administrative functions of this business, enabling the proper operation of the wider site. As the office and yard are codependent, there is a clear necessity for the development to be located in this specific location. On this basis, the proposal is considered to necessitate this location, and the proposal can be judged to be in accordance with Policy 1.

That being said, within the submitted Covering Letter, it was stated that a new facility has gained planning approval (see H09-0501-23) which will replace this existing site in due course. As such, the need for the offices to be on this specific site is not permanent. Once the business moves, then the need would cease to be present. As such, a temporary permission is recommended to prevent inappropriate development in the countryside.

As outlined above, any application for the development of a commercial use, which as a Class E use this would be, should also be assessed against the provisions of Policy 7, even if in conformity to Policy 1. As previously stated, the proposal would not represent redevelopment of previously developed land or the reuse of an existing building; and therefore, should be assessed under criteria a-g of Policy 7. Assessing the proposal against these criteria, the following is considered:

- a. The development would not conflict with neighbouring land uses. The proposal operates in conjunction with the wider uses of the site and is integral to their proper function.
- b. As explored in greater detail within the "Layout, Design, Scale and Consideration of the Character of the Area" section of this report, there would be no adverse impact upon the character of the area. The use is consistent, both in type and scale, with the existing use of the wider site.
- c. As explored in greater detail within the "Layout, Design, Scale and Consideration of the Character of the Area" section of this report, the design is of no particular merit. However, it is not necessarily detrimental to the character of the area, given the commercial use of the site. It has been in situ for an extended period of time without harming the appearance of the area and has evidently been well maintained throughout this period. Point C has been met.
- d. The offices have been in place on the site for an extended period of time without creating any adverse impact upon the local highway network. As there would be no change to the intensity of the use, it can be assumed that there would be no further highway impacts.
- e. The proposal is of a small enough scale as to have no significant impact upon the viability of any employment site.
- f. The site is located outside of any settlement, within a relatively isolated location. As such, the site is not accessible via sustainable methods of transport. That being said, given the site is used in conjunction with an agricultural business and is required to be located here for functional reasons, a degree of leniency may be shown in this regard and the weighting attached to this point tempered accordingly.
- g. The offices are required for the running of an established business in this location. Therefore, there is a clear need for the development to be located on this site.

The proposal would not conform to Criterion f of Policy 7. However, it is considered that there are mitigating circumstances here. On balance, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the provisions of Policy 7 as a whole.

Turning to the provisions of Paragraph 88 of the NPPF, the proposal would not help to diversify an agricultural business. However, it would help to ensure the proper function of that business, which would still be in accordance with the overarching aims of the paragraph.

Principle of Development - Summary

As outlined above, the proposal represents the retention of an existing office block used in conjunction with an established agricultural/ commercial venture. The proposal can be considered to necessitate this location, thereby conforming to the aims of Policy 1 of the SELLP. Whilst it is not necessarily accessible via sustainable modes of transport, the proposal broadly aligns with the aims of Policy 7. Weight is given in favour of the proposal under Paragraph 88 of the NPPF.

For these reasons, the proposal is in accordance with Policies 1 and 7 of the SELLP, as a whole, and Paragraph 88 of the NPPF. The principle of development is therefore considered acceptable.

That being said, the need for the offices can be seen as temporary, and therefore, it is recommended that the permission is granted on a temporary basis to prevent unnecessary development in the open countryside.

Layout, Design, Scale and Consideration of the Character of the Area

Section 12 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places", states that the "creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve" and as such, it is generally accepted that good design plays a key role towards sustainable development.

Paragraph 135, contained within Section 12 of the NPPF, states that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area (including beyond the short term) and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. This goes on to establish that it is important that new development should be of the highest quality, to enhance and reinforce good design characteristics, and that decisions must have regard towards the impact that the proposed development would have on local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting such as topography, street patterns, building lines, boundary treatment and through scale and massing. Developments should create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, among other considerations.

Likewise, Policy 2 of the SELLP outlines sustainable development considerations for proposals; providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals. Furthermore, Policy 3 of the SELLP requires development to comprise good design; identifying issues that should be considered when preparing schemes so that development sits comfortably with, and adds positively to, its historically designated or undesignated townscape or landscape surroundings.

These policies accord with the provisions of the NPPF and require that 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. Proposals for new development would therefore require the aforementioned considerations to be adequately assessed and designed, including the siting, design, and scale to be respectful of surrounding development and ensure that the character of the area is not compromised.

The office is of no architectural or visual merit. It is a prefabricated, temporary office block typical of sites such as this. Whilst the office has been maintained well since its installation in 2014, as a temporary structure, there is the potential that the building would degrade over time. This degradation would lead to a worsening of the appearance of the building and the site, which would be to the detriment of the character of the area. On this basis, as recommended in H06-0259-14, it is recommended that the permission is granted on a temporary basis.

That being said, the site is reasonably well screened from the public realm, reducing the potential impacts upon the area. Moreover, the typicality of the structure prevents it from being seen as immediately visually incongruous.

Taking account of the design, scale, and nature of the development, as detailed above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable. The proposal would not cause an adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area and would therefore be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Impacts Upon Resident Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that development should create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Policies 2 and 3 of SELLP sets out that residential amenity and the relationship to existing development and land uses is a main consideration when making planning decisions.

The distance between the site and the boundary is significant enough to reduce the level of shadow cast. Moreover, this shadow would largely fall upon the existing boundary treatments, further reducing the potential impacts.

The south-eastern, first-floor window is obscure glazed. This prevents an unacceptable level of overlooking from occurring. No views could be obtained from the other windows within the building.

As detailed above, the scale and design of the proposal is considered to have no significant or unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of adjacent properties or land users, when also taking account of the conditions recommended. As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Section 12 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan in terms of impact upon residential amenity.

Highway Safety and Parking

Section 9 of the NPPF is titled 'Promoting sustainable transport'. Within this, Paragraph 116 advises that "development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios".

In respect of highway matters, Policy 2 details that proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to access and vehicle generation. Policy 3 details that development proposals will demonstrate how accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, public rights of way and cycle ways will be secured, where they are relevant to the proposal. Policy 33 further reinforces the need for developments to be accessible via sustainable modes of transport.

Policy 36 of the SELLP, in conjunction with Appendix 6, sets out minimum vehicle parking standards and requires at least one space per 30sqm of a B1 use (now Class E). Adequate parking has been provided on the site to meet these requirements.

The site has operated for a significant period without having a severe or unacceptable impact on the highway network. Given that the use would not be intensified due to this proposal, it is not anticipated that the retention of this office block would have a worsening effect.

As briefly outlined previously, the site is located a significant distance to the nearest settlement. There is no dedicated footpath to the site. This section of the B1165 is 60mph, with two way traffic. As such, users could not be reasonably expected to walk or cycle to the site.

There is no dedicated bus stop near to the site, and therefore those wishing to use public transport would have to walk the 950m to Sutton St James to access the site. Given the concerns relating to the safety of this, this is not considered a viable option.

As such, it is not considered that the site is accessible via sustainable methods of transport. This would therefore conflict with the aims of Policies 2, 3 and 33 of the SELLP and Section 9 of the NPPF with respect to sustainable transport objectives. That being said, Section 9 of the NPPF is clear that proposals should only be refused where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network. This is not considered to be the case here and so the development should not be resisted purely due to a lack of accessibility.

The proposal would therefore be acceptable and would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on highway safety in accordance with Policies 2, 3, 33 and 36 of the SELLP, as well as Section 9 of the NPPF.

Flooding Considerations

Section 14 of the NPPF requires development plans to "apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development - taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change - so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property. They should do this, and manage any residual risk, by: (...) applying the sequential test and then, if necessary, the exception test as set out below".

Paragraph 174 of the NPPF states "the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding". The strategic flood risk assessment provides the basis for applying this

test.

Paragraph 175 of the NPPF states that "the sequential test should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, except in situations where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates that no built development within the site boundary, including access or escape routes, land raising or other potentially vulnerable elements, would be located on an area that would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future (having regard to potential changes in flood risk)."

If, following the application of the Sequential Test, it is not possible, consistent with wider sustainability objectives, for the development to be located in zones with a lower probability of flooding, the Exceptions Test can be applied if appropriate. The process for applying the Exception Test is outlined within Paragraphs 177, 178 and 179 of the NPPF. Paragraph 178 states "to pass the exception test it should be demonstrated that: a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall"

The site lies within Flood Zone 3 of the Environment Agency's Flood Maps. These have been created as a tool to raise awareness of flood risk with the public and partner organisations, such as Local Authorities, Emergency Services and Drainage Authorities. The Maps do not take into account any flood defences.

The South-East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) provides an overview of how flood risk has been considered in shaping the proposals of the Local Plan, including the spatial strategy and the assessment of housing and employment sites. Policy 4 of the SELLP is clear in that "Development proposed within an area at risk of flooding (Flood Zones 2 and 3 of the Environment Agency's flood map or at risk during a breach or overtopping scenario as shown on the flood hazard and depths maps in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment) will be permitted" in instances where specific criteria is met.

It is worth noting that large parts of the district of South Holland lie within Flood Zone 3. It is therefore necessary to use the refined flood risk information (Hazard and Depth maps) within the SFRA as a basis to apply the sequential test.

Within the SFRA the site is outside of any identified hazard zone.

Paragraph 174 is clear that the "strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this (sequential) test." As the site is outside of any identified hazard zone, it is considered to pass the Sequential Test.

Overall, when considering the development on balance, it is considered, given the mitigation measures detailed and recommended by condition, that the proposal accords with Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the SELLP and the intentions of the NPPF with regards to flood risk.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021) requires developers to deliver a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain using standardized biodiversity units measured by statutory biodiversity metrics. This is often referred to as the mandatory requirements for Biodiversity Net Gain.

"Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, subject to some exceptions, every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met ("the biodiversity gain condition"). This objective is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat. This increase can be achieved through onsite biodiversity gains, registered offsite biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits".

The biodiversity gain condition is a pre-commencement condition. This relates to a condition that seeks, once planning permission has been granted, a Biodiversity Gain Plan that must be submitted and approved by the planning authority before commencement of the development, alongside the

need to submit a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan.

The effect of Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the "biodiversity gain condition". The effect of this "biodiversity gain condition" is that development granted by this notice must not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan, or
- (c) the development is exempt from the biodiversity gain condition.

The proposal would be located on a hard surfaced area. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be exempt from the need for biodiversity net gain under Regulation 4 of The Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024.

Planning Balance

As detailed above, Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposal necessitates a countryside location, albeit temporarily. The proposal in its current form would not harm the character and amenity of the area; however, the temporary nature of construction would result in gradual degradation, leading to harm to the character of the area. On this basis, it is considered that the proposal is in conformity with the provisions of the SELLP and NPPF as whole; however, a temporary permission is recommended given the nature of this case and temporary nature of the need for these units.

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.

Conclusion

Taking these factors into consideration, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 33, and 36 of the SELLP, as well as Sections 6, 9, 12, and 14 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the benefits of the proposal; therefore, the planning balance is in favour of the proposal.

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be approved under Delegated Authority.