

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H13-1038-19 **Applicant:** Mr Holt Myers

Proposal: Change of use of site and buildings to commercial use (Classes B1c, B2 and B8) - retrospective.

Location: Poplar Farm Austendyke Road Weston Hills

Terminal Date: 28th January 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
07	Improving South East Lincolnshire's Employment Land Portfolio
30	Pollution
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Sections 2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 12 and 14

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
PLANNING LIAISON OFFICER - FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT	0	0	1	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	1	0
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a change of use of existing agricultural buildings to an industrial use (Classes B1c, B2 and B8) - retrospective.

Site Description

The site is located on the southern side of Austendyke and is currently occupied by 3 agricultural buildings of brick/fibre cement and metal construction. It is currently served by a concrete access roadway which passes over a culvert serving a frontage drain.

A pair of semi-detached houses are situated to the east and a large house (The Beeches) and associated buildings to the north-west on the opposite side of Austendyke.

History

H13-0818-08 - Change of use to B1 (Business) and B8 (Storage or Distribution) - Withdrawn

H13-0898-06 - Change of use to B8 (storage and distribution) - Withdrawn

Representations

Moulton Parish Council - No response.

LCC Highways/SUDS - Does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.

SHDC Environmental Protection - No objection.

Environment Agency - Falls within Cell G4 of the Local Flood Risk Standing Advice.

Public - No objections received.

Planning Considerations

The main issues in this case are:

- Policy;
- Flood risk.

Policy

As indicated in paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019, planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The site is located outside a defined settlement limit within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019. For the purposes of the SELLP, the site therefore lies within the countryside.

SELLP Policy 1 states that development in the Countryside will only 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.

Policy 7 of the SELLP indicates that new employment development outside 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.

The above policies are consistent with advice within the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019. Section 6 supports sustainable economic growth in rural areas. It stresses that planning policies and decisions should place significant weight on the need to support economic growth taking into account local business needs. Paragraph 83 states that planning policies and decisions should promote the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through the conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings. Paragraph 84 goes on to stress that planning decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements and in locations that are not well served by public transport. The use of previously developed land should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist.

Addressing the above, the site is outside an allocated employment site and is not closely related to an existing settlement or public transport network. However, there is an identified need for industrial development within the district. The proposal supports economic growth and involves the re-use of farm buildings. Moreover, it is relatively small scale and constitutes a form of rural diversification. It is considered that a development of this scale would not have a significant adverse impact upon the viability of delivering any allocated employment site. Given the aforementioned and advice within paragraph 84 of the Framework, there are no objections in locational terms.

In terms of its relationship to neighbouring land uses, there are residential properties nearby. However, the application is retrospective and no complaints have been received. SHDC Environmental Protection has raised no objections. It is considered that the proposal would not significantly harm the amenity of nearby residents, subject to the imposition of a noise condition as a safeguard.

There would be no significant affect upon the character/appearance of the area because the proposal involves the re-use of existing buildings. They have previously had an agricultural use which included the external storage of machinery.

Access to the site is via a concrete roadway. Lincolnshire County Council (as Highway Authority) has been consulted and has concluded that the proposed change of use would not be expected to have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety or have a severe residual cumulative impact upon transportation within the area.

It is accepted that the proposal would involve the use of motor vehicles to access the site. However, it is considered that the economic benefits in this case outweigh the constraints and that the proposal is acceptable in policy terms.

Flood Risk

The site lies within Flood Zone 3 defined by the Environment Agency Flood Map. The latter 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. Also, large parts of the South Holland District lie within Flood Zone 3. It is therefore necessary to use the refined flood risk information (Hazard and Depth maps) within the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017) as a basis to apply the sequential test.

The hazard mapping within the SFRA shows the site to be unaffected if a breach of the flood defences were to occur. The proposal therefore satisfies the sequential test. The proposal falls within Cell G4 of the Local Flood Risk Standing Advice so no flood mitigation measures are necessary in this case.

Conclusion

Although the proposal is not wholly in accordance with Policies 1 and 7 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019, it is outweighed by other material considerations in this specific case. The economic benefits of the scheme outweigh socio and environmental constraints such as the distance from the nearest settlement and reliance upon the motor vehicle/lack of public transport. Advice within the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019, has been taken into consideration when reaching this decision.

In terms of flood risk, the proposal satisfies the sequential test.

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.