DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H14-0100-26**	**Applicant:**	**J O Sims Ltd**
Proposal:	Proposed extension to provide additional packhouse & storage area together with external yard		
Location:	J O Sims Ltd Pudding Lane Pinchbeck		
Terminal Date:	10th April 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
28	The Natural Environment
30	Pollution
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
Section 4 - Decision-making
Section 6 - Building a strong, competitive economy
Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 11 - Making effective use of land
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

WELLAND AND DEEPINGS INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	2	0
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	1	0	0	2

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The proposal seeks full planning permission for an extension on the eastern side of an existing food storage/processing facility (J O Sims Ltd). The extension is proposed to provide an additional packhouse and storage area. An external concrete yard is proposed to the south of the extension which would link with an existing concrete area.

Site Description

The site is located within a food storage / processing facility, J O Sims Ltd. The site is located next to the eastern side of the building within the site which is surrounded by areas of hardstanding, landscaping and parking bays. Morrisons supermarket is located to the east and a number of industrial units are located to the west and south of the site.

The site is within the settlement boundary of Pinchbeck, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and the accompanying policies map.

The site is within Flood Zone 3, as identified by the Environment Agency's flood risk maps.

Planning History

H14-1921-88: (Full Application) Industrial development to provide relocated and expanded premises - approved 08 February 1989

H14-1922-88: (Outline Application) Industrial development to provide relocated and expanded premises - approved 08 February 1989

H14-0417-90: (Full Application) Erection of new warehouse/distribution centre with ancillary first floor offices and external works - approved 11 May 1990

H14-1163-90: (Outline Application) Industrial development (B1, B2, B8 Use Classification) - approved 22 November 1990

H14-0948-95: (Full Application) Extension to existing distribution centre - approved 12 December 1995

H14-1083-95: (Full Application) Extension to existing distribution centre and removal of disused railway embankment - approved 23 January 1996

H14-0110-96: (Discharge of Conditions) Details of access/exit crossovers, landscaping and fences (Conditions 3, 6, & 8 of H14/1083/95) - approved 25 March 1996

H14-0109-96: (Discharge of Conditions) Details of access/exit crossings and landscaping (Conditions 3 & 8 of H14/0948/95) - approved 25 March 1996

H14-1066-18: (Full Application) Temporary storage structure to support expansion requirements (retrospective) - approved 29 November 2018

H14-1138-18: (Full Application) Proposed extension to east side of existing fruit packing premises to support expansion requirements - approved 21 December 2018

H14-0308-21: (Full Application) Proposed single storey ancillary outbuilding at fruit packing premises to provide fruit processing rooms - approved 04 June 2021

H14-0999-21: (Section 73 Application) Temporary storage structure to support expansion requirements (retrospective) - approved under H14-1066-18. Modification of Condition 1 to allow structure to remain on site for a further period of time - approved 28 October 2021

H14-1093-25: (Full Application) Proposed external loading dock and relocation of engineers store and baler buildings - approved 07 January 2026

Consultation Responses

The responses received from consultees during the consultation period are summarised below. The responses can be viewed in their entirety on South Holland District Council's website.

Pinchbeck Parish Council: This will contribute positively to local commercial activity and employment opportunities.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: Will the proposal result in any increase in vehicle movements in/out of the site? Will there be any increase in staff as a result of the extension?

Environmental Protection: No comments.

Environmental Protection (Land Contamination): As the site has past industrial use as railway land, I recommend the following condition be placed on any permission granted; In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported immediately to the Local Planning Authority (LPA). An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with details to be agreed with the LPA. Where remediation is necessary, a remediation scheme must be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA. No deviation shall be made from this scheme without the express written agreement of the LPA. If during redevelopment contamination not previously considered is identified, then the LPA shall be notified immediately and no further work shall be carried out until a method statement detailing a scheme for dealing with the suspected contamination has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA.

Lincolnshire County Council - Historic Environment: The proposal is unlikely to have an impact on significant archaeological remains. Consequently, no further archaeological input is necessary for this application. It is not necessary to consult us on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals.

Ecology Officer: There has been sufficient evidence provided to determine this application, as long as the mandatory 10% net gain is achieved through securing offsite units pre-commencement. In this case the metric indicates that 10% mandatory net gain cannot be achieved on-site, and therefore the proposals require 0.3 area-habitat units off-site. These will need to be secured pre-commencement.

Welland and Deepings Internal Drainage Board:

First Response (11 March 2026): Surface water provisions should be confirmed to the Board. If soakaways are not being used as the method for surface water disposal then I would wish to be reconsulted.

Second Response (08 April 2026): I have held informal discussions with the consulting engineers, with an agreement being reached in principle for a surface water discharge from site at a reduced flow rate. I am pleased to see detailed within the revised Surface & Foul Water Drainage Strategy, reference: SW26-114-REP-01A, a proposed reduced flow surface water discharge restricted to 2.8

litres per second as a maximum. The proposed surface water discharge from site requires the prior written consent of the Board should planning permission be granted. Any application is subject to the agreement of technical details, payment of the application fee as well as payment of the relevant development contribution. Based on the submitted information of a total impermeable area of 0.145 ha and a maximum flow restricted to 2.8 litres per second, this results in a development contribution of £6,116.54 payable in advance of connection. Please note that development contributions are subject to annual increase in line with RPI. Prior to connection, the receiving riparian watercourse is to be inspected to see if it is capable of taking the proposed additional flow, and if not currently suitable, then it would need to be brought up to a suitable standard.

Cllr S Slade: No response received.

Cllr J Avery: No response received.

Cllr E J Sneath: No response received.

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 representations have been received from members of the public.

Key Planning Considerations

Development Plan

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, December 2024 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

There are no adopted Neighbourhood Plans for the area within which the site is located.

The main issues and considerations in this case include the following:

-Principle of Development;
-Visual Impact;
-Impact on Residential Amenity;
-Highway Safety and Parking;
-Flood Risk and Drainage; and
-Biodiversity Net Gain.

These matters are assessed in turn below.

Principle of Development

Policy 1 of the Local Plan 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.

In this case, the site is within an existing main employment area as identified by Policy 7 of the Local Plan (Improving South East Lincolnshire's Employment Land Portfolio). The proposal seeks to support an existing business that operates from the site, J O Sims Ltd which is a food manufacturer. Policy 7 encourages the retention and expansion of existing businesses within identified employment areas. As such, the principle of development is acceptable as the proposed use comprises an appropriate form of development for the location which would be in accordance with the overall principles of the spatial strategy.

Visual Impact

Paragraph 135 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.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan similarly outlines sustainable development considerations for development proposals, providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals.

Policy 3 accords with the provisions of Section 12 of the NPPF as it 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.

The area where the extension is proposed is on the eastern side of the existing building. The extension features two shallow pitch gable end roof forms and a flat roof link to connect it to the existing building. The extension measures 34m by 24m, featuring cladding and roof panels that would match the colour of the existing building.

Initially, the extension was proposed to be taller than the main building. This was discussed with the applicant's agent and the height of the extension has been reduced. As such, the extension is now proposed to be level with the ridgeline of the main building, which is 10.3m in height. The extension would be partially visible from the street scene from Wardentree Lane which is to the north of the site; however, due to the reduced height it is considered that the extension would be an appropriate addition to the building as it would not be overly dominant or out of character with the area. There is also a thick tree belt to the east of the site, beyond which is Morrisons car park and as such, the site is relatively well screened from the east.

Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Impact on 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; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

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

Around the site, there is a mixture of commercial and industrial businesses and there are no dwellings located around the site. As such, the proposals would not affect the amenity of nearby residents. Therefore, the development is considered to accord with the provisions of the Section 12 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan.

Highway Safety and Parking

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF sets out 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 would be severe, following mitigation.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan sets out 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 Local Plan, in conjunction with Appendix 6, sets out minimum vehicle parking standards.

No changes are proposed to be parking arrangements within the site, nor are any changes proposed to the site access.

Lincolnshire County Council's highways team have queried whether there would be an increase in vehicle movements in and out of the site and if there will be any increase in staff numbers as a result of the extension. According to the application form, there will be an increase in 25 employees as a result of the proposals. The applicant's agent has subsequently clarified that initially there would not be an immediate increase in employee numbers. There might eventually be an increase of 25 employees; however, employees often car share and as such, the additional number of arrivals and departures is likely to be limited to around 6 to 8 vehicles per day at seasonal peaks. The existing car park has sufficient capacity for the potential increase in employee numbers.

Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact in terms of highway safety in accordance with Policies 2, 3, 33 and 36 of the Local Plan, as well as Section 9 of the NPPF.

Flood Risk and Drainage

Section 14 of the NPPF sets out guidance relating to how local authorities should assess and determine applications which are subject to flood risk concerns.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan requires proposals to meet sustainable development considerations including in relation to sustainable drainage and flood risk (part 7).

Policy 4 of the Local Plan requires proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be supported by sufficient information relating to flood risks associated with the development.

The site is located within Flood Zone 3; however, the development is identified as a 'less vulnerable' use according to Annex 3 of the NPPF. As such, it is not considered necessary to apply to exception test to the development. Whilst it is still necessary to apply the sequential test, it is recognised that the proposal seeks to extend an existing building within the site to expand an existing business. As much of the surrounding area is also within Flood Zone 3, it is not considered that the development could be located on alternative land in this instance. As such, it is considered that the development passes the sequential test in flood risk terms.

Within the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, areas across South Holland have been identified according to the level of hazard that is posed in terms of flood risk. Appendix C of the SFRA sets out guidance in terms of the minimum measures that are required according to what hazard category areas fall under. The site is within a low hazard area. For 'less vulnerable' uses such as the proposed extension, the SFRA does not recommend any specific flood risk mitigation in low hazard areas.

In addition to the extension, the proposal also seeks consent for a large concrete yard area comprising approximately 623sqm of land. This would reduce the amount of impermeable land within the site. The necessity of this yard area has been discussed with the applicant's agent. The agent has set out that the yard area is required to store items such as pallets and other non-food materials to assist with the business operation. Ideally, to compensate for the loss of permeable land the drainage strategy would incorporate a sustainable drainage system such as soakaways. However, a drainage strategy has been provided within which it was concluded that the site has superficial deposits of silty sandy clays, according to a borehole log that has been provided. As

such, the site is unsuitable for soakaways. The proposed drainage strategy is to discharge to a nearby watercourse. Welland and Deepings Internal Drainage Board have been re-consulted on the proposals as the drainage strategy was provided during the determination of the application, rather than at the validation stage. It is considered that the proposed discharge rate of 2.8 litres per second is acceptable; however, as set out within the Board's second consultation response, the prior written consent of the Board will be required to agree the discharge rate. This process is separate from the planning system.

Therefore, in terms of flood risk, it is considered that the proposed development accords with Policy 4 of the Local Plan and Section 14 of the NPPF.

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 (BNG) using standardized biodiversity units measured by statutory biodiversity metrics. This is often referred to as the mandatory requirements for BNG.

"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 application is accompanied by a BNG Assessment and associated BNG calculations. According to the submitted information, the BNG metric indicates that 10% mandatory net gain cannot be achieved on-site and as such, the proposals require 0.3 area-habitat off-site. As such, the proposal seeks to provide BNG units off-site by purchasing BNG units. This can be secured through a pre-commencement condition.

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 development hereby proposed does not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality or the amenity of residents given that there are no dwellings next to the site. The proposed development is considered to accord with the Local Plan and the provisions of the NPPF when viewed as a whole. In this instance, there are no material considerations that weigh against the proposal and as such, the planning balance is in favour of the development.

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 the above considerations into account, the proposal is considered to accord with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 30 and 36 of the Local Plan, along with the identified sections contained within the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that indicate against the proposal and outweigh the consideration in favour of the proposal and the policies referred to above.

Recommendation

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