

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	H14-0652-21	Applicant:	Greencell Ltd.
Proposal:	Warehouse extension to house business growth.		
Location:	Greencell Ltd Holly Lodge West Marsh Road		
Terminal Date:	11th August 2021		

Planning Policies**South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019**

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
07	Improving South East Lincolnshire's Employment Land Portfolio

National Guidance**National Planning Policy Framework 2021**

Sections 6 & 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

6 - Building a strong, competitive economy
12 - Achieving well-designed places

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	0	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a full application for a warehouse extension to house business growth at Greencell Ltd, Holly Lodge, West Marsh Road, Pinchbeck. The proposal seeks to provide an extension that projects approx. 6.53 metres from the side elevation wall and is approximately 25 metres in length. The eaves are approx. 4.90 metres high, with a lean to height of 5.5 metres. The proposed materials of construction are Kingspan insulation panels and over cladding for the walls to match existing, with an insulated panel roof with colours to match existing. There will not be any new entrance points to the building in this extension space.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposal is within defined settlement limits with West Marsh Road to the west and north, the A16 to the east and Vernatt's Drain to the east and south. The site is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3 and in a "Danger for All" hazard area with a maximum predicted flood depth of over 2 metres.

HISTORY

H14-0393-79

Full - Erection of dwelling at San Jose Farm - Approved - 04 July 1979

H14-0830-81

Full - Erection of wholesale warehouse remove part of soil bank at Holly Lodge - Approved - 06 October 1981

H14-0968-87

Full - Change of use to haulage and transhipment depot - Approved - 30 November 1987

H14-0059-88

Full - Provision of portacabin office and W.C. - Approved - 17 February 1988

H14-0485-88

Full - Erection of transhipment building - Approved - 15 June 1988

H14-0766-88

Full - Transfer site for Civil Engineering Contractors' waste - Approved - 25 July 1988

H14-0055-89

Full - Distribution Warehouse - Approved - 07 June 1989

H14-1065-90

Full - Hard standing/lorry park - Approved - 05 November 1990

H14-0080-91

Condition Compliance - Hard standing/lorry park without complying with' Condition 3 on H14/1065/90 (stopping-up of access) - Refused - 28 March 1991.

H14-0624-91

Full - Extension to form office - Approved - 30 August 1991

H14-0699-92

Extension and alteration to offices - Approved - 14 August 1992

H14-1301-92

Full - One bay extension to existing warehouse - Approved - 15 February 1993

H14-0354-93

Outline - Industrial or storage development (B1, B2 and B8 use classes) - Refused - 28-06-93

H14-0183-95

Condition Compliance - Details of landscaping (Condition 7 of application H14/0055/89) - Approved - 09 March 1995

H14-0184-95

Condition Compliance - Details of landscaping (Condition 6 of application H14/0660/89) - Approved - 09 March 1995

H14-0185-95

Condition Compliance - Details of landscaping (Condition 5 of application H14/1065/90) - Approved - 09 March 1995

H14-0186-95

Condition Compliance - Details of landscaping (Condition 3 of application H14/1301/92) - Approved - 09 March 1995

H14-0553-95

Advertisement - Erection of two fascia signs - Approved - 11 December 1995

H14-0924-96

Condition Compliance - Landscaping details for warehouse extension (Condition 3 of application H14/1301/92) - Approved - 23 December 1996

H14-0487-98

Full - Siting of portacabin for office use - Approved - 23 June 1998

H14-0416-99

Permission Renewal - Erect buildings for use in Class B1, B2 & B8 and construct new roundabout (renewal of H14/0712/95) - Approved - 02 August 1999

H14-0445-02

Full - Siting of 3 portakabins to provide toilet block, canteen and smoking room - Approved - 24 June 2002

H14-0747-02

Condition Compliance - External colour of portakabins (Condition 2 of H14/0445/02) - Approved - 15 July 2002

H14-0041-05

Section 73 - Continuation of permission without complying with Condition 1 of H14/0445/02 - Approved - 01 March 2005

H14-0875-05

Full - Extension and overcladding roof and wall to existing storage/distribution depot - Approved - 02 August 2005

H14-1251-05

Condition Compliance - Details of materials for external walls and roofs (Condition 2 of H14/0875/05) - Approved - 16 September 2005

H14-0100-06

Advertisement - One entrance sign and three fascia signs - Approved - 13 March 2006

H14-0748-11

Full - Proposed steel frame industrial building - Approved - 30 November 2011

H14-0253-14

Full - Proposed two additional custom built ripening rooms (retrospective) - Approved - 04 June 2014

H14-0239-15

Full - Siting of portacabin to be used as canteen and toilet facilities (retrospective) - Approved - 21 May 2015

H14-0289-15

Full - Erection of warehouse extension to provide additional ripening rooms - Approved - 20 May 2015

H14-0379-16

Full - New warehouse extension on the north face of the existing building to house future ripening rooms - Approved - 09 June 2016

H14-0273-19

Prior Approval - Proposed roof mounted photovoltaic solar panels - Approved - 02 May 2019

H14-0463-19

Full - New warehouse for the storing and ripening of avocados - Approved - 15 August 2019.

H14-0858-19

Full - New warehouse for storing and ripening of avocados - Approved - 02 December 2019.

H14-0407-20

Prior Approval - Proposed Roof Mounted Photovoltaic Panels - Refused - 22 April 2021.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

LCC - County Highways & SUDS Officer

No objections.

SHDC - Environmental Protection

No objection.

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

"The new development must not impact on the biological diversity of the Local Wildlife Site. This should include consideration of any new lighting, parking of vehicles and account for the footprint of the building, construction work and ongoing management and maintenance. I would suggest that, due to the proximity of this development to Vernatts Drain Local Wildlife Site, the developer seeks professional advice on potential effects on local ecology and inclusion of Biodiversity Net Gain."

Welland & Deepings Internal Drainage Board

"The Boards Planning & Enforcement Officer and Asst Foreman have visited site and met the applicant to take some measurements. They are content that the proposed new extension falls outside the Board's 9 metre easement to its Vernatts drain. The new extension will also be sited on existing hardstanding so there will be no net increase in surface water produced as a result of this development. I therefore have no objection to the application as submitted."

Pinchbeck Parish Council

Support.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Assessment against SELLP Policy 1 - Spatial Strategy

This proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 1 titled - Spatial Strategy. The relevant section in this policy is titled Main Service Centres. This section of the policy states:

"Within the settlement boundaries of the Main Service Centres (as shown on the Inset Maps) development will be permitted that supports their role as a service centre for the settlement itself, helps sustain existing facilities or helps meet the service needs of other local communities."

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

The proposal will help to support the settlement of Pinchbeck and sustain the existing facilities therein.

This application accords with Policy 1 of the SELLP.

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 and layout of the proposed extension is small when compared with the size of the

existing building that is being extended. The works are sited to the rear of the site and will not be clearly visible to the public. There is not considered to be an impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

2. The design is to match that of the existing building and the orientation is such that it compliments the way the existing building and overall site functions.

3. Materials are to match those of the existing building and this is considered to benefit the site as a whole.

4. Access and vehicle generation levels are considered to be unaffected by this proposal, which will be located on existing hardstanding.

5. The capacity of existing community services and infrastructure is not impacted by this proposal.

6. There is not considered to be a noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion impact from this proposal, due to the small scale of development in comparison to the existing building, as well as the proposed location.

7. The site is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3 and in a "Danger for All" hazard area with a maximum predicted flood depth of over 2 metres. As the extension is not for habitable purposes and is no lower than the existing floor level, there is not considered to be a need to raise finished floor levels to address flood risk.

8. Whilst the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust has suggested an ecological report, it is not considered to be a requirement in this instance. This is because the extension would be located on pre-existing hardstanding and there is a roadway closer to Vernatt's Drain than the proposed building.

This application accords with Policy 2 of the SELLP.

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 size, scale and layout of the proposed extension is small when compared with the size of the existing building that is being extended. The works are sited to the rear of the site and will not be clearly visible to the public. There is not considered to be an impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. A sense of place is not considered to be impacted by this proposal.

4. The site is primarily served by private transport and this won't change as a result of this proposal.

5. Refuse and bike storage, as well as car parking provision will not be impacted by this proposal.

11. There is not considered to be a noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion impact from this proposal, due to the small scale of development in comparison to the existing building, as well as the proposed location.

12. The site is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3 and in a "Danger for All" hazard area with a maximum predicted flood depth of over 2 metres. As the extension is not for habitable purposes and is no lower than the existing floor level, there is not considered to be a need to raise finished floor levels to address flood risk.

This application accords with Policy 3 of the SELLP.

Assessment against SELLP Policy 7 - Improving South East Lincolnshire's Employment Land Portfolio

This proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 7 - Improving South East Lincolnshire's Employment Land Portfolio. The relevant section of Policy 7 is titled Main Employment Areas and this section states:

"The Policies Map identifies Main Employment Areas, as listed below, which are reserved for main employment in Classes B1, B2 and B8. On Mixed-use development sites, which incorporate main employment uses under Class B as specified for each site, together with other identified appropriate employment-generating uses, non-Class-B uses will only be supported where the applicant can demonstrate they are ancillary to the effective functioning of the Mixed-Use Area identified. A master plan will be required for prestige sites identified. Mixed-use developments, which incorporate main employment uses together with other identified appropriate employment-generating uses, will be supported in Mixed-Use Areas identified."

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

The proposed extension is for an existing B2 / B8 use so meets the above criteria.

This application accords with Policy 7 of the SELLP.

PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed B2/B8 use extension will help support the continued growth of this avocado storage and distribution business. It is considered that this extension by virtue of its scale and location can be accommodated on the site without materially harming the character and amenity of the surrounding area. This proposal therefore accords with Policies 1, 2, 3 and 7 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019, as well as Sections 6 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2021.

CONCLUSION

This application is recommended for 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.