DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H14-0669-26**	**Applicant:**	**Moll Mshy Tattoos**
Proposal:	Change of use of existing commercial premises (Class E) to Tattoo Studio (Sui Generis)		
Location:	Shop And Premises 42a Knight Street Pinchbeck		
Terminal Date:	10th September 2026		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
24	The Retail Hierarchy
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 August 2026

Section 4 - Achieving sustainable development
Section 14 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 15 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 20 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	0	0	0	1
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	1	0

OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	3

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a full planning application, seeking the change of use of 42A Knight Street, Pinchbeck from Class E to a tattoo studio (sui generis). No external alterations are proposed.

Site Description

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Pinchbeck, as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The unit is towards the centre of the settlement, within a small cluster of shops and takeaways. The site is within Pinchbeck Conservation Area.

Relevant History

H14-1282-80 - Outline - Erection of one or two lock up shops - Approved 08/04/81

H14-0506-26 - S192 - Use of Premises as Tattoo Studio - Refused 15-07-26

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:

Environment Agency

The Environment Agency does not wish to make any comments on this application.

Historic Environment Officer

Having reviewed the application documents and the updated available Historic Environment information for this application, 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. However, if you would like advice from us, please contact us to explain your request

SELCP Ecologist

Thank you for consulting us on this application. We have reviewed the proposals and have no ecological concerns to raise at this time; therefore, we have no objections.

Pinchbeck Parish Council

Support - Pinchbeck Parish Council supports this application, recognising the benefits it would bring in supporting local employment and economic activity. Whilst the application does not propose any external alterations, should any future obscuring of the windows be considered necessary, the Council would strongly prefer obscured glazing rather than the application of vinyl window film, in the interests of maintaining the appearance of the building. Subject to this observation, Pinchbeck Parish Council supports the application

Environmental Protection

No comments

Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority

The proposal is for change of use of existing commercial premises (Class E) to Tattoo Studio (Sui Generis) and it does not have an adverse impact on the Public Highway.

Conservation Officer

I have no objections to this proposal on built heritage grounds. The site is located within the Pinchbeck Conservation Area; however, no external alterations are proposed as part of this application. As such, the proposal would not adversely affect the character or appearance of the conservation area. Should the applicant wish to install any external advertisements or signage in the future, they should ensure that these are of an appropriate design, scale, and quality, having regard to the character and appearance of the conservation area

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, 2026 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

Principle of Development

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 within the settlement of Pinchbeck which is classed as a main service centre within Policy 1. As such development will be permitted that supports Pinchbek's role as a service centre, helps sustain existing facilities or helps meet the service needs of other local communities.

Policy S3(1) of the NPPF states:
"Decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means:
a. Policy S4 in this Framework should be applied when considering development proposals within settlements;
b. Outside settlements, policy S5 should be applied"
As previously outlined, the site is within a defined settlement limit, and therefore, Policy S4 is relevant. This states:

"Development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework."

Policy S4(2) outlines circumstances where the benefits of approving a development are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects. This includes, but is not limited to, development on allocated land for purposes other than those allocated, the loss of cemetery land, loss of land used for flood risk management, or failure to comply with a policy which explicitly states development should be refused in specific circumstances.

As the site is within Pinchbeck, development within this location is considered appropriate. The proposal would support the settlement's role as a main service centre.

Therefore, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy 1 of the SELLP, as well as Policy S4 of the NPPF. The principle of development on this site is considered acceptable subject to other material considerations being met.

Town Centre Uses and the Retail Hierarchy

Policy TC3 of the NPPF states:
"A sequential test should be applied to proposals for main town centre uses for which planning permission is required, where these are neither in an existing centre nor in accordance with an allocation for that purpose in an up-to-date development plan".

Annex B of the NPPF defines "main town centre uses". This states that main town centre uses include:
"Retail development (including warehouse clubs and factory outlet centres); leisure, entertainment and more intensive sport and recreation uses (including cinemas, restaurants, drive-through restaurants, bars and pubs, nightclubs, casinos, health and fitness centres, indoor bowling centres and bingo halls); banks; professional services; offices; and arts, culture and tourism development (including theatres, museums, galleries and concert halls, hotels and conference facilities)."

The proposed use as a tattoo studio is not explicitly listed within the above definition. It should be noted that the reference to "professional services" listed within the definition may appear broad; however, it is a term used explicitly in Class E of the Use Class Order 1987, and therefore, there is an implication that this element is referring solely to Class E(cii) uses.

Therefore, as a Sui Generis use, whilst conventionally within town centres, the proposal would not strictly be a town centre use for the purposes of the NPPF. As such, a sequential test would not strictly be required.

In any event, the proposal would be within an existing, currently vacant, unit within a cluster of retail units. Therefore, whilst not within a defined town centre area, it is within a retail cluster, and represents a broadly acceptable use in this context.

The requirements of Policy 24 of the SELLP and TC3 of the NPPF have been broadly met as a result, and the requirements of Policy S4 of the NPPF have also been met.

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

Section 14 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places", outlines that planning decisions and policies should "promote high quality, healthy, inclusive and sustainable places".

Paragraph 1 of DP3 outlines that "development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets".

In order to create well-designed places, Paragraph 2 outlines that proposals should reflect seven key principles, as appropriate to the nature of the development and its location. These are: liveability, climate, nature, movement, built form, public space, and identity.

Paragraph 3 of DP3 is explicit that proposals which conflict with paragraph 1, the relevant aspects of paragraph 2 of DP3, or relevant development plan policies and guidance, should be refused.

Conversely, substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals.

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 site lies within Pinchbeck Conservation Area. In respect of any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, through Section 72 the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Policy HE6 of Section 20 of the NPPF states that "When considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance".

Policy HE9(2) of the NPPF expands upon this, in relation to Conservation Areas, stating:
"Not all elements of a conservation area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Where a development proposal would result in the loss of a building or other element which contributes to the character or appearance of a conservation area that is desirable to conserve, the assessment of impact should take into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the conservation area as a whole, and the effects of this considered in accordance with policies HE5 and HE6.".

Policy 29B, relating to conservation areas, states: "Proposals within, affecting the setting of, or affecting views into or out of, a Conservation Area should preserve (and enhance or reinforce, as appropriate) features that contribute positively to the area's character, appearance and setting. Proposals should:
1. Retain buildings/groups of buildings, existing street patterns, historic building lines and ground surfaces;
2. Retain architectural details that contribute to the character and appearance of the area;
3. Where relevant and practical, remove features which are incompatible with the Conservation Area;
4. Retain and reinforce local distinctiveness with reference to height, massing, scale, form, materials and plot widths of the existing built environment;
5. Assess, and mitigate against, any negative impact the proposal might have on the townscape, roofscape, skyline and landscape;"

No external changes are proposed. As the site is within a retail cluster, the fundamental use would not be out of keeping. As such, there would be no significant impact on the character or appearance of the area.

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, 3 and 29 of the SELLP and Sections 14 and 20 of the NPPF.

Impacts Upon Resident Amenity

DP3 of the NPPF outlines that development should create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a focus on promoting liveability.

Likewise, Policy P3(1) outlines that development proposals should be appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, whether these effects are on or off-site. This point is expanded upon in P3(2) which states all development proposals should "provide healthy living conditions for occupiers and users in terms of adequate access to light and avoiding exposure to levels of air, noise, artificial light or other sources of pollution which could have an unacceptable adverse effect on health and the quality of life ".

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 hours of operation proposed are 9am till 6pm, Monday to Friday, and 10am till 4pm on Saturdays. These are conventional business use times, at the least sensitive part of the day. In any event, the noise generated by a tattoo studio would be limited, and would not be detrimental to resident amenity.

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 15 of the NPPF is titled 'Promoting sustainable transport'. Within this, Policy TR6(4) advises that "development proposals should be refused if they would have a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety; taking into account any mitigation measures proposed as well as any wider network improvements, including measures to support sustainable patterns of movement. This applies both during the construction phase and following completion."

Policy TR3 of the NPPF outlines that development should be located where it can support sustainable patterns of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure. The policy outlines a series of principles to achieve these aims, with the expectation that all proposals should, so far is relevant, conform to them. Policy TR3(2) is explicit that "The Connectivity Tool should be used alongside other relevant quantitative or qualitative evidence in assessing the connectivity of particular locations proposed for development."

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. No defined standards are given for tattoo studios.

No off-street parking is available on site. However, the proposed business would not result in a more intensive use than the existing Class E use of the building. In this regard, there would not be a worsening effect. Moreover, as the site is within the centre of a defined settlement, one which is reasonably well connected, users could utilise sustainable modes of transport to access the site.

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 15 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 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.

No external development is proposed. The site is therefore exempt under the de minimis exemption.

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 represents appropriate development within the defined settlement boundary. Whilst the proposal would technically display a degree of conflict with the exact wording of the retail strategy of the Local Plan, the actual tangible details would be broadly consistent with the aims of the policy, in that it represents an appropriate commercial use in an appropriate area. The development hereby proposed does not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, or amenity of nearby residents, and provides adequate parking, whilst conforming with the SELLP and the provisions of the NPPF when viewed as a whole.

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, 24, 28, 33 and 36 of the SELLP, as well as Sections 4, 14, 15 and 20 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.