

SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

Report of: Development Manager

To: Planning Committee - 01 September 2021

(Author: David Grant - Planning Officer)

Purpose: To consider Planning Application H15-1023-20

Application Number: H15-1023-20

Date Received: 16 November 2020

Application Type: FULL

Description: Change of use of agricultural coldstore to mixed agricultural coldstore and storage of third party agricultural produce

Location: PROVIDENCE HOUSE NORTH DROVE QUADRING FEN

Applicant: J B Robinson & Son

Agent: Robert Doughty Consultancy Ltd

Ward: Donington, Quadring and Gosberton

Ward Councillors: Cllr H J W Bingham
Cllr S C Walsh
Cllr J L King

You can view this application on the Council's web site at

<http://planning.sholland.gov.uk/OcellaWeb/planningDetails?reference=H15-1023-20>

1.0 REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

1.1 Issues raised and objections received which merit Committee consideration.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 This is an application relating to Providence House, North Drove, Quadring Fen for a change of use of an agricultural coldstore to a mixed agricultural coldstore and storage of third party agricultural produce. The proposal does not seek any internal or external alterations to the building or the surrounding area of the site.

2.2 The applicant intends to continue to use the store primarily for flower grading and bunching as approved under application reference H15-0144-19. However, during winter months and potentially if a crop fails at other times of the year, the applicant intends to also use the building for the storage of third party agricultural produce such as oranges, avocados and melons. The primary use of the site as a whole remains solely agricultural.

2.3 The agent has provided a supporting statement which states:

"The applicant farms some 348ha of land for cut flowers, 145ha for cereals and 61ha for potatoes. Providence House is the principal farmstead and consists of a number of modern agricultural stores, some of which are chilled. The buildings (excluding offices and plant rooms) equate to approximately 4,720sqm. The building, which is used for only parts of the year to store third party produce, the subject of this application, is 720sqm, or roughly 15% of the total floorspace."

Like every other agricultural and horticultural business in the country, there are seasonal peaks and troughs in production and occasionally poor weather can see whole flower crops destroyed (recently 16ha of planted flowers was lost in one freak weather incident). Like many other producers, the farming company ensures that the buildings are made best use of rather than standing empty for parts of the year. The building which is the subject of this application is a modern chilled facility and is, therefore, particularly useful for storing the type of perishable, non-native or out of season produce routinely imported into this country in order to satisfy customer demands. Accordingly, when it is known that the building in question is likely to be under-utilised, the applicant will store third-party produce such as oranges, grapes, broccoli, and calabrese. The time/periods when the building is used for this type of storage varies throughout the year, but it is for only parts of the year. The produce can only be stored one pallet high because each pallet contains pre-packed produce and cannot, therefore, be stacked on top of each other. Depending on the type of produce, the store will hold up to 300-350 tonnes. By way of comparison, when the building is used to store the applicant's own potatoes, these are stored 6 high at the eaves and the building will hold 1200 tonnes.

Each year, the applicant's farming and horticultural activities generate approximately 25,000 boxes of Sunflowers, 2 million stems of Snowberry which equates to 4,000 boxes, 1.5 million stems or 1000 boxes of Hypericum, 2,000 boxes of Sweet William, 700 boxes of ornamental brassica flowers grown across 348ha, 3,750 tonnes of potatoes across 61ha and 1,250 tonnes of cereal grain across 145ha. To put the third- party storage into perspective, it uses 15% of the floorspace available on the farming complex to store between 300 and 350 tonnes of third party produce for probably no more than 6-8 weeks; or around 5% of the year. The traffic generation associated with the proposal also makes up a small percentage of the use of the building in question and an even smaller percentage of that attributable to the planning unit."

3.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 3.1 The site is outside of defined settlement limits and the surrounding area is predominately rural, characterised by non-nucleated linear development of varying ages and designs. The site is located in Flood Zone 3 and is not subject to increased flood hazard or flood depth on the 1% 2115 South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

4.1 The Development Plan

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, March 2019

If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts, Section 38 (6) to the Town and Country Planning Act as amended by the 2004 Act states that the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Policy 1 - Spatial Strategy

Policy 2 - Development Management

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

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2021

Section 6 - Building a strong, competitive economy

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

5.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 H15-0144-19

Full - Proposed flower bunching and grading shed with covered canopy and switchgear building
- Approved - 11 April 2019.

Full - Proposed storage building for boxed potatoes and external plant room building - Approved
- 15 July 2020.

6.0 REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 Quadring Parish Council

Support.

6.2 Councillor S C Walsh

No observations.

6.3 Councillor H J W Bingham

No objection.

6.4 The Rt Hon Sir John Hayes CBE MP

I share the concerns of local residents about the impact this application will have on their homes and amenity. North Drove is a narrow lane in a quiet rural area, my constituents are worried that this application will lead to an increase in large farm machinery and heavy good vehicle traffic, at all times of the day. Farms should not be permitted to turn tranquil, green open spaces into industrial area. I would, therefore, be grateful if you could please treat this letter as formal objection to the proposal.

6.5 LCC - County Highways & SUDS Officer

Does not wish to restrict the grant of permission. Having given due regard to the appropriate local and national planning policy guidance (in particular the National Planning Policy Framework), Lincolnshire County Council (as Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority) has concluded that the proposed part-year use of this previously consented building for the storage of off-site produce would not be expected to have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety and therefore does not wish to object to this application. They have also highlighted that no accidents have been recorded on this road in the last five years.

6.6 SHDC - Environmental Protection

No objections.

6.7 Lincolnshire Fire Rescue

One call in last 10 years to site - FAGI (False alarm good intent)

6.8 Public (50 representations received, summarised)

Objections - 32 pre-amendment and 7 post-amendment

- Concern re highway safety (vehicles, pedestrians and horses), condition of roads and level and type of vehicles business generates
- Damage to drains from heavy vehicles.
- Vibrations from passing lorries shake dwellings
- Noise from site (loud music, vehicles beeping horns, sleep disturbed by night-time traffic)
- Vehicle emissions from increased vehicular journeys on North Drove.
- Appearance of the site.
- Impact on property value
- Hazardous waste is being burnt on site and applicant does not have a waste licence
- Concern re area becoming dominated by industry and agriculture; New storage buildings should be located next to A17
- Risk to local wildlife

- Storage use will not generate additional staff
- Applicant is storing produce for people who are not Greencell and request made for copy of storage agreement with Greencell
- Query why the applicant has a Food Hygiene Certificate when farmers do not need one
- Off-site goods are being stored in buildings that are not connected to the application
- Comments made regarding profits and where they are coming from
- Speculation as to future plans for the site

6.9 Whilst the above is a summary of comments received from numerous objectors, it should be noted that a number of these were a pro-forma letter/petition and a large amount of the correspondence in objection to the application was received from a single objector.

6.10 *Support - 8 pre-amendment and 3 post-amendment*

- The building is already on site
- Access and parking on site is fine
- The owners helped clear the surrounding roads with their vehicles after snow on December the 4th 2020
- No music is ever played on site
- Robinsons had a bonfire on November the 4th 2020 and at no other time
- Visually the buildings present as agricultural buildings which are not uncommon in this area
- No evidence submitted of claims of vehicular movements
- Matters of road safety are the responsibility of County Highways not the applicant
- Businesses were here on this land long before the existing residents
- There is no nature reserve to the south of this site as claimed
- The application provides local employment
- There is off site parking available for staff
- Reversing beepers on forklift trucks are a health and safety requirement
- There has been a decrease in traffic over the years as smaller farms decline
- "We have never seen huge amounts of people walking on Town Drove. It is an unpaved road and pedestrians do have to be aware of traffic and as mentioned previously most of the road has good verges for pedestrians to step on to when meeting traffic."
- The owner and staff of J.B. Robinsons are considerate to horse riders
- The applicant is not responsible for the majority of traffic on North Drove
- With the growth in residential development in neighbouring villages, local jobs need to be secured
- The farm should be supporting in its diversification to preserve the existing business
- The use of the building for storage by other local businesses will reduce emissions overall by ensuring additional storage capacity remains nearby
- By approving this application it will help "provide job and food security especially during these challenging times."
- "The leaflet I received as a resident of Town Drove against the planning application I find is not accurate in many view points and appears more a personal vendetta against the business in question as oppose to a constructive points of view against the planning application."
- The applicant is subject to targeted bullying, harassment and trespass
- Established farm business over 5 generations
- Nearby residents who live in the countryside should expect countryside noises and disturbances

7.0 **CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 **Planning Considerations**

7.2 Principle

7.3 The principle of this proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 1 titled - Spatial Strategy. The site is within the Countryside for planning policy purposes and the relevant section of this policy states:

7.4 "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."

- 7.5 When assessed against the above criteria the following can be observed:
- 7.6 The applicant intends to continue to use the store primarily for flower grading and bunching as approved under reference H15-0144-19. This building has been constructed and is in operation. However, during winter months and potentially if a crop fails at other times of the year, the applicant intends to also use the building for the storage of third party agricultural produce such as oranges, avocados and melons. Having regard to the likely timeframe that the building would be used for the storage of third party produce, it is considered that the primary use of the site would remain agricultural and the third party storage element would be ancillary. Storage and distribution uses are not uncommon in the Countryside and this proposal is not considered to materially change the overall appearance or intensity of use of the site.
- 7.7 In light of the above, the principle of the proposed storage use in this location is, on balance, considered to be acceptable.
- 7.8 Assessment against SELLP Policy 2 - Development Management
- 7.9 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."
- 7.10 When assessed against the above relevant criteria the following can be observed:
- 7.11 1. The size, scale and layout of the building remains unaltered by the proposal. The character and appearance of the surrounding area is not impacted by this proposal.
- 7.12 2. The design and orientation of the proposal building remains unaltered by the proposal.
- 7.13 3. Materials of construction remain unaltered by this proposal.
- 7.14 4. Access to the site remains unaltered. The application confirmed that with regard to the vehicles that deliver to the site, it is predominantly Turners Transport although they also subcontract some of the haulage to various other companies whilst also transporting our own products. County Highways & SUDS Officer, has no objections and responded to an objecting member of the public, stating: "I have, as promised, revisited the site and have driven several times along the road between the Application Site and the A152, Main Road through Quadring. I have also corresponded with Lincolnshire Road Safety Partnership in respect of their Personal Injury Collision records for this part of the network and I have discussed the details of the Application with the Planning Case Officer, David Grant, who I have copied into this e-mail. My conclusion is that, notwithstanding your own views on the matter, there still is no cause for the Highway Authority to be recommending to the Local Planning Authority that the proposed change of use of the subject building should be prevented or refused Consent on the grounds of that change of use having an unacceptable impact upon highway safety or a severe residual cumulative impact upon the highway network."
- 7.15 5. The proposal is not considered to materially impact existing community services and infrastructure.

- 7.16 6. There is not considered to be a material impact from noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion. Internal storage is not considered to generate a material increase in noise or visual intrusion as the building is already in place and any noise from traffic would only be during regular operational hours on site. External odour impact would not be anticipated from the internal storage of fruit and vegetables in a chillstore. There is not considered to be a material disturbance impact from this proposal as the storage building is within the existing site and the farm does not operate outside of normal working hours. The site on the opposite side of North Drove at Honeysuckle House has permission and operates as a haulage/storage and distribution site under previous permissions H15-1088-84; H15-1202-88 and H15-0124-94, so a storage and distribution use in the open countryside is not uncommon generally, and would not set a precedent in the surrounding area. Consideration does need to be made however to the wording of a condition that does not allow the storage and distribution to become the primary business at the expense of agriculture. The NPPF does support the diversification of agricultural business to ensure their long term sustainability, but this cannot be at the expense of losing agriculture as the predominant business on site.
- 7.17 7. There is not considered to be a sustainable drainage or flood risk impact from the proposal. The site is located in Flood Zone 3 and is not subject to increased flood hazard or flood depth on the 1% 2115 South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping. The SUDS Officer has no objections to the submitted details.
- 7.18 8. The proposed use of the storage building is not considered to materially impact any natural habitats, historical buildings or heritage assets.
- 7.19 The proposal is considered to be in general accordance with SELLP Policy 2.
- 7.20 Assessment against SELLP Policy 7 - Improving South East Lincolnshire's Employment Land Portfolio
- 7.21 This proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 7 - Improving South East Lincolnshire's Employment Land Portfolio. The relevant section of Policy 7 is titled Other Employment Sites and this section states:
- "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."
- 7.22 When assessed against the above relevant criteria the following can be observed:
- a. The proposal does not conflict with agricultural or any other neighbouring land uses. The site on the opposite side of North Drove at Honeysuckle House has permission and operates as a haulage/storage and distribution site under previous permissions H15-1088-84; H15-1202-88 and H15-0124-94, so a storage and distribution use in the open countryside is not uncommon generally, and would not set a precedent in the surrounding area.
 - b. There are no alterations proposed to the storage building. There is therefore not considered to be a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.
 - c. There are no alterations proposed to the storage building.
 - d. There is not considered to be a significant increase in traffic as a result of this proposal. The

County Highways & SUDS Officer has no objections to the proposal.

e. The proposal gives the applicant the opportunity to store off-site produce in winter months or if the flower crop fails. This helps to ensure financial stability for the business and keeps the storage of fruit and vegetables in the local area thereby supporting local businesses. The storage of third party produce would be ancillary and nature and not impact upon the viability of delivering any allocated employment site.

f. As the proposal keeps off-site storage in the local area this is considered to minimise travel distance and therefore emissions associated with vehicle movements.

g. Their building is pre-existing and helps maintain income and employment during winter months when flowers are not grown and storage areas are vacant.

7.23 The proposal is considered to satisfactorily accord with SELLP Policy 7.

7.24 Private traffic survey by CTS

7.25 A private traffic survey was commissioned by an objector to observe traffic entering and exiting the site. The observer for the company CTS made observations about highway safety and the condition surrounding roads that serve the area. The County Highways & SUDS Officer has expressed no concerns to that regard. The observer has also provided an accident review for the site which shows no accidents on North Drove in the last 22 years, although six over the same period occurred on the Quadring Bank and Town Drove routes.

7.26 The traffic survey took place over four hours on the morning of Thursday 5th August 2021. The observer states that they intended to observe the site for five days in total. They also state that the applicant asked that they leave the site as they were parked without permission on land belonging to J.B. Robinson.

7.27 The observer states the following:

"During this four hour period there were two hgv's with curtain sides that arrived and later departed. There was an additional hgv with a shipping container that left and another that arrived later.

There were nine tractors with trailers leaving and two arrived, with another tractor arriving on its own.

There were several distinct agricultural movements, e.g. a crop spraying vehicle, and several private cars and smaller pick-up trucks observed.

Overall, 17 vehicles arrived and 23 departed in the four-hour period. 15 were HGV's, 33% tractors with trailers and the remainder light goods or cars.

This equates to a vehicle movement related to the site every six minutes. If these vehicles take a minute to pass along North Drove that suggests present levels of traffic would present 10% chance of another vehicle meeting them along this section. However, that value could easily increase were more flows added."

7.28 The observer concludes by further commenting on the state of the surrounding roads and requesting that the applicant submits a Transport Statement.

7.29 The observations made are limited in a number of ways. Firstly, the observer does not record the number plates. It is therefore difficult to ascertain whether the vehicular movements are of the same vehicles and around the vicinity of the large area of land owned by the applicant, or to further afield. Secondly, over half the movements are from private motor vehicles which would likely be workers parking or being dropped off on site.

7.30 Thirdly, the survey was commenced when the site is at its busiest. Therefore to make assumptions to the number of vehicular movements per minute over the course of a day, let alone a longer period of time is not considered to be a true reflection on what has been observed when conducting three site visits and five drive pasts during normal office hours by

the Planning Officer. During these visits on or past the site, the number of vehicles entering / exiting or passing the site was significantly less than the numbers given by CTS.

7.31 Other Considerations

- 7.32 For completeness, this section covers the issues raised by resident objections that are not already addressed in previous sections of this report.
- 7.33 Damage to drains from heavy vehicles - This is a civil matter and not one which the Local Planning Authority can address.
- 7.34 Noise from site (loud music, vehicles beeping horns, sleep disturbed by night-time traffic) - Colleagues in Environmental Protection have no objections to the proposal and have not highlighted any historic noise complaints related to the site.
- 7.35 Vehicle emissions from increased vehicular journeys on North Drove - There is no evidence to suggest that there will be a significant increase in vehicle movements as a result of the proposal.
- 7.36 Appearance of the site - The building in question will remain unaltered and the site is of typical agricultural appearance.
- 7.37 Impact on property value - This is a consideration but one which carries very limited weight in the overall planning balance.
- 7.38 Hazardous waste is being burnt on site and applicant does not have a waste licence - Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue have not been called out to the site in the last ten years. No evidence has been brought forward to demonstrate that fires in the vicinity are on land belonging to J.B. Robinson.
- 7.39 Concern re area becoming dominated by industry and agriculture; New storage buildings should be located next to A17 - Each application is considered on its own merits and the very nature of the countryside means it tends to be predominantly agricultural.
- 7.40 Risk to local wildlife - This application relates to the storage of agricultural produce in a pre-existing building, therefore there should not be a material adverse impact on wildlife.
- 7.41 Storage use will not generate additional staff - Storage uses do typically generate lower levels of employment but the proposed use is effectively a form of farm diversification which will assist the business financially and hopefully protect jobs.
- 7.42 Applicant is storing produce for people who are not Greencell and request made for copy of storage agreement with Greencell - This is not considered to be of relevance to this application as the applicant has not specifically stated that the building will only be used by Greencell.
- 7.43 Query why the applicant has a Food Hygiene Certificate when farmers do not need one - This farm requires a food hygiene exemption certificate due to the arable nature of their business.
- 7.44 Off-site goods are being stored in buildings that are not connected to the application - Site visits have been conducted by Officers, with photographs being taken that show no off-site goods stored in other buildings on-site.
- 7.45 Comments made regarding profits and where they are coming from - Financial accounts are not required to demonstrate whether or not a shared use is appropriate within a pre-existing building.
- 7.46 Speculation as to future plans for the site - Any potential future plans for the site cannot form part of the application at hand.

7.47 **Planning Balance**

7.48 The proposed change of use will help support a local agricultural business and will not materially impact the character and amenity of the surrounding area. Whilst concerns have been raised about the level of vehicles accessing the site, the Highway Authority have no objections to the proposal and the traffic survey submitted by an objector is somewhat limited in terms of its reliability.

7.49 The planning balance is therefore considered to be in favour of the proposal.

7.50 **Conclusion**

7.51 The proposal is considered to accord with Policies 1, 2 and 7 of the South East Lincolnshire Plan, 2019, as well as Sections 6 & 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2021.

7.52 **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.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1 **Grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed at Section 9.0 of this report.**

9.0 **CONDITIONS**

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
46918/100
46918/101
46918/103
46918/102
Application Form

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. For the avoidance of doubt, the building permitted to be used for the storage of third party produce is the building indicated as a 'flower bunching and grading shed/store on drawing no. 46918/101 (i.e. that approved by virtue of application reference H15-0144-19) and the storage of third party produce shall remain ancillary to the agricultural use of the building.

Reason: For clarity and to ensure that the agricultural use of the building remains the primary use.
This Condition is imposed in accordance with Policies 1 and 7 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019.
4. Noise from fixed plant and machinery shall not exceed a level of 5 dB(A) above the background noise level when measured as a L(A)eq15min at any residential boundary not within the applicant's ownership.

Reason: To ensure that there is no noise nuisance to nearby residents.
This Condition is imposed in accordance with Policies 2, 3 and 30 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019.
5. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing it against all material considerations, including national guidance, planning policies and representations that have been received during the public consultation exercise, and subsequently determining to grant planning permission.

This decision notice, the relevant accompanying report and the determined plans can be viewed online at <http://planning.sholland.gov.uk/OcellaWeb/planningSearch>

Background papers:- Planning Application Working File

Lead Contact Officer

Name and Post:	Richard Fidler , Development Manager
Telephone Number:	01775 764428
Email	rfidler@sholland.gov.uk

Appendices attached to this report:

Appendix A Plan A

MapThat Scale Print Title

