

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H23-0618-25 **Applicant:** Mr J Welch

Proposal: Change of use (of existing agricultural shed) from agricultural use to include both agricultural use & use associated with the storage & repair of motor vehicles

Location: Glebe Farm Bush Meadow Lane Whaplode

Terminal Date: 27th August 2025

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
29	The Historic Environment
30	Pollution
33	Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network
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	0	0	1
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS	0	0	0	1

SUPPORT				
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	2	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for the change of use of an existing agricultural building to an agricultural use and for the storage and repair of motor vehicles. Five parking spaces are proposed within an existing concrete hardstanding area, to the west of the building.

Site Description

The site comprises land at Glebe Farm, Bush Meadow Lane, Whaplode. The site is located to the north-east of Whaplode and is mostly surrounded by agricultural fields. There is a dwelling, Glebe Farm, located approximately 20m to the west of the site. The dwelling is currently boarded up for security purposes and is not currently occupied. There is also a dwelling, Willow Cottage, and a boarding kennels business located to the south of the site.

The site is outside any defined settlement boundary, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 and the accompanying policies map.

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

Relevant Planning History

No planning applications have previously been submitted within the site.

Consultation Responses

Responses have been received from the below referenced consultees. The responses are summarised below, however, the responses can be viewed in their entirety on South Holland District Council's website.

Whaplode Parish Council: Concern about Meadow Lane and the increase in traffic movements, Highways input required here.

Lincolnshire County Council: Highways and SUDS: Will the proposal result in an increase in vehicle movements to and from the site? Is the change of use directly related to the agricultural business, or will it be commercial?

South Holland Internal Drainage Board: Byelaw 3 (Surface Water) I cannot see that the applicant has identified a drainage strategy for the site within their application. We recommend a drainage strategy is provided for the site. If the applicant proposes to discharge surface water to a watercourse, consent would be required under Byelaw 3. The Board recommend that any discharge is in line with the National standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) published in June 2025. Further to the National Standards for SuDS, the Board's policy is to restrict discharges to 2l/s/ha or annual average flood flow rate (QBar or QMed), whichever is higher. Please note that any consent granted for the discharge of surface water is likely to be subject to a Surface Water Development Contribution fee (SWDC) as outlined within our Development Control Charges and Fees. Byelaw 3 (Treated Foul Water) The applicant's proposals do not appear to require the

disposal of foul water, therefore Byelaw 3 (Treated foul water) does not apply. Section 23, Land Drainage Act 1991 I am not aware of any riparian owned/maintained watercourses within or adjacent to the site boundary, however this should be confirmed by the applicant. Should the applicant's proposals include works to alter a watercourse, or if works are proposed to alter a watercourse at any time in the future, consent would be required under the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and byelaw 4). Byelaw 10 There are no Board maintained watercourses within or adjacent to the site boundary therefore Byelaw 10 does not apply.

Environmental Protection: No comments.

Environmental Protection - Contaminated Land: No comments regarding land contamination.

Cllr A C Beal: No response received.

Cllr P A Redgate: No response received.

Ecology Officer: 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 letters of representation have been received.

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;
- Design and Visual Impact;
- Impact on Amenity;
- Highway Safety and Parking;
- Biodiversity; and
- Flood Risk.

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.

The site is outside any defined settlement limit and is therefore within the countryside in planning policy terms. Policy 1 sets out that within 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.

The proposed development is for the change of use of an existing agricultural building within the site, to a combined use of agricultural and the storage and repair of motorcycles. The proposal therefore seeks to re-use an existing building. The proposal is for a relatively small-scale business.

Policy 7 of the Local Plan sets out that new businesses outside of the 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. As the proposal seeks to use an existing building within the site for the business, this accords with the aims of Policy 7.

The principle of the proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable in this case. This is however subject to a consideration as to whether the proposed development accords with the development plan and national policy in terms of other material considerations.

Design and 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 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.

Policy 3 of the Local Plan 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.

No changes are proposed to the external appearance of the building to facilitate the change of use. The proposal seeks to use an existing area of concrete hardstanding at the front of the building to provide five car parking space. It is considered that the proposal would not cause an adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area. The proposal would, therefore, accord 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.

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

The site is mostly surrounding by agricultural fields. There is a disused dwelling, Glebe Farm, located approximately 20m to the west of the site. This dwelling shares a vehicular access with the site. The dwelling is also owner by the applicant and according to the submission, the dwelling has been bordered up for security. The other nearest dwelling to the site is Willow Cottage, which is located approximately 65m to the south-west of the site. To the rear of Willow Cottage, there is a boarding kennels business. The other nearest dwellings are located at least 170m from the site.

Currently, two part time workers use the site as part of the agricultural use of the site. This would continue as part of the proposals. The proposed motor vehicle use is proposed for an additional four people working on their own vehicles, and also on other people's vehicles on a part-time basis. Deliveries to the site will not be necessary. The proposed operating hours for the motor vehicle maintenance and storage use part of the proposals are 9am to 6pm Monday to Saturday, and 10am to 2pm on Sundays and Bank Holidays. It would be considered appropriate to secure these

operating hours via condition to reduce the potential impact on residential dwellings within the wider area. It is also considered necessary to restrict operating hours on Sundays and Bank Holidays in the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby dwellings.

It is not considered that the proposed use of the site to repair and store motorcycles would generate significant levels of noise. Activities would take place within the building and the operating hours would be restricted. There is an existing boarding kennel business to the south of the site, and this already likely generates some noise within the area. The proposed use would generate more trips to and from the site as there would be an increase in the number of employees accessing the site. The number is not considered to be significant. Furthermore, the council's environmental protection team have not set out any specific concerns in terms of noise generation. It is considered that the proposed use would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of dwellings within the area.

As such, it is considered that the proposal would have no significant detrimental amenity impacts. Therefore, the proposed development would accord with the Section 12 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan in amenity terms.

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.

Vehicular access to the site is taken from Bush Meadow Lane, to the west of the site. The access would remain unchanged as a result of the proposals. Five parking spaces are proposed within an existing area of concrete hardstanding at the front of the building. As set out previously, the proposed use could result in up to six employees using the site. Employees would use the site on a part-time basis and it is unlikely that all of the employees would be on the site at any time, particularly the existing two part-time agricultural workers. Presumably, these workers do not need to work within the building for long periods of time every day. Therefore, the proposed parking arrangements are acceptable.

According to the submission, no deliveries to the site will be required as a result of the proposals. The employees would be part-time workers and could, presumably have parts delivered to their homes if required.

Lincolnshire County Council's Highways Team have queried whether the proposal will result in an increase in vehicle movements to and from the site. The proposal will result in an increase in vehicle movements, however, it is anticipated that this could be in the region of two motor vehicles per day. As the proposed employees would only use the site on a part-time basis, the frequency of visits will vary and would not necessarily entail every single employee being there every day all day. There could, therefore, be fewer visits than two per day.

The Highways Team have also queried if the change of use is directly related to the agricultural business, or if it will be commercial. The change of use will work in parallel with the existing agricultural business. The part-time workers will also undertake repairs and maintenance on the agricultural vehicles. They will also work on their own vehicles and on other people's vehicles. It is commercial in so far as when working on other people's vehicles, this would be paid work.

Therefore, the proposal would therefore have an acceptable impact in terms of highway safety and

as such, the proposal would accord with Policies 2, 3, 33 and 36 of the Local Plan, as well as Section 9 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.

For applications that are submitted prior to the introduction of this requirement, the development would be exempt from the mandatory 10% requirement and as such, the Biodiversity Gain Condition would not apply. However, this application was submitted following the introduction of this legislation. As such, unless comprising development that is exempt from this mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (10%), a condition would be required, as mandatorily set.

When taking the above into account, the development in this instance the application is exempt from the statutory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirements. For example, no additional floor space is proposed.

Flood Risk

The site is within Flood Zone 3 as identified by the Environment Agency's flood risk maps. Large areas of South Holland are located within Flood Zone 3. Policy 4 of the Local Plan sets out that development within Flood Zone 3 will be permitted in instances where specific criteria is met.

Paragraph 176 of the NPPF sets out that proposals for changes of use should not be subject to the sequential or exception tests. Therefore, in this case it is not necessary to apply these tests. Paragraph 176 sets out that development will nonetheless meet the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments.

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 identified within a hazard rating area of both 'Danger for Some'. In this case, the recommendation mitigation set out within the SFRA is for the finished floor levels to be raised as high as practicable (a minimum of 300mm above the existing ground level). The proposal is for a change of use and as such, the building is already in place. Therefore, it is not considered to be practical or necessary to raise the existing floor levels by 300mm.

South Holland Internal Drainage Board have asked for further details regarding the proposed drainage strategy for the site. As the proposal is for a change of use of an existing building and no

extensions are proposed, it is not considered to be necessary to obtain further drainage details given that the existing strategy will remain unchanged.

Therefore, the proposed development therefore is not likely to increase the risk of flooding within the site. The development therefore satisfactorily accords with Policy 4 of the Local Plan.

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 proposed development is appropriate and would not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, or the amenity of nearby residents. The development is acceptable in terms of highway safety and overall, the proposed development accords with the Local Plan and the NPPF.

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 proposed development accords with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 28, 30, 33 and 36 of the Local Plan, as well as Sections 9, 11, 12, 14 and 15 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.