

Officers Report

Planning Application No: 140485

PROPOSAL: Planning application to erect a new operational services depot to facilitate waste services in the region, including an operations office and staff welfare building, external yard for storage and maintenance of the vehicle fleet, bulky storage facility, staff and visitor parking, and site landscaping.

LOCATION: Land East of A15/North of A631 Caenby Corner Market Rasen Lincolnshire LN8 2AR

WARD: Waddingham and Spital

WARD MEMBER: Cllr Summers

APPLICANT NAME: Mr A Selby

TARGET DECISION DATE: 21/04/2020

DEVELOPMENT TYPE: Major - Other

CASE OFFICER: Martin Evans

RECOMMENDED DECISION: It is recommended that planning committee delegate powers to officers to grant planning permission subject to conditions following receipt of any outstanding consultation replies and matters arising as well as receipt of and any matters arising from:

- Cross sections of the site showing any land level changes
- A scheme of archaeological trial trenching

If these matters are not resolved within 6 months of the date of this planning committee the application will be reported back to the next available planning committee after the 6 months has expired.

This application is reported to planning committee because the applicant is made by an employee on the behalf of West Lindsey District Council.

Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017:

The development has been assessed in the context of Schedule 2 of the Regulations and after taking account of the criteria in Schedule 3 it has been concluded that the development is not likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of its nature, size or location. Neither is the site within a sensitive area as defined in Regulation 2(1). Therefore the development is not 'EIA development'. The proposal is subject to a separate screening opinion.

Description:

This is an application for planning permission to erect a new operational services depot for West Lindsey District Council waste services including an operations office and staff welfare building with floorspace totalling 845m². A

new two lane vehicular access is proposed from the A631 leading to a 77 space car park with 4 disabled user parking spaces, 4 car share spaces, 2 electric vehicle charging spaces, 7 visitor spaces and 20 cycle parking spaces with surface water balancing pond to the front. The main two storey building would have a monopitch roof and measure 7.5m high, 15m wide and 17.5m deep. External finishing materials include single ply membrane to the roof, blue grey aluminium cladding and grey facing brickwork with feature brick coursing to the front wall. Brise soleil provide shading to the windows. This building would provide shower, changing and toilet facilities as well as office and meeting room space for staff. Three external air conditioning units would be attached the north facing elevation of the building. The proposal would provide for 80 full time equivalent employees. Opening hours are not specified because the site may be required for 24/7 use in the event of an emergency such as the need to provide sand bags in the event of a flood or fly tipping on a highway that must be cleared by staff.

The section of the site to the north of the main building would be accessed via rising arm barrier with vehicles using a circulation route to prevent the need for reversing. This area contains a refuelling station with associated self bunded tanks; 30 refuse vehicle and 10 caged vehicle parking spaces; two vehicle wash down bays with pressure washer housing; a trade and wheelie bin storage area; road sweeping deposit area; and a storage building with adjacent external storage space.

The storage building would be 50m long, 8m deep and 4.5m high at the tallest point. It would feature a monopitch roof providing double height bays in part of the building and various stores for materials collected as part of the waste collection service and associated operational storage space such as a bag store and road sweeper store. The building features a roof overhang and the same external finishing materials as the main building. A tyre trailer and skip area are located adjacent the storage building.

The proposed site layout has a 4-5m wide peripheral landscaping buffer area in which planting can take place to soften the appearance of the proposal. A large external amenity area and grassed area to the east of the main building is proposed. The front car park would be covered in tarmac whilst the rear car park would be covered in concrete. Package treatment plant would be used to treat foul water. Surface water would drain to the attenuation pond with restricted discharge to the roadside drain.

The application site is 2.08 hectares in area and located in the countryside to the north east of Caenby Corner roundabout. The site sits on a slope with the highest point being the north west corner at 46.159mAOD sloping gradually down to the south east corner at 39.449mAOD. The southern boundary of the site adjoins the A631 where there is a roadside surface water drain and existing vehicular access.

The site is currently a grass field with roadside hedge used on 6 days a year for camping and parking associated with Sturton & Stow Motor Sports Club which uses the site and the land directly to the west for race days. The club is

limited to a maximum of 6 days of events per calendar year via planning permission condition.

Development in the area is primarily clustered around Caenby Corner roundabout to the south west including a transport café with parking area, vehicle repair business, disused public house, petrol filling station, car sales area and restaurant. A dwelling known as Lyndarlea Lodge is located on the south west corner of the roundabout approximately 360m away from the site.

To the south of the site is the A631 with arable farmland beyond with 1 and 2 Cliff Cottages approximately 330m away. To the east of the site is arable farmland with Slates Farm, which contains a dwelling and intervening farm buildings, approximately 270m away. To the north of the site is arable farmland with Home Farm approximately 370m away.

The site is within a limestone minerals safeguarding area.

Relevant history:

M06/P/0318 Planning Application to change the use for grass track motor sports. Temporary 2 year planning permission. Approved 8/6/06.

121385 Planning application to remove and/or extend conditional planning permission M06/P/0318 granted 06/04/06 for a period of two calendar years. This period expires at the end of August 2008. Approved 21/2/08 on a permanent basis. Condition 6 of this permission requires egress from the events to be via the vehicular access point on the application site.

Representations:

Glenthams Parish Council:

24/1/2020

“Glenthams Parish Council has no objections to the proposal but has concerns about surface water drainage and the potential to put multiple houses at flood risk. Seggimoor Beck already floods, the latest being Nov/Dec 2019, and increased water into the beck will only exacerbate the problem. Council needs to be assured that sufficient action is being taken to mitigate any potential problems before planning permission is given.”

28/1/2020

“Further to Glenthams Parish Council's response made last week I have been asked to send an amendment to the statement regarding flooding of Seggimoor Beck in 2019. This was in fact flooding caused by blocked drains. The last flooding of the beck was in June 2007 causing significant flood damage to a number of properties. Since then water levels have risen significantly but never over topped the beck. The parish council's aim is that this remains the case and that the proposed development will manage its surface water discharge to ensure downstream watercourses do not receive any more volume of water.”

Local residents:

Residents of Glenthams House, High Street, Glenthams object (summary):

- Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. Such land needed more than ever because the UK has left the EU.
- Size and mass is of industrial scale in the countryside close to dwellings.
- The proposal does not consider Lindarlea Lodge.
- Proposal is in an unsuitable area. It could be on Hemswell Cliff Industrial Estate.
- Surface water flooding may occur because of the slope of the site and the attenuation pond is not big enough to cope. Runoff would go to the dyke and any pollution will go into Glenthams Beck then the River Ancholme to the detriment of the population along these water ways and wildlife. Pollution could impact on water quality and supply.
- The A631 is a red route with numerous accidents and fatalities. This is a national speed limit road with poor visibility near the proposed entrance. Vehicles, particularly motorbikes, speed in this area. The road layout should be altered with a slip road and central reservation. Comparison is made with 136274. Existing access is insufficient for the proposal.
- Proposal will not provide employment for locals or local economic benefits.
- Visual impact as this is a blot on the landscape.

Residents of Jarebe, Bishop Norton Road, Glenthams and Lyndarlea Lodge, Caenby Corner make general observations (summary):

- The Council released a press briefing stating the proposal is to meet needs of future new homes whereas the application infers it is to consolidate other sites.
- The Council is committed to a greener environment but the only way to access the proposal is by private vehicles due to lack of regular bus service, the footpath is rough and muddy in inclement weather and there are no cycle paths or safe cycling routes.
- It would be interesting to understand if the Council would be discriminating against existing and potential employees who are unable or unwilling to travel by car.
- Suggest Council commits to building footpaths and cycle ways from Glenthams, Gainsborough and Lincoln and ensuring a regular bus service from Glenthams through Caenby Corner to Lincoln and Gainsborough.
- Lyndarlea is omitted from the design and access statement and it is a concern the impact on residents has not been fully assessed [case officer note: please note this dwelling is considered in the noise assessment].

WLDC Conservation Officer:

“There are a cluster of listed buildings at Spital in the Street, including Cromwell House which has a principal architectural elevation facing south (towards the proposed site) and the nearby Norton Place (grade I listed). Norton Place has no inter-visibility the site, and I do not think the development would affect its setting. With regard to Cromwell House, there may be a distant direct view of the proposed building, which is not small, but this would be unlikely to impact on how the significance of the principal elevation is experienced. I would advise that there is no harm to the setting of listed buildings arising in this particular case.”

WLDC Environmental Protection Officer:

24/1/2020: Queries perceived inconsistencies in the noise assessment regards number of vehicle movements assessed and type of wash down facility provided. This may have implications for how noise levels for residents have been assessed. It is not clear whether an acoustic fence is proposed. The comments of residents of Lyndarlea are noted. However, the noise assessment does consider impacts on them.

12/03/2020: Following receipt of amended/additional information the only remaining query is regarding whether a wheel wash of vehicle wash is proposed and the noise impact this would have in terms of duration and frequency. It is noted an acoustic fence is not proposed.

LCC Highways and LLFA:

12/2/2020- Interim response

“Highways

Access point is acceptable however the two lane split for vehicles departing the depot is unnecessary, it also results in an access with excessive width. Could the applicant redesign the access arrangement complete with swept paths to demonstrate its suitability.”

“Drainage

The drainage strategy, along with the discharge rate is acceptable in principle. It is noted in the Flood Risk Assessment that the option of discharging surface water via infiltration has been discounted based on web based geology information and a nearby borehole log. It is recommended by the HLLFA that a site specific ground investigation report is carried out to confirm the viability of infiltration on site.”

Travel plan feedback (summary):

- Travel plan contains relevant information for a business travel plan
- Current data on staff travel should be sought along with intended travel to enable a baseline to be set for future monitoring
- Additional detail and or clarity is requested regarding- planning policy summary to be provided; appendix c- summary of bus times and link to lincsbuses.info in sufficient; targets- travel plan co-ordinator (TPC) should undertake staff survey before the move to ascertain current and intended modes of travel to be used as baseline for future monitoring

and to assist staff plan and prepare for the move, travel plan commencement and review date to be reviewed, is car park capacity sufficient for staff numbers and how many would work at the site?; travel plan survey and database- LCC uses an online tool to monitor travel plans which enables better access and monitoring for travel plan co-ordinator and local authority, this should be used by the TPC; travel plan measures- review of chapter 7 requires appendix c, the council could promote the cycle to work scheme and wheels to work, there could be dedicated car sharing spaces, marketing and promotion- the TPC could promote bikeweek, walk to work week and liftshare week. It is recommended that these comments are used to revise the travel plan for approval, staff surveys undertaken and the travel plan is conditioned to be in place prior to opening of the new site.

LCC Minerals and Waste:

“It is considered that having regard to the scale, nature and location of the proposed development, the applicant has demonstrated that in accordance with the criteria set out in policy M11 that the site is of a minor nature which would have a negligible impact with respect to sterilising the mineral resource. Accordingly, the County Council has no safeguarding objections.”

LCC Archaeology (summary):

- Caenby Corner lies in a rich multiperiod archaeological landscape, with Roman Ermine Street (today's A15) and adjacent to the shrunken medieval village and hospital of St Edmund at Spital in the Street, with prehistoric and high status Anglo-Saxon burial mounds (barrows) known nearby.
- As detailed in the developer's Historic Environment Feasibility Assessment, the site is thus located in an area where archaeological remains from the prehistoric period onwards may be expected.
- The geophysical survey has demonstrated that the site does appear to have been subject to modern surface disturbance.
- Subtle buried remains could be affected by deeper ground works. It is therefore recommended that a targeted programme of trial trenching be required to assess the survival and significance of any surviving remains in the areas of proposed greatest ground disturbance. From the information currently available, this could include the attenuation pond, main building, and storage building.
- Recommendation: Insufficient information is available at present with which to make any reliable observation regarding the impact of this development upon any archaeological remains. I recommend that further information is required from the applicant in the form of an archaeological trial trench evaluation, to be considered alongside the application and previous geophysical survey. This should focus on areas proposed for the greatest depth of ground disturbance, and anomalies of potential archaeological origin noted in the geophysical survey.

Environment Agency:

No objection with environmental permit informative.

Natural England:

No objection. "Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites or landscapes."

Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue:

Object to the application on the grounds of inadequate water supply for firefighting purposes. Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue requires the installation of one fire hydrant conforming to BS750-2012 within 90m of the premises entrance in respect of this planning application to be provided at the developer's expense. Fire hydrant acceptance testing will be carried out by a Hydrant Inspector on completion and a standard hydrant marker "H" plate will be fitted nearby. Following adoption the Fire Service will be responsible for the on-going maintenance and repairs for the lifetime of the fire hydrant.

Reconsultation

The Council received an amended travel plan, transport statement, proposed site plan, response to EPO noise queries and additional water services layout plan. At the time of writing these are the subject of a 14 day reconsultation with LCC Highways and LLFA, Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue and neighbours/those that have written in. Any responses will form an update at the meeting.

Relevant Planning Policies:**Statutory test**

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

"66 General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions.
(1) In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Here, the Development Plan comprises the provisions of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (adopted in April 2017); and the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (adopted June 2016).

Development Plan

- **Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036 (CLLP)**

<https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/central-lincolnshire/local-plan/>

Relevant policies of the CLLP include:

Policy LP1: A Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy LP2: The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy

Policy LP3: Level and Distribution of Growth

Policy LP13: Accessibility and Transport

Policy LP14: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk

Policy LP17: Landscape, Townscape and Views

Policy LP21: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy LP25: The Historic Environment

Policy LP26: Design and Amenity

Policy LP55: Development in the Countryside, Part E

- **Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (LMWLP)**

<https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/planning/minerals-waste>

The site is within a Limestone Minerals Safeguarding Area where policy M11 of the Core Strategy applies.

National policy & guidance (Material Consideration)

- **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. It is a material consideration in planning decisions.

The most recent iteration of the NPPF was published in February 2019.

Paragraph 213 states:

"Existing [development plan] policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)."

- **National Planning Practice Guidance**
- **National Design Guide (2019)**

Main issues

- **The principle of development**
- **Sustainability of the location and highway impacts**
- **Design and impact on the character of the area**
- **Residential amenity**
- **Heritage impacts**
- **Flood risk and drainage**
- **Ecology**
- **Other**

Assessment:

The principle of development

The application site is in a limestone minerals safeguarding area. A minerals assessment has been submitted as required by Policy M11 of the Minerals and Waste Plan. LCC Minerals and Waste raises no objection on minerals safeguarding grounds because the development is of a minor nature which would have a negligible impact with respect to sterilising the mineral resource. The proposal complies with Policy M11 and mineral safeguarding impacts are acceptable.

The site is located in the countryside therefore Policy LP2 Tier 8 Countryside applies which states:

“8. Countryside

Unless allowed by:

a. policy in any of the levels 1-7 above; or

b. any other policy in the Local Plan (such as LP4, LP5, LP7 and LP57), development will be regarded as being in the countryside and as such restricted to:

- that which is demonstrably essential to the effective operation of agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation, transport or utility services;*
- renewable energy generation;*
- proposals falling under policy LP55; and*
- to minerals or waste development in accordance with separate Minerals and Waste Local Development Documents.”*

The CLLP does not define utility services. The Cambridge Dictionary defines utility as follows:

“utility noun (SERVICE)

[C] formal

a service that is used by the public, such as an electricity or gas supply or a train service”.

Under the terms of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, West Lindsey District Council is classed as a Waste Collection Authority, and as such, under section 45(1) it has a statutory duty to collect household waste from all domestic properties within its administrative area. The Council's Waste and Recycling Collection Policies set out the services the Council provide to manage household waste in a safe and cost effective way that encourages waste minimisation and recycling.

The application entails a depot essential to the effective operation of the Council's waste and recycling collection service which is considered to be a utility as it provides a service to the public. The proposal would enable the amalgamation of the existing depots at Gallamore Lane Industrial Estate in Market Rasen and North Warren Road in Gainsborough, which would close,

with associated operational and locational efficiencies by virtue of having all staff and equipment on one site and a depot located in the centre of the area it serves with excellent road links to all parts of it via the A15/A631 roundabout at Caenby Corner. It is understood both existing depots are reaching the end of their useful lives and it would not be economical to redevelop either site.

The proposal is considered to be a sui generis use as it does not fit within another use class. Therefore, the proposal does not fall to be considered under Policy LP5 which relates to business uses. Notwithstanding this, there are no apparent suitable 2 hectare sites available in nearby established industrial areas such as Hemswell Cliff to accommodate the proposal and locating a waste related depot within or adjacent a food enterprise zone is considered undesirable. More distant sites would not provide the locational efficiencies associated with Caenby Corner.

It should be noted the planning system controls the development and use of land in the public interest. The proposal is fundamental to the public interest and sustainable development because it enables waste to be collected. Without such a service large scale environmental pollution would arise with harm to human health, ecology, the water environment etc. Waste collection is an essential part of an orderly society.

Whilst the structure of Policy LP2 enables the principle of development to be justified on utility services grounds alone, it is relevant to consider countryside policy LP55 which states:

*“Part E: Non-residential development in the countryside
Proposals for non-residential developments will be supported provided that:*

- a. The rural location of the enterprise is justifiable to maintain or enhance the rural economy or the location is justified by means of proximity to existing established businesses or natural features;*
- b. The location of the enterprise is suitable in terms of accessibility;*
- c. The location of the enterprise would not result in conflict with neighbouring uses; and*
- d. The development is of a size and scale commensurate with the proposed use and with the rural character of the location.”*

The proposal has the potential to enhance the rural economy because employment opportunities will arise for residents in the area due to the natural turnover of staff and new job opportunities arising. The site is considered to have suitable accessibility and result in no conflict with neighbouring uses as explained in more detail below. The size and scale of the proposal is commensurate with the proposed use and rural character of the area.

Policies LP2 and LP55 restrict development in the countryside, unless certain exceptions are met, in a manner consistent with the NPPF paragraph 170a requirement that policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. These policies are given full weight.

The site is not in agricultural use therefore loss of potential best and most versatile agricultural land is not a material planning consideration in this instance.

The proposal complies with Policies M11 of the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Plan, and policies LP2 and LP55 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. The principle of development is considered to be acceptable and in compliance with the development plan.

Sustainability of the location and highway impacts

Policy LP13 states:

“All developments should demonstrate, where appropriate, that they have had regard to the following criteria:

a. Located where travel can be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes maximised;

b. Minimise additional travel demand through the use of measures such as travel planning, safe and convenient public transport, walking and cycling links and integration with existing infrastructure;

c. Should provide well designed, safe and convenient access for all, giving priority to the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, people with impaired mobility and users of public transport by providing a network of pedestrian and cycle routes and green corridors, linking to existing routes where opportunities exist, that give easy access and permeability to adjacent areas;

d. Ensure allowance is made for low and ultra-low emission vehicle refuelling infrastructure.”

The policy also requires appropriate parking facilities for a range of vehicles for all site users along with safe vehicular access. These requirements are reflected in NPPF section 9, paragraph 103 of which states:

“103. The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.”

The submitted transport statement shows there are no footways adjacent to the site with the closest being the narrow footways that route around Caenby Corner roundabout. Footway provision in the area is limited as would be expected in the countryside. A cycling distance of up to 5 miles, as recommended by Cycling England, is used to identify settlements from which cycling to the site is likely to occur. These include Hemswell, Bishop Norton,

Glentham, Caenby and Glentworth. Cycling would be on road. The nearest bus stops are located approximately 1.5km to the west of the site on Creampoke Crescent in Hemswell Cliff which lies within the preferred maximum walking distance for commuting bus services. The bus service is the 103 which runs from Scunthorpe to Lincoln. Considering the rural location of the proposed development, cycling would be a realistic option for local staff wishing to travel to/from the Waste Depot. Pedestrian trips are likely to be minimal given the rural location. Bus trips are also likely to be minimal given the proximity to local bus stops/services. A more likely option for staff would be to car share and staff would be encouraged to do so as part of the Travel Plan.

The proposal, in itself, is not located where travel can be minimised but significant travel demand arises from a depot of this nature regardless of its location. There is only limited opportunity for sustainable transport modes in the form of cycling and car share/electric vehicles. However, the operational need to have a single depot is clear. If this were to be developed in Gainsborough, staff from across the district and beyond would have to travel to this depot with refuse vehicles travelling huge distances to collect from the farthest reaches of the district. The same is true of a single depot in Market Rasen. Furthermore, relocating to the centre of the district from Gainsborough and Market Rasen, could reduce operational vehicle travel.

This proposal is irregular in the sense that West Lindsey District Council has a statutory duty to serve a large geographical area with its main population centres at its periphery such as Gainsborough, Caistor, Market Rasen and the Lincoln fringe villages. Therefore travel patterns are always going to be significant regardless of location.

The site would be a base for 30 refuse vehicles and 10 caged vehicles as well as 70 operational and 15 office staff with 24/7 access required. It is considered that trips associated with the proposed development will largely already be present on the highway network. These trips would be re-routed to the site due to the amalgamation of the existing depot's. The existing scheduled routes shall be undertaken as presently, and these are not proposed to be amended. Operational staff start and finish work at 06:45 and 16:45 which means they will travel outside peak highway periods whereas the 15 office staff do travel at peak highway periods. The proposal would result in 8 arrivals during morning peak period and 8 departures during evening peak period with negligible impact on the highway network. The proposal would generate 75 vehicle movements between 6am and 7am and 66 between 4pm-5pm. The proposal may add up to 2% increase on existing traffic on the A631 during the PM peak period and 20% and 17% increases to existing traffic flows in the AM and PM peak flows for the depot.

Visibility splay requirements of Manual for Streets (MfS) of 2.4m x 124m can be achieved. The site access layout has been designed to accommodate the safe access and egress of a 16.5m articulated vehicle. Swept path analysis has been undertaken to illustrate the manoeuvres of the vehicle during access and egress of the proposed development site. There is ample room for

vehicles to pull off the highway whilst waiting for gates to open. The proposed depot shall accommodate 77 vehicles including 7 visitor spaces, 2 electric vehicle charging spaces, 4 car share spaces and 4 accessible parking spaces. This is based on existing demand of 35 staff vehicles with an increase in capacity due to the rural nature of the location. Electric vehicle charging spaces comply with LP13.

The submitted Travel Plan puts forward measures to reduce single occupancy car trips by promoting cycling take up and to encourage car sharing between staff as part of a travel plan to be implemented by a travel plan co-ordinator.

The proposal may not be located within a settlement but it is located in the centre of the area it serves which will assist in minimising travel required of a single depot as far as practicable in the circumstances. There is limited opportunity for sustainable travel modes but some cycling may occur, there is a fairly distant bus stop and car sharing as well as electric vehicle charging points are proposed to encourage sustainable forms of travel. Well designed, safe and convenient access for all is proposed. Ample cycle and vehicle parking is proposed as well as internal site arrangements. There is not considered to be a need for a footway link to Caenby Corner because the likely pedestrian traffic would be minimal given the development population with limited facilities at this junction to draw people in and the footpath would be approximately 300m long which would result in a disproportionately expensive and therefore unreasonable condition to impose upon the applicant.

The further comments of LCC Highways are awaited. The revised site layout appears to address its interim comments regarding access arrangements. A verbal update will be provided at the meeting if these comments are received in the intervening period.

This is considered to be a sustainable location for a proposal of this nature, with district wide use and the highway implications are acceptable in accordance with LP13 and the NPPF.

Design and impact on the character of the area

Policy LP26 requires all development must achieve high quality sustainable design that contributes positively to local character, landscape and townscape, and supports diversity, equality and access for all. It requires all development must take into consideration the character and local distinctiveness of the area and where applicable must demonstrate that they make effective and efficient use of land; maximise pedestrian permeability; respect existing topography, landscape character, relate well to the site and surroundings with regard to siting, height, scale, massing, form and plot widths; not result in settlement coalescence; not result in ribbon development, nor extend existing linear features of the settlement and instead retain, where appropriate, a tight village nucleus; incorporate as far as possible existing natural and historic features; incorporate appropriate landscape treatment to ensure assimilation into the surrounding area; provide well designed boundary

treatments and hard and soft landscaping; protect important local views; reflect or improve on the original architectural style of the local surroundings or embrace opportunities for innovative design and new technology which sympathetically complement or contrast with the local architectural style; use appropriate high quality materials which reinforce local distinctiveness.

Section 12 of the NPPF seeks to achieve well-designed places. Paragraph 124 states “The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve”. Paragraph 127 requires policies and decisions ensure developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities); optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Policy LP17 states:

“Character and setting

To protect and enhance the intrinsic value of our landscape and townscape, including the setting of settlements, proposals should have particular regard to maintaining and responding positively to any natural and man-made features within the landscape and townscape which positively contribute to the character of the area, such as (but not limited to) historic buildings and monuments, other landmark buildings, topography, trees and woodland, hedgerows, walls, water features, field patterns and intervisibility between rural historic settlements. Where a proposal may result in significant harm, it may, exceptionally, be permitted if the overriding benefits of the development demonstrably outweigh the harm: in such circumstances the harm should be minimised and mitigated.

Creating and protecting views

All development proposals should take account of views in to, out of and within development areas: schemes should be designed (through considerate development, layout and design) to preserve or enhance key local views and vistas, and create new public views where possible. Particular consideration should be given to views of significant buildings and views within landscapes which are more sensitive to change due to their open, exposed nature and extensive intervisibility from various viewpoints.”

LP17 is consistent with NPPF paragraph 170 as they seek to protect valued landscapes and recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. It is therefore attributed full weight.

The proposed buildings and site are of a necessarily utilitarian design. The overall scale is appropriate to the location and reflects the needs of the service it provides. The buildings are located far from the highway which will reduce their presence in the streetscene. External finishing materials are grey brick and grey metal cladding which are appropriate for the proposal and in the context of the mixed palette of materials in the area which includes red and buff bricks, limestone, various colours of render and metal cladding.

The large parking areas in particular will require good and effective landscaping to soften their impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside. There is ample room at the boundaries to allow for hedge and tree planting to soften the appearance of the proposal in what is a relatively flat open landscape.

The main unknown is how the land levels on the site would be altered as part of this proposal. Existing topography entails an approximate 6m fall across the site as the site sits on a slope with the highest point being the north west corner at 46.159mAOD sloping gradually down to the south east corner at 39.449mAOD. The applicant has been asked to provide existing and proposed cross sections of the site to show how this would be dealt with but at the time of writing this has not been submitted. Therefore, receipt and dealing with any matters arising from this forms part of the recommendation. The likely solutions are cutting into the northern section of the site potentially with some retaining walls. Whether existing land levels are retained or they are reduced or increased, it will be possible to secure boundary landscaping to soften the appearance of the proposal to a sufficient degree such that the design, layout and resulting visual, landscape, streetscene and character impacts are considered to comply with Policies LP17 and LP26.

Residential amenity

Policy LP26 requires proposals do not unduly harm residential amenity with consideration to compatibility with neighbouring land uses; overlooking; overshadowing; loss of light; increase in artificial light or glare; adverse noise and vibration; adverse impact upon air quality from odour, fumes, smoke, dust and other sources; adequate storage, sorting and collection of household and commercial waste, including provision for increasing recyclable waste; and creation of safe environments. This is consistent with the requirements of NPPF Paragraph 127 that policies and decision should ensure that developments “f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users” and NPPF paragraph 170 in seeking to prevent new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability and can be given full weight.

The proposed buildings are sufficiently removed from neighbouring residential dwellings to prevent harm to residential amenity by virtue of their presence. The main consideration is the impact on residential amenity from activities on the site and traffic.

The PPG states;

“How can noise impacts be determined?

Plan-making and decision making need to take account of the acoustic environment and in doing so consider:

whether or not a significant adverse effect is occurring or likely to occur;

whether or not an adverse effect is occurring or likely to occur; and

whether or not a good standard of amenity can be achieved.

In line with the Explanatory note of the noise policy statement for England, this would include identifying whether the overall effect of the noise exposure (including the impact during the construction phase wherever applicable) is, or would be, above or below the significant observed adverse effect level and the lowest observed adverse effect level for the given situation. As noise is a complex technical issue, it may be appropriate to seek experienced specialist assistance when applying this policy.

Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 30-003-20190722

What are the observed effect levels?

Significant observed adverse effect level: This is the level of noise exposure above which significant adverse effects on health and quality of life occur.

Lowest observed adverse effect level: this is the level of noise exposure above which adverse effects on health and quality of life can be detected.

No observed effect level: this is the level of noise exposure below which no effect at all on health or quality of life can be detected.

Although the word ‘level’ is used here, this does not mean that the effects can only be defined in terms of a single value of noise exposure. In some circumstances adverse effects are defined in terms of a combination of more than one factor such as noise exposure, the number of occurrences of the noise in a given time period, the duration of the noise and the time of day the noise occurs.

See the noise policy statement for England for further information.

Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 30-004-20190722”

Noise exposure hierarchy table:

Response	Examples of outcomes	Increasing effect level	Action
No Observed Effect Level			
Not present	No Effect	No Observed Effect	No specific measures required
No Observed Adverse Effect Level			
Present and not intrusive	Noise can be heard, but does not cause any change in behaviour, attitude or other physiological response. Can slightly affect the acoustic character of the area but not such that there is a change in the quality of life.	No Observed Adverse Effect	No specific measures required
Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level			
Present and intrusive	Noise can be heard and causes small changes in behaviour, attitude or other physiological response, e.g. turning up volume of television; speaking more loudly; where there is no alternative ventilation, having to close windows for some of the time because of the noise. Potential for some reported sleep disturbance. Affects the acoustic character of the area such that there is a small actual or perceived change in the quality of life.	Observed Adverse Effect	Mitigate and reduce to a minimum
Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level			
Present and disruptive	The noise causes a material change in behaviour, attitude or other physiological response, e.g. avoiding certain activities during periods of intrusion; where there is no alternative ventilation, having to keep windows closed most of the time because of the noise. Potential for sleep disturbance resulting in difficulty in getting to sleep, premature awakening and difficulty in getting back to sleep. Quality of life diminished due to change in acoustic character of the area.	Significant Observed Adverse Effect	Avoid
Present and very disruptive	Extensive and regular changes in behaviour, attitude or other physiological response and/or an inability to mitigate effect of noise leading to psychological stress, e.g. regular sleep deprivation/awakening; loss of appetite, significant, medically definable harm, e.g. auditory and non-auditory.	Unacceptable Adverse Effect	Prevent

The Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) (March 2010) states;
 “2.9..... Unlike air quality, there are currently no European or national noise limits which have to be met”

“2.22 It is not possible to have a single objective noise-based measure that defines SOAEL (Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level) that is applicable to all sources of noise in all situations. Consequently, the SOAEL is likely to be different for different noise sources, for different receptors and at different times. It is acknowledged that further research is required to increase our understanding of what may constitute a significant adverse impact on health

and quality of life from noise. However, not having specific SOAEL values in the NPSE provides the necessary policy flexibility until further evidence and suitable guidance is available.”

“2.24 The second aim of the NPSE refers to the situation where the impact lies somewhere between LOAEL (Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level) and SOAEL. It requires that all reasonable steps should be taken to mitigate and minimise adverse effects on health and quality of life while also taking into account the guiding principles of sustainable development (paragraph 1.8). This does not mean that such adverse effects cannot occur.”

The applicant has submitted a noise assessment and an additional briefing note. These establish a baseline noise level at the nearest sensitive receptors to the proposed site as noted in the description above. Established prevailing weekday noise levels during key operational periods, namely early morning 06:00-07:00 and daytime period 07:00-17:00, have been used as a basis for the noise assessment. Existing noise levels are dominated by road traffic including the A15. The key noise sources from the proposed development were considered to be:

- Fixed external plant and building services;
- On-site operations;
- Movement of refuse collection and caged vehicles; and
- Road traffic noise.

Provided the recommended noise limits from fixed external plant and building services satisfy the criteria in Table 4.1, the existing residential amenity should not be adversely affected by the proposed development.

Noise emissions from intermittent on-site operations are predicted to result in low impact. This includes wheel washing, wheelie bin storage using a JCB, training area, road sweeper, 7 refuse and caged vehicle movements and 30 car movements.

Noise emissions from movement of 15 refuse collection and 5 caged vehicles is predicted to result in predominantly low impact with potential for minor adverse impact during the early morning period with the biggest impact on Slates Farm with a difference of +2db above background noise level with a minor impact predicted. The results indicate that existing residential amenity should not be adversely affected by this predominantly time compressed operation, which is generally programmed to occur early morning and mid-afternoon.

The potential impact from changes in road traffic noise over a 1-hour period is predicted to be predominantly negligible with potential for minor adverse impact due to the potential increase in percentage HGVs. Taking account of the overall increase in road traffic noise of 1.2dB, this should however be acceptable and not adversely impact the existing residential amenity.

The Council's EPO has considered the noise assessment and additional note. No objection to noise is raised. With regards to national policy the proposal is considered to fall within the present and not intrusive category which crucially,

is below the lowest observed adverse effect level. This means the noise generated by the proposal and the impact this would have on nearby sensitive noise receptors is acceptable in light of the requirements of the NPSE, PPG regarding noise and LP26. There are not considered to be any harmful impacts arising from vibration, odour, dust or air quality given substantial separation distances to sensitive receptors. The proposal is considered to achieve acceptable noise levels with no harm to residential amenity nor to that of anyone else in the area.

Heritage impacts

The aforementioned statutory test regarding the impact of development on the setting of a listed building is the primary consideration. NPPF paragraph 193 requires “When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation”. This level of protection is reflected in Policy LP25 which references the tests in the NPPF and is therefore consistent and given full weight.

There are a cluster of listed buildings at Spital in the Street, including Cromwell House which has a principal architectural elevation facing south (towards the proposed site) and the nearby Norton Place (grade I listed). Norton Place has no inter-visibility the site, and it is considered the proposal would not affect its setting. With regard to Cromwell House, there may be a distant direct view of the proposed building, which is not small, but this would be unlikely to impact on how the significance of the principal elevation is experienced. It is considered there is no harm to the setting of listed buildings arising in this proposal. The Council’s Conservation Officer raises no objection to the proposal.

NPPF paragraph 189 states “Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.” Policy LP25 reflects this stating “If initial assessment does not provide sufficient information, developers will be required to undertake field evaluation in advance of determination of the application. This may include a range of techniques for both intrusive and non-intrusive evaluation, as appropriate to the site.”

Proposed land level changes on the site are, at the time of writing, unknown. This is pertinent to archaeological impacts because LCC Archaeology opines there is currently insufficient information available at present to make reliable observations and there is considered to be a need for trial trenching focussing on areas of greatest depth of ground disturbance and geophysical anomalies.

The applicant has been asked to provide the aforementioned cross sections showing site level changes. This should be used to inform a scheme of archaeological trial trenching which the applicant has also been asked to submit. The submission of and matters arising from this further information

form part of the recommendation in order to enable archaeological matters to be addressed before planning permission is granted, if planning committee determines this is the appropriate course of action, and to ensure compliance with Policy LP25 and the NPPF.

The heritage impacts are otherwise considered acceptable in accordance with the statutory listed building setting test, Policy LP25 and the provisions of the NPPF.

Flood risk and drainage

Policy LP14 requires the flood risk sequential test in the NPPF be carried out and is therefore inherently consistent. Policy LP14 requires proposals demonstrate that they have incorporated Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in to the proposals unless they can be shown to be impractical whereas NPPF Paragraph 165 requires this for only major developments. However, there is general consistency in requiring developments do not lead to increased risk of flooding. Policy LP14 also requires proposals demonstrate they would not adversely affect ground water quality. This is consistent with NPPF paragraph 170 which requires planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by.... (e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans. LP14 is attached full weight.

The application includes a flood risk assessment which also considers drainage matters. A detailed ground investigation has not been provided, with resultant reliance on British Geological Survey (BGS) mapping for underlying geological data.

The site is in flood zone 1 and is not at risk of any other form of flooding. The proposal passes the flood risk sequential test. The Environment Agency raises no objections regarding flood risk.

Surface water drainage

The FRA calculates the existing site results in an existing surface water runoff rate of 7.50litres per second in a mean annual flood.

The Building Regulations requires rainwater drainage shall discharge to one of the following, listed in order of priority:

- (a) An adequate soakaway or some other adequate infiltration system, or, where that is not reasonably practicable,
- (b) A watercourse; or, where that is not reasonably practicable,
- (c) A sewer.

The FRA assumes infiltration is not an option on the site without providing a detailed ground investigation in evidence. The FRA recommends such an investigation is carried out to further inform the development.

A ditch lies along the southern boundary of the site that would offer a suitable outfall. The ditch that passes the site becomes the Seggimore Brook, flowing east into the Norton Beck before ultimately discharging into the River Ancholme (a Main River). An onsite attenuation basin is proposed to the south of the site, adjacent to the outfall ditch where topographical levels are at their lowest to enable a gravity discharge from all areas of the site. In addition, as spatial constraints presented by the site plan limit the size of the basin, to supplement the attenuation storage a geo-cellular tank is also proposed. The geo-cellular tank will be positioned beneath vehicular car parking areas, just to the north of the proposed basin. This will intercept the run-off generated within the site itself and reduce the incidence of overland flow causing flooding across adjacent land. Detailed calculations including a climate change allowance are provided for attenuation volumes required by the proposal.

The FRA includes an outdated proposed site layout plan. Furthermore, the LLFA considers the drainage strategy, along with the discharge rate is acceptable in principle whilst recommending that a site specific ground investigation report is carried out to confirm the viability of infiltration on site.

The further comments of LCC Highways and LLFA are awaited. It is anticipated a surface water drainage condition requiring a finalised scheme accompanied by, amongst other things, detailed ground investigation will be required. Provision is made for this in the recommendation.

Foul water drainage

There are no Anglian Water foul drains in the area. As no foul water disposal options exist, it is proposed to use a package treatment plant to treat foul flows before discharging to the onsite ditch/watercourse. Packaged treatment plant options based on development population are provided in the FRA although it is not specific as to which is proposed and it is not clear whether attenuation requirements reflect foul flows from the site.

Ground water protection

The FRA demonstrates underlying geology is not sensitive in relation to ground water although it should be noted water from the site would flow into an area that is so. The Environment Agency raises no objections regarding ground water protection whilst recommending an informative regarding the potential need for an Environmental Permit which requires sites should not harm human health or pollute the environment. The FRA proposes interceptors to prevent contamination of the site runoff prior to discharge into the southern ditch/watercourse. The fuel package tank is an inner storage tank, externally encased within an outer weatherproof bund to ensure any leakage or nominal overflow situation is safely contained.

It is considered the application includes sufficient information to demonstrate it is possible to drain surface water from the site in accordance with SUDS principles without increased risk of flooding to the proposal or adjacent sites in accordance with Policy LP14 and the provisions of the NPPF. It is necessary to attach separate foul water drainage and ground water protection conditions to ensure compliance with these policies.

Ecology

Policy LP21 states “Any development which could have an adverse effect on sites with designated features and / or protected species, either individually or cumulatively, will require an assessment as required by the relevant legislation or national planning guidance.” It is consistent with NPPF section 15 in requiring “170. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:..... (d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity” and “175. When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles: (a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused”. LP21 is consistent with the NPPF and is given full weight.

A preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA) has been submitted with the application. The site consists of managed semi-improved neutral grassland bound by hedgerows and tall ruderal vegetation. Other habitats recorded on site include bare ground, buildings and a dry ditch. No statutory designated nature sites are on or near the site.

The PEA recommends habitat compensation and enhancements that *could* include native species landscaping; making the attenuation pond wildlife friendly; retention of eastern boundary vegetation; gapping up of existing hedgerows; retention and improvement of grassland on site; artificial habitats for bats, birds and invertebrates.

Precautionary mitigation measures are recommended for amphibian at paragraph 5.11, 5.12 and 5.13, birds at 5.18, and reptile at 5.23 which are conditioned.

The PEA gives non-specific suggestions for enhancements for amphibians, bats, birds and reptiles. Examples include no number or location of bat and bird boxes or soft landscaping details which could have been provided for the periphery of the site. It is also not clear whether an attenuation pond can be suitably designed as an ecological enhancement. This results in the need for a condition to secure specific ecological enhancements in accordance with Policy LP21.

Natural England raises no objection to potential impacts on statutorily protected nature and landscape sites. The proposal is considered to have acceptable ecological impacts in accordance with Policy LP21.

Other

Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue objects to the initial lack of a fire hydrant to enable fire services to deal with an emergency at the development. The applicant has submitted an additional plan showing provision of such a hydrant to serve the development. The further comments of Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue are awaited and will form an update at the meeting. However, this is not a material planning consideration that should otherwise limit the development proposed.

Conclusion

Mineral safeguarding impacts are considered to be acceptable. The principle of development is found to be acceptable as it provides a statutory service essential to the public with specific operational and locational requirements. This is considered to be a sustainable location for this proposal because of the inherent travel requirements associated with the use and the geographically dispersed population centres it serves. Sustainable travel modes are promoted where possible. Sufficient on-site parking is proposed along with safe access in an area with highway capacity to accommodate trip generation. The design is necessarily utilitarian with appropriate soft landscaping space provided to soften the appearance from surrounding countryside. Impacts on the character of the area and visual amenity are acceptable. No harm to residential amenity would arise from the physical presence of the development or as a result of its operation including noise and odour impacts. There would be no harm to the setting of distant listed buildings. Archaeological matters require further information but should be acceptable. The site is at low risk of flooding. Surface, foul and the water environment matters are acceptable subject to final design conditions. The impact on ecology would be minimal with enhancements secured. A hydrant is to be provided in the interests of fire safety. Subject to the matters in the recommendation the proposal is considered to be sustainable development therefore planning permission should be granted subject to conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To conform with Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. Development shall proceed in accordance with the following approved drawings:

Location Plan (received 21/1/2020)

Proposed Building Plan (received 21/1/2020)

Proposed Building Elevations (received 21/1/2020)

Proposed Storage Building (received 21/1/2020)

Fuel Package Tank (received 21/1/2020)

Proposed Water Services Layout (received 10/3/2020)

Proposed Site Plan (received 18/3/2020)

Reason: For the sake of clarity and in the interests of proper planning.

3. No development shall take place until a scheme for foul water including pipe routing, collection, treatment and disposal sufficient for the needs of the development population, and details of any attenuation requirements and the outfall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details and the scheme shall be in place prior to the first use of the site.

Reason: To ensure appropriate foul water treatment facilities are in place to serve the development and prevent pollution and flooding of the surrounding area in accordance with Policy LP14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

4. No development shall take place until a scheme for the prevention and interception of any pollutants from the development to the water environment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details and the scheme shall be in place prior to the first use of the site.

Reason: To prevent pollutants from the development contaminating the water environment in accordance with Policy LP14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

5. No development shall take place until a scheme of ecological enhancements for the site and a timetable for this taking place has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To secure ecological enhancements in accordance with the requirements of Policy LP21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

6. Development shall proceed in accordance with the precautionary mitigation measures as recommended for amphibians at paragraph 5.11, 5.12 and 5.13; birds at 5.18; and reptiles at 5.23 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal.

Reason: To prevent harm to protected species in accordance with Policy LP21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

7. Prior to their use in the development details of the external finishing materials shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To secure good design in accordance with Policy LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

8. Before the first use of the development, a scheme of landscaping including details of the size, species and position or density of all trees and hedges to be planted (which must include planting in the peripheral landscape buffer

around the site boundary) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the first use of the site or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any planting which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure that a landscaping scheme to soften the appearance of the development and provide ecological enhancements is provided in accordance with Policies LP17, LP21 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

9. No external lighting shall be installed unless details of the number, location, design and light pollution reduction measures have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To minimise light pollution in the interests of the amenities of the area and ecology in accordance with Policies LP21 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

Informatives

The Environment Agency makes the applicant aware of the following:

This development may require a permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 from the Environment Agency.

The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 state that permitted sites should not harm human health or pollute the environment. The operator is therefore required to have measures in place which will:

- prevent pollution
- ensure that there is no harm to human health, the quality of the environment, or the surrounding amenity
- ensure that there is no offence to a human sense or damage to material property

Human Rights Implications:

The above objections, considerations and resulting recommendation have had regard to Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol of the European Convention for Human Rights Act 1998. The recommendation will not interfere with the applicant's and/or objector's right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.

Legal Implications:

Although all planning decisions have the ability to be legally challenged it is considered there are no specific legal implications arising from this report