

Development Management Delegated Decision Report

B/20/0481



SUMMARY OF APPLICATION

Application Reference	B/20/0481		
Application Type	Full Planning Permission		
Proposal	Change of use of land to allow the siting of one shepherds hut for holiday letting		
Location	Park Cottages, Church End, Frampton, Boston, PE20 1AH		
Applicant	Ms D Loizou		
Agent	Design and Management.co.uk		
Received Date:	01-Dec-2020	Consultation Expiry Date:	17-Feb-2021
Valid Date:	04-Dec-2020	Statutory Expiry Date:	29-Jan-2021
Date of Site Visit:	23-Dec-2021	Extension of Time Date:	19-Mar-2021
Objections received?	Yes		
5 day notification record:			
Councillors notified	Date	Response received – date	Ok to continue
Cllr N Welton	08/03/21	In agreement with the officer recommendation – 08/03/21	Ok
Cllr D Brown	08/03/21	No response	Ok
Cllr P Watson	08/03/21	In agreement with the officer recommendation – 08/03/21	Ok
Recommendation	REFUSE		
Report by:	Grant Fixter		
Date:	16/03/2021		

OFFICER REPORT

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site is located off Church End Road, Frampton and comprises a shepherd's hut within the land under the ownership of the Grade II Listed Park Cottages and its associated curtilage. The shepherd's hut falls within the criteria of the Caravan Sites Act (1968) Part III (Miscellaneous). An outbuilding which recently was granted planning permission for the first floor to be used as a holiday let is to the east of the shepherd's hut (B/20/0480), with black metal fencing north of the shepherd's hut.

The site is bound by extensive mature planting and in terms of surroundings, there is residential development to the east and west. The general character of the wider area is agricultural. The South East Lincolnshire Local Plan identifies the access, Park Cottage and the southern extent outbuilding to be within the settlement boundary, with the remainder of the site within the countryside. The Local Plan also shows the site to be within Frampton Conservation Area.



DETAILS OF PROPOSAL:

This proposal seeks full planning permission for the change of use of the land to allow the siting of one shepherd's hut for holiday letting.

The shepherd's hut is already on site, however, the use of the hut as a holiday let is not approved.

From reviewing the submission, the officer had concerns and issues with both the accuracy of the submission, in addition to the proposal itself. At this juncture it is important to note that the Council has worked in a proactive manner during discussions with the agent following receipt of additional information and how it then shaped the application.

The agent was first contacted on 22/01/2021 with concerns regarding the description of the application, extent of the red line (this originally included the entire curtilage associated with Park Cottages) and Environmental Health's comments. The description, the red line and Environmental Health's comments regarding the required 6m distance were subsequently amended and acknowledged but not the re-siting of the hut to the north of the outbuilding.

There was correspondence regarding the Environment Agency's position and this is set out in the 'Consultation responses' section of this report.

The officer called the agent on 16/02/2021 to establish both their and the applicant's views on re-siting the shepherd's hut 6 metres north of the outbuilding.

Upon receipt of the Environment Agency's re-consultation response (22/02/2021) who confirmed they would withdraw their objection should a seasonal occupancy condition be imposed, the submission was again assessed by the officer.

The officer emailed the agent on 24/02/2021 outlining the plans were not accurate and expressed their concerns with the current submission. In order for the scheme to be viewed more favourably, a number of amendments and information were requested, namely:

- The hut being relocated 6 metres north of the outbuilding to preserve amenity levels. It was stated that whilst the hut is already serviced in its existing location it cannot influence the officer's decision-making;
- Anchoring details are submitted as part of this submission as these can sometimes be excessive, this would ensure the historic environment is protected as much as possible;
- Seasonal occupancy condition is attached.

A deadline of 26/02/2021 was given to establish how the agent/ applicant wished to proceed.

On 24/02/2021, the agent responded seeking clarification from the officer on some points prior to them discussing these with the applicant. The agent queried the need to relocate the hut on amenity grounds and stated how anchoring could work, but no exact details were submitted. The seasonal occupancy condition was agreed to.

On 02/03/2021, no response had been received, so the officer emailed the agent confirming the deadline had passed. A further deadline to the end of that day was given but beyond that, the report would be written with a recommendation of refusal. No response was received.

Therefore this application has been duly considered against the following plans and documents:

- Site Location Plan;
- Nov 2020 Typical Layout & Elevations Plan;
- 01/2021 Rev A Existing & Proposed Site Layout Plan.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

- B/20/0480 - Change of use to create holiday flat – Approved on 09/02/2021;
- B11/0237/88 – Application for Listed Building Consent for the construction of an outbuilding at Park Cottage, Middlegate Road, Frampton – Approved on 03/11/1988.

RELEVANT DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES AND DOCUMENTS:

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2011-2036)

The following policies contained within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2011-2036) (i.e. SELLP) are relevant to this application:

- Policy 1: Spatial Strategy;
- Policy 2: Development Management;
- Policy 3: Design of New Development;
- Policy 4: Approach to Flood Risk;
- Policy 9: Promoting a Stronger Visitor Economy;
- Policy 29: The Historic Environment;
- Policy 30: Pollution;
- Policy 36: Vehicle and Cycle Parking.

OTHER RELEVANT DOCUMENTS / LEGISLATION / GUIDANCE:

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

At the heart of the 2019 Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The following sections are relevant to this scheme:

- Section 2: Achieving sustainable development;
- Section 4: Decision-making;
- Section 6: Building a strong, competitive economy;
- 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 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Frampton Parish Council

Made the following comments:

- Mentioned they were disappointed their objections for application reference B/20/0480 were not taken more seriously and that these echoed a number of nearby residents. These comments have no relevance to this application and are, therefore, given no weight. The officer did call the Parish Council clerk and dealt with this separately, clarifying the correct processes and protocols were followed;
- Hut was installed last summer and presumably connected to Park Cottage's services;
- Believe it would have been advertised for holiday renting if Covid-19 restrictions were not in place;
- Siting of hut overlooks Grade II Listed Memorial Cottage;
- Believe the hut should be sited closer to the summer house in the north east corner of the curtilage;
- This would reduce overlooking and increased privacy for future users and Memorial Cottage.

Environment Agency

Objected on 25/01/2021 for the following reasons:

- No FRA attached to this application which does not comply with requirements set out in the Planning Practice Guidance, Flood Risk and Coastal Change section;
- No suitable basis for assessment on the flood risks arising from the proposal;
- Unclear if it is for year round use (highly vulnerable) or subject to a seasonal occupancy period;
- Want risks of flooding identified and mitigation measures to overcome these.

The agent sent the officer an email to overcome the above objection. The EA were subsequently re-consulted on the information contained within the agents email.

On 22/02/2021, the EA responded and maintained their objection:

- The site lies in Hazard category 'Danger to Most', with flood depths in excess of 1m in the 2115 0.1% (1in1000 year) Tidal breach scenario;
- 'Highly vulnerable' uses eg caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use, are contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework;
- Confirmed that imposing a seasonal occupancy condition would see their objection withdrawn.

The agent was subsequently informed of this and they confirmed on 24/02/2021 that they would be happy for such a condition to be imposed.

The EA were then re-consulted on this basis so they could officially withdraw their objection, which they did on 03/03/2021.

Historic Conservation Advisor

Made the following comments on 03/02/2021:

- Shepherd's hut is located within the setting of a listed building and is located within the Frampton Conservation Area and as such any proposals need to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area;

- The hut will be set back from the road, away from the host building, but immediately to rear of a different listed building;
- Whilst the hut may not be an issue, the proposal represents another development within the setting of the listed building, and continued development could represent over-development which could impact the setting of the listed building;
- Proposals for fencing not detailed on the application;
- Any fencing and surfacing should be conditioned to ensure they are sympathetic to the rural and natural character of the area.

Further comments were then made on 22/02/2021 which built on/ clarified the original comments:

- Shepherd's hut has rural character;
- Unit seems to be independent, meaning additional features may be needed to maintain this independence;
- Any boundary treatments would negatively impact the space;
- Subdividing open space which is a positive feature of the setting of adjacent listed buildings;
- Defined boundary may require surfacing for footpath. BBQs etc - further exacerbate the subdivision, failing to maintain the character of the site and impact on the setting of the listed building. Additional paraphernalia such as picnic benches etc would go even further in this regard;
- Whilst an isolated shepherds hut would not be an issue, the impact of the further knock on effects have the potential to impact the setting of the listed building, and as such should be considered full at this stage and not left to a later date.

Environmental Health

- Confirm the hut falls within the definition of a caravan, therefore, will need to be licensed under the aforementioned legislation;
- One of the licensing requirements is a 6m distance from other structures;
- Requests the hut is re-sited to achieve a 6m distance from the existing outbuilding;
- Scope to move the hut further from the nearest residential neighbours boundary, Memorial Cottage;
- Siting the hut 6m north of the existing building would help screen the hut and lessen its impact on amenity.

Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board

Did not respond.

Lincolnshire County Council

Have no objections as there is adequate off street parking to accommodate the increased demand that might be associated with the shepherd's hut. Highway safety would not be affected.

THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

As a result of the publicity, 6 third party representations have been received from the occupiers of the following properties:

- Cotton Hall, Church End, Frampton;
- The Grange, Sandholme Lane, Frampton;
- Winterdyne, Thornimans Lane, Frampton;
- Lime Tree Cottage, Church End, Frampton;
- Rowan House, Thornimans Lane, Frampton.

The 5 objections are summarised below:

Amenity

- Current position overlooks Memorial Cottage – direct views into the garden and rear windows;
- Support re-siting stated by Environmental Health;
- Village prized on peace and quiet and rural setting;
- Detrimental for surrounding residents;
- Impact on noise;
- No impact on the applicant's residence.

Historic environment and character of the area

- Peace of Frampton which is in Conservation Area would be disturbed by holidaymakers;
- Property is Grade II Listed and in the Conservation Area for a reason;
- Over-development of Grade II Listed property in the Conservation Area;
- Allow one shepherd's hut, holiday accommodation and parking for up to 12 vehicles will change this;
- Sets precedent for similar development onsite and in the village;
- Want to preserve village;
- No local amenities in the village for visitors to access;
- No benefit to local community.

Foul water and household waste

- Foul sewage cannot be to mains sewer as there are no mains sewerage assets of Anglian Water in Frampton Church End;
- How will household waste and sewage be dealt with;
- Already blocks pavement with rubbish put out for the bins – additional waste on pavement will create further hazards;
- Look at Cheshire County Council v Woodward (1962) 2 QB 126 as there have been skips, work vans and building supplies delivered during lock down.

Highways

- Junction at The War Memorial is a blind spot;
- Hedges either side of driveway which restricts views;
- Extra traffic will be an accident waiting to happen;
- Many drivers don't adhere to speed restrictions;
- RSPB Reserve signage takes people away from the villages narrow lanes;

- Frequently used by dog walkers, walkers, walking groups, runners, cyclists, children, horse riders and farm vehicles.

The further comments from Cotton Hall were based on the revised site plan and are summarised below:

- Revised site plan shows no material change in the position of the shepherd's hut;
- Still imposes on Grade II Listed Memorial Cottage;
- Applicant has ample space to site the hut elsewhere;
- Would support the application if it was moved to the summer house or north of the outbuilding.

Where objections and comments comprise material planning considerations, they are considered in the evaluation section of this report.

EVALUATION:

The key considerations in regard to this application are set out below:

- Principle of development;
- Impact on the historic environment, character and appearance of the area;
- Impact on residential amenity;
- Highway safety and parking;
- Flood risk.

Principle of development

Policy 1 of the SELLP sets out the settlement hierarchy, stating development will be permitted within the settlement boundaries of the respective settlements providing the proposal supports the designated role of the settlement in which it is to be executed. Applications in the countryside (outside of settlement boundaries) will be approved provided it is necessary to its location and/ or can be demonstrated that it meets sustainable development needs of the area.

Policy 9 of the SELLP states proposals for tourism and visitor development which utilise and enrich the natural and built environment within the settlement boundary will be supported. Those outside the settlement boundary will have to be small-scale in nature, not conflict with neighbouring uses, in keeping with the character of the locality and demonstrate a functional link with an existing rural attraction.

As shown on 'Inset Map No 35 – Frampton', the access and host dwelling are located within the settlement boundary for Frampton. The southern side of the outbuilding marks the settlement boundary with open countryside beyond. The majority of the outbuilding, shepherd's hut and associated curtilage is in the countryside. Weight, therefore, has to be given to the fact a small part of the site is partially within the settlement boundary and that the remainder of the site is immediately adjacent.

The proposal is for the change of use of land to allow the siting of one shepherd's hut for holiday letting.

Policy 1, part (d) Countryside states:

“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.”

No information has been submitted with this application to demonstrate it is necessary to its location. When considering the sustainable development needs of the area, the proposal will provide a small economic contribution to the local economy. However, there are no community benefits to this proposal, especially when considering the impacts on amenity and the character of the area which are explored later in this report. Furthermore, there are no environmental benefits to this proposal.

The proposal, therefore, does not accord with Policy 1 of the SELLP.

Policy 9 of the SELLP is also a consideration and has three requirements for this form of development to be supported:

- “1. Do not conflict with neighbouring land uses;*
- 2. Are in keeping with the character of the locality; and*
- 3. Demonstrate a functional link with an existing rural attraction or farm enterprise.”*

As stated by the Historic Conservation Advisor, the shepherd's hut has a rural appearance which is in keeping with the rural appearance of the area. The increase in fencing and essentially form a sense of enclosure for the hut immediately adjacent to the Grade II Listed Memorial Cottage boundary would conflict on the character/ appearance of the site.

For reasons outlined later in this report, the current siting of the hut will have negative impacts on the residential amenity of the occupiers of Memorial Cottage, therefore, the proposal conflicts with neighbouring land uses. The proposal also does not have a functional link to an existing rural attraction or farm enterprise.

Based on the current submission, the proposal does not comply with Policy 1 and 9 of the SELLP.

The principle of development, therefore, is not acceptable.

Impact on the historic environment, character and appearance of the area

Policy 2 of the SELLP states that proposals requiring planning permission will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met. These include size, scale, layout, density and impact on the amenity, trees, character and appearance of the area as well as the quality of its design and orientation.

Policy 3 of the SELLP states all development must create a sense of place by respecting the density, scale, visual closure, landmarks, views, massing of neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area.

Policy 29 of the SELLP relates to the historic environment. Any proposals involving the change of use of a listed building will be granted where it is in the interests of the buildings preservation and does not involve activities or alterations prejudicial to the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building or its setting. Proposals within a conservation area should

preserve, enhance, or reinforce features that positively contribute to the areas setting and appearance.

Policy 30 of the SELLP will not be permitted where proposals will have adverse impacts upon aspects such as the amenities of the area and the historic environment.

The proposal seeks permission for the change of use of the land to allow the siting of one shepherd's hut for holiday letting.

The external appearance of the shepherd's hut is one which fits in with the rural character of the area. As the Historic Conservation Advisor stated, the hut itself is not an issue due to its sympathetic external appearance in respect of the rural character of the area.

Firstly, the existing and proposed site plan submitted with this application is not accurate. The plan shows a strip of fencing from north west to south east direction which joins up with the boundary between the Park Cottages and Memorial Cottage curtilage. This strip of fencing is not on site and, therefore, the existing and proposed site plan is inaccurate. This was raised with the agent and how new site plans were needed, one existing without this strip of fencing and one proposed which showed the fencing if this was still part of the plans for the site. No revised plans were submitted.

No plans were submitted showing the detailing of the highlighted strip of fencing, meaning it could not be appropriately assessed whether the fencing would be of an appropriate nature and its potential impacts on the character and appearance of the area and the historic environment. A plan outlining such information was requested and no plans were received.

The plans submitted showed no details in respect of potential areas of hardstanding and how the shepherd's hut would be anchored to the ground to provide appropriate mitigation against flood risk. Anchoring measures can vary and given the historic sensitivity of the site, it was deemed such information was needed as part of this submission and prior to determination of the application. Albeit the agent confirmed in an email how the anchoring could work and be minor, no official details were confirmed or submitted.

By virtue of the proposed site plan, it shows the shepherd's hut will be enclosed by the outbuilding to the east, fencing to the north, proposed fencing to the west and the boundary between Park Cottages and Memorial Cottage. The proposed fencing will essentially form a sense of enclosure and erode the large open space associated with Park Cottages. The proposal will of course lead to an intensification of the use on site, which will be further exacerbated by the proposed siting and fencing and will form a sense of enclosure. This will negatively affect the setting of both the host Grade II Listed Building and the neighbouring Grade II Listed Memorial Cottage, therefore, leading to negatively impacting the character of the area, in addition to the historic environment.

This intensification of use on site would have been better mitigated had the shepherd's hut been re-sited and the fencing aspect of the proposal removed.

The officer is in agreement with advice from the Historic Conservation Advisor received on 22/02/21. The increase in boundary treatments would negatively impact the space and details should have been submitted as part of this application. This would also lead to the subdivision of open space within the curtilage of the host Listed Building and will impact both the host Listed Building and adjacent Listed Building's setting. By virtue of the hut essentially having a

sense of enclosure and the boundary treatments, further surfacing and hardstanding would likely be needed to service the hut. Essentially, as highlighted by the officer and Conservation Advisor, such information was needed as part of this submission to appropriately assess the potential impacts on the character of the area and historic environment.

Anchoring requirements for huts such as these can be done through chains, areas of hardstanding, stakes in the ground etc. Due to the sensitivity of the site, such information was requested as part of this submission to thoroughly assess the potential impacts of the scheme. The lack of detail on the proposed fencing, which was highlighted as existing on the submitted plans also means the officer could not thoroughly assess the submission.

Overall, the current siting of the hut and proposed fencing would have detrimental impacts on the character of the area and historic environment. Insufficient information was also submitted to enable a proper assessment of the proposal.

The proposal fails to comply with policies 2, 3, 9, 29 and 30 of the SELLP in respect of the historic environment, character and appearance of the area.

Impact on residential amenity

SELLP policies 2, 3 and 30 seek to ensure that a new development does not significantly impact neighbouring land uses by reason of noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion.

The shepherd's hut will be sited west of the existing outbuilding and by virtue of the existing and proposed fencing, will essentially be enclosed to a parcel of land up against the Grade II Listed Memorial Cottage boundary.

The current use of the land is garden space associated with the host dwelling. By virtue of granting permission of the change of use of the land to allow the siting of the hut for holiday letting, this would lead to an intensification of the site. The level of intensification and effect on amenity will vary depending on its siting and its relationship with the neighbouring property.

Concerns regarding the siting of the shepherd's hut were raised with the agent early in the process and they were asked to consider comments from Environmental Health. The agent was then informed that the application would be refused if the siting was not changed and an alternative location of north of the outbuilding was suggested. One of the reasons stated was the impact on the neighbouring properties amenity. No response was received so the application is being assessed on the current proposed siting.

The boundary treatment between Park Cottages and Memorial Cottage relevant to this proposal comprises a low level hedge. The proposed fencing will essentially enclose the shepherd's hut within an area which is immediately adjacent to the Memorial Cottage boundary. In order to meet the 6m licensing requirements, the hut will have to be moved further from the outbuilding than it is at present. In turn, this will result in the hut exposed within the site emphasised by the distance from Memorial Cottage boundary and its associated curtilage.

The intensification of the site would have been less significant had the hut been moved to the north elevation of the outbuilding. In its current siting it will mean the intensification of the site will lead to activities associated with future users of the hut immediately adjacent to the neighbouring property's boundary.

Due to the low level hedge separating Park Cottages and Memorial Cottage, the current siting will provide uninterrupted views into the Memorial Cottages curtilage and the dwelling itself. Therefore a significant loss of privacy for the neighbouring property will occur. This is unacceptable and would lead to a loss of amenity for the existing property.

The amenity of future users of the hut also has to be considered and the above comments also apply to the hut. The siting of the hut would provide uninterrupted views from Memorial Cottage to the hut, meaning users will suffer from a loss of privacy and be subject to overlooking issues.

Noise disturbance from future occupiers is also of concern. Given the proximity of the hut and the existing and proposed fencing, the users and their activities will likely be confined to this one area. This area is immediately adjacent to the neighbouring properties boundary, and given the low level nature of the boundary treatment, there will be no screening to protect from noise disturbance and it will be unavoidable.

The fact the host and neighbouring property are also both listed means further scrutiny has to be placed on these considerations, as the site is more sensitive.

The officer is of the view subject to appropriate anchoring details, removal of the proposed fencing and the hut being re-sited, the scheme may have been viewed more favourably. However, based on the current submission it is deemed there would be detrimental impacts on both neighbouring and future users amenity.

It is considered that the proposal fails to comply with policies 2, 30 and 30 of the SELLP in respect of residential amenity.

Highway safety and parking

Policy 36: Appendix 6 of the SELLP relates to parking standards. It requires 2 spaces for dwellings with up to 3 bedrooms and 3 spaces for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms. It also requires 1 cycle space within each residential plot.

From attending site and reviewing the plans, it is considered there is sufficient parking provision on the site, alleviating pressure on the highway. The proposal is extremely unlikely to encourage increased larger vehicles to pass through the settlement. Finally, it is considered the vehicle movements that would be generated from this proposal would not negatively impact highway safety.

Objectors raised concerns on the impact the proposal would have on highway safety. However, having attended site and in the absence of an objection from the Local Highway Authority it is considered the proposal would not have a significant impact on highway safety.

The proposal is, therefore, acceptable on highway safety and parking grounds.

Flood risk

Policy 4 of the SELLP states a proposed development within an area of flood risk (Flood Zones 2 and 3) will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that there are no other sites available at a lower risk of flooding, that it is essential infrastructure in FZ3a & FZ3b, it is highly vulnerable development in FZ2 or is more vulnerable development in FZ3 provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk.

Where supported by a site specific flood specific risk assessment a criteria will need to be adhered to.

The Environment Agency has removed the objection to the application given the agent has agreed to a seasonal occupancy condition:

“No caravans/chalets/log cabins/huts on the site shall be occupied between 1 November (or the following Sunday, if half terms extends into November) in any one year and 14 March in the succeeding year.”

The EA also recommended the hut was anchored to the ground and raised 300mm above ground level.

The concerns regarding the anchoring were not on flood risk grounds, simply their impact on the historic environment and character of the area as there are numerous methods.

Subject to being anchored to the ground and being raised 300mm above ground level, it is deemed the proposal would not increase the flood risk in the area or have an adverse effect on surface water.

CONCLUSION:

As with any application, it is important to consider the planning balance.

This proposal seeks full planning permission for the change of use of land to allow for the siting of one shepherd's hut for holiday letting.

The proposal has been deemed acceptable on both flood risk grounds (subject to anchoring details and raising 300mm above ground level) and highway grounds.

The application site is within the curtilage of a Grade II Listed Building, adjacent to a Grade II Listed Building and falls within the Conservation Area. It has been deemed that based on the current submission, the increase in boundary treatments would lead to a sense of enclosure and loss of open space. Furthermore, the plans are not accurate and no detail has been submitted on the proposed fencing, anchoring details and any areas of hardstanding. This means it is not possible to fully assess the impacts on the proposal on the historic environment and character of the area. Based on the proposal and lack of information, the proposal will neither be in keeping with the character of the area, nor respect the historic environment.

The current siting will lead to detrimental impacts on amenity for both neighbouring properties and future occupiers of the shepherd's hut. Both will suffer from a loss of privacy and be subject to overlooking and noise disturbance.

Finally, it was deemed the principle of development is not wholly acceptable, as given the issues outlined above, the proposal would not comply with Policy 1 or 9 of the SELLP.

The proposal, therefore, is not deemed acceptable and it is recommended to refuse this application.

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE

CONDITIONS / REASONS		
Pre-commencement conditions?		Agreed with applicant/agent - Date:
<p>The proposed development has not been proven to be necessary to its location, whilst not meeting the sustainable development needs of the area as there are no environmental or community benefits. The proposed development will conflict with neighbouring land uses, is not in keeping with the character of the locality and no functional link has been demonstrated to show how the development is linked with an existing rural attraction or farm enterprise. This development is, therefore, contrary to the objectives of Policies 1 and 9 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2011-2036) and Sections 2 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) which seeks to achieve sustainable development and secure a high standard of design that is sympathetic to the character of an area with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.</p>		
<p>The proposed development, by reason of its position and characteristics of the site, will generate a significant loss of privacy, in addition to creating overlooking issues and significant noise and general disturbance for the occupiers of Memorial Cottage and future users of the shepherd's hut, all of which will be harmful to residential amenity and the quiet and peaceful living conditions currently experienced. This development is, therefore, contrary to the objectives of Policies 2, 3, 9 and 30 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2011-2036) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) which seeks to secure a high standard of design that is sympathetic to the character of an area with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.</p>		
<p>The increase in boundary treatments will negatively impact the space through effectively subdividing the open space which is a positive feature of the setting of the host and adjacent listed buildings. This means the proposal will negatively impact both the character and appearance of the area. Insufficient evidence was provided in regards to the additional proposed fencing and how the shepherd's hut will be anchored to the ground, both of which have potential to further impact the historic environment and character and appearance of the area. This development is, therefore, contrary to the objectives of Policies 2, 3, 9 and 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2011-2036) and Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) which seek to secure a high standard of design that is sympathetic to the character of an area and preserve or enhance the historic environment.</p>		
<p>Refused plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site Location Plan; ▪ Typical Layout & Elevations Plan; ▪ Existing & Proposed Site Layout Plan. 		

**INFORMATIVES / NOTES
TO BE INCLUDED ON/WITH DECISION NOTICE**

STATEMENT OF PROACTIVE WORKING:

In determining this application, the authority has taken account of the guidance in paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 in order to seek to secure sustainable development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the Borough.