

Burrell, Becky

From: Chance, Jennifer
Sent: 22 January 2026 14:58
To: _planningadvice
Subject: H01-1245-25

Importance: High

Dear Planning Advice

Could the consultation response below be uploaded to Ocella please?

Kind regards

Jen

From: Watkinson, Gregory
Sent: 22 January 2026 14:50
To: Chance, Jennifer <jennifer.chance@sholland.gov.uk>
Subject: H01-1245-25
Importance: High

Hi Jennifer,

Sending my comments on the above case to you direct as the portal doesn't seem to want to accept it. Please see my formal response below:

I write to confirm that I wish to object to this application as currently proposed.

For the sake of clarity, I have no objections to the housing development of 3 properties (plots 1-3). The objections are based solely on the proposed conversion of the Engine Shed (marked on plan as plots 4-5).

The Engine Shed (A.K.A the Goods Shed) is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) by virtue of it's attractive historic detailing and importance to the agricultural history of the locale, being recorded in the Lincolnshire HER under reference: MLI126584, which describes the building like so:

“Two storey brick built former goods shed associated with Cowbit railway station (ML123554). The goods shed itself was built in 1867 by the Great Northern Railway, and is of through type with two cart docks and attached office (the single storey projection), featuring a prominent chimney with stone decoration and a variety of attractive brick detailing. The goods shed is perhaps of greater significance than the passenger station to the south, as it was for the export of the area's agricultural produce that this line was constructed, which continues to thrive as a result of the improved access to markets initially provided by the railway. Goods trains continued to call at Cowbit long after passenger services had finished until the line was closed and the tracks pulled up in 1982. Whilst not Listed, the Cowbit good shed is featured in Historic England's 2016 publication 'The Railway Goods Shed and Warehouse in England'.

A Historic Building Survey undertaken in 2025, revealed that the both the goods shed and goods office is a single storey building of English bond brick with a gable roof and interlocking tiles, aligned north west to south east. The west elevation is divided into five recessed bays with a arched window in each of them. The east elevation contains two large entrances which would have entrances for the loading bay and a cart entrance. Both the north and south elevations contain entrances for locomotives. The goods office contains two arched windows on its south elevation. The interior of the goods shed is open to the roof and contain trusses on an axial beam running the length of the building, which suggest that it originally supported a crane mechanism. Evidence of a dock mechanism is present on the north west side of the building. The floor is comprised on concrete, and shows no evidence of a track bed, though a circular indentation exists which has been interpreted as the spot of a wagon turntable. The goods office contains a cast iron fireplace on the north east corner which is thought to be original.”

The proposed conversion of the Goods Shed seemingly makes no attempt at design sympathy with this attractive former rail building; seeking to infill and remove all readability of historic openings, reveals and recesses with marley boarding, and replacing character windows and doors with standard dimension PVC fenestration with absolutely no relation to the character of the existing. So great is the proposed harm to the NDHA, that I would suggest that the scale of harm should be recognised as at the higher end of ‘substantial’ as it seeks to effectively remove or substantially alter more or less every character feature of the structure, save for the chimney stack and pot, and would modernise the appearance of the asset to an extreme degree, resulting in an unattractive form of development. In accordance with this view, I would therefore recommend that without amendment, Para. 216 of the NPPF should be used as justification for a refusal.

Should the applicant be minded to seek amendment, I would suggest that the whole principle behind the proposal should be rethought totally. The agreed class Q conversion under application reference: H01-0098-24 showed that a sensitive and high quality conversion of this building is not outside of the bounds of design, and should be seen as a useful baseline standard in informing what form any future plans for the Goods Shed may take.

Many thanks.

Kind regards,

Gregory Watkinson BA (Hons), MA

Principal Conservation Officer

South & East Lincolnshire Councils Partnership

T: 01775 764560

M: 07584 553350

E: GWatkinson@sholland.gov.uk

www.sholland.gov.uk | www.boston.gov.uk

www.e-lindsey.gov.uk | www.selcp.co.uk

Please note that any informal officer opinion expressed by this email is without prejudice and is not binding on the Council during the consideration of any formal application.



South & East Lincolnshire Councils Partnership