

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	H06-0743-26	Applicant:	S & S Pugh & Sons Ltd.
Proposal:	Proposed Agricultural Implement Store		
Location:	Parsons Yard Middle Drove Gedney		
Terminal Date:	1st October 2026		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
04	Approach to Flood Risk
28	The Natural Environment
30	Pollution

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework August 2026

Section 3 - Decision-making policies (DM1 - 10)
 Section 4 - Achieving sustainable development (S1 - S6)
 Section 7 - Building a strong, effective economy (E1 - 4)
 Section 12 - Making effective use of land (L1 - 3)
 Section 14 - Achieving well-designed places (DP1 - 4)
 Section 15 - Promoting sustainable transport (TR1 - 8)
 Section 17 - Pollution, public protection and security (P1 - 6)
 Section 18 - Managing flood risk and coastal change (F1 - 9)
 Section 19 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (N1 - 9)

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	1
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1

SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	0	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	2

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The proposal seeks full planning permission for an agricultural barn and an extension to the existing vehicular access from Middle Drove, which is to the south of the site.

Site Description

The site comprises land at Parsons Yard, Middle Drove, Gedney. The site includes an existing access from Middle Drove and vacant land located to the east of a dwelling. Other than this dwelling, the site is mostly surrounded by agricultural land.

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

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

Planning History

H06-0240-26: (Prior Notification) Proposed agricultural store to store farm implements, machinery & tractors - refused 02 April 2026

Consultation Responses

Gedney Parish Council:

No objections.

Lincolnshire County Council - Historic Environment:

Having reviewed the application documents and the updated available Historic Environment information for this application, the proposal is unlikely to have an impact on significant archaeological remains. Consequently, no further archaeological input is necessary for this application.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS:

The access and parking arrangements remain unchanged; therefore, it is considered that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Environmental Protection:

No comments regarding land contamination or environmental protection.

Ecology Officer:

We have no significant concerns regarding the ecological impacts of this proposal. We recommend that the applicant remains ecologically mindful, and that all works cease if there is any risk of impacting nesting birds or protected species, with advice sought from a suitably qualified ecologist. We also recommend the inclusion of ecological enhancements on site, such as bird and/or bat

boxes, either integrated into the building fabric or installed as wall-, pole-, or tree-mounted features.

South Holland Internal Drainage Board:

Byelaw 3 (Surface Water): The applicant has indicated that they intend to dispose of surface water via infiltration, however we cannot see that the viability of this proposal has been evidenced. We recommend that ground investigation is carried out to determine infiltration potential, followed by testing in line with BRE Digest 365 if onsite material is considered favourable for infiltration. If infiltration is not feasible at this site, following the drainage hierarchy we would expect the applicant to propose to discharge surface water to a watercourse. In this case, consent would be required under Byelaw 3. The Board recommend that any discharge is in line with the National standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) published in June 2025. Further to the National Standards for SuDS, the Board's policy is to restrict discharges to 2/l/s/ha or annual average flood flow rate (QBar or QMed), whichever is higher. Please note that any consent granted for the discharge of surface water is likely to be subject to a Surface Water Development Contribution fee (SWDC) as outlined within our Development Control Charges and Fees.

Byelaw 3 (Treated Foul Water): The applicant's proposals will not require the disposal of foul water, therefore Byelaw 3 (treated foul water) does not apply.

Section 23, Land Drainage Act 1991: I note the presence of a watercourse which is not maintained by the Board (a riparian watercourse) adjacent to the southern and eastern site boundaries. Whilst not currently proposed, should the applicant's proposals change to include works to alter the riparian watercourse, or if works are proposed to alter the watercourse at any time in the future, consent would be required under the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and Byelaw 4).

Byelaw 10: There are no Board arterial watercourses within or directly adjacent to the site boundary therefore Byelaw 10 does not apply.

Cllr J L Reynolds: No response received.

Public Representations

This application has been advertised in accordance with the Development Procedure Order and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In this instance, no representations from members of the public have been received.

Key Planning Considerations

Development Plan

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The adopted South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, adopted March 2019 (SELLP), is the development plan for the district, and is the basis for decision making in South Holland. The relevant development plan policies are detailed within the report above.

The policies and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, August 2026 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

There are no adopted Neighbourhood Plans for the area within which the site is located. A Neighbourhood Plan has been designated for Long Sutton, however, a draft version of the plan has not yet been issued.

The main issues and considerations in this case include the following:

- Principle of Development;
- Design, Layout and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area;
- Impact on Residential Amenity;
- Highway Safety and Parking;
- Flood Risk; and

-Biodiversity Net Gain.

These matters are assessed in turn below.

Principle of Development

Policy S5 (Principle of development outside settlements) of the NPPF sets out only certain forms of development should be approved outside settlements, including agricultural development. These forms of development should be approved, unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the NPPF.

Policy E2 (Meeting the need for business land and premises) of the NPPF sets out that to support business growth, substantial weight should be given to benefits for domestic food production, animal welfare and/or the environment which can be demonstrated through proposals for development for farm and agricultural modernisation.

Policy E4 (Rural business development) of the NPPF sets out that in applying policy E2, the sustainable growth of businesses in rural areas should be supported, including through the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based businesses.

Policy 1 of the Local Plan sets out the settlement hierarchy in respect of delivering sustainable development, which meets the social and economic needs of the area whilst protecting and enhancing the environment; in order to provide enough choice of land for housing to satisfy local need, whilst making more sustainable use of land, and to minimise the loss of high-quality agricultural plots by developing in sustainable locations and at appropriate densities.

Policy 1 expresses this sustainable hierarchy of settlements, ranking the settlements deemed to be most sustainable in descending order. The most sustainable locations for development are situated within the 'Sub-Regional Centres', followed by 'Main Service Centres'. Lower down the hierarchy are areas of limited development opportunity including Minor Service Centres, with areas of development constraint comprising 'Other Service Centres and Settlements'. The countryside is at the bottom of the settlement hierarchy and represents the least sustainable location.

In this case, the site comprises land within the countryside, outside of any settlement boundary. Section D of Policy 1 sets out that development within the countryside will be permitted that is necessary to such a location and / or where it can be demonstrated that it meets the sustainable development needs of the area in terms of economic, community or environmental benefits.

The supporting policy text of Policy 1 sets out the following at Paragraph 3.2.15

"The Countryside of South East Lincolnshire is a precious resource, mainly in its role for agriculture but also for recreation. There are types of development that require a Countryside location either because it is the location of an existing building or use of land. Where changes to such buildings or land uses require planning permission Policy 1 and other more detailed Local Plan policies will apply. Agriculture and forestry are clearly uses which must function in the Countryside but other uses which may diversify from agriculture and forestry, e.g. recreation and tourism, can meet the broad sustainable objectives of the Local Plan."

The application seeks consent for an agricultural implement store and an extension to an existing vehicular access from Middle Drove which is to the south of the site.

Initially, the submission contained limited information regarding the applicant or the need for the proposed barn. This was queried with the applicant's agent and further information was subsequently provided.

The applicant, Pugh and Sons Ltd operate an agricultural unit covering 600 hectares of land. The building is proposed to store farm implements, machinery and tractors to assist with operating the agricultural unit. Currently, the applicant needs to go back and forth from their main yard in Swineshead whereas the proposed building would assist the agricultural unit by allowing storage closer to some of the agricultural fields within the unit. According to the applicant, implements have been left in open fields over the past year and have either been broken or stolen and as such, the proposed building would provide a secure place to store items and machinery.

Therefore, the current application has been submitted as the building was not eligible under the Class A permitted development right; however, there is general policy support for agricultural buildings in the countryside where they are reasonably necessary and support agricultural businesses.

In this case, it is considered that a large agricultural unit can reasonably require building to store implements, machinery and vehicles and as such, it is considered that the building is reasonably necessary. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal accords with the aims of Policy 1 of the Local Plan and Policies S5, E2 and E4 of the NPPF.

Design, Layout and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

Policy DP3 (Key principles for well-designed places) of the NPPF states that development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan similarly outlines sustainable development considerations for development proposals, providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals.

Policy 3 accords with the provisions of Section 12 of the NPPF as it requires development to comprise good design; identifying issues that should be considered when preparing schemes so that development sits comfortably with, and adds positively to, its historically-designated or undesignated townscape or landscape surroundings.

The building is proposed to measure approximately 45m in length and 10m in width. A monopitch roof form is proposed measuring 4.5m in height at its tallest point and 3.38m in height on the other side of the building.

The external materials include brickwork to match the neighbouring dwelling, black profile metal sheeting walls and roof and black steel doors. It is considered that the building would feature a utilitarian appearance that is common for agricultural buildings.

The building is proposed to be located near the northern edge of the field in which the site is located. There is a boundary hedge located to the north and east of the site the provides a degree of screening; however, the building would still be visible from the surrounding area as beyond the site, there is mostly open and flat agricultural land.

Whilst the building would introduce built form within a flat and relatively open landscape, it is considered that the visual impact would be acceptable in this instance. For example, the scale and appearance of the building would not be incongruous for the area.

Therefore, the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 14 of the NPPF.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy P3 (Living conditions and pollution) of the NPPF sets out that development should provide healthy living conditions for occupiers and users in terms of adequate access to light and avoiding exposure to levels of air, noise, artificial light or other sources of pollution. The policy also sets out that proposals should not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site.

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

The building is proposed to be located to the east of a dwelling; however, it is not expected that the agricultural building would result in an adverse impact on the amenity of occupants of the building. For example, it is not proposed to house livestock within the building and the proposed storage of agricultural machinery, vehicles and equipment is not considered likely to have an adverse impact

on the amenity of the nearest dwellings to the site. There might be a degree of disturbance resulting from agricultural vehicles accessing the site; however, the impact of this is not considered likely to result in an adverse impact.

Highway Safety and Parking

Policy TR6 (Assessing transport impacts) of the NPPF sets out that development proposals should only be refused on highways grounds if they would have a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety; taking into account any mitigation measures proposed as well as any wider network improvements, including measures to support sustainable patterns of movement.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan sets out that proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to access and vehicle generation.

Policy 3 details that development proposals will demonstrate how accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, public rights of way and cycle ways will be secured, where they are relevant to the proposal.

Policy 36 and Appendix 6 of the Local Plan, set out minimum vehicle parking standards. The standards require at least two spaces for dwellings of up to three bedrooms, and three spaces for dwellings with four or more bedrooms.

The proposal seeks to extend an existing vehicular access from Middle Drove to the south of the site. The part of the access closest to Middle Drove is already surfaced. The area where the extended access is proposed would be surfaced with hardcore. Lincolnshire County Council's (LCC) highways team have not raised any objections to the proposal nor have they requested any planning conditions.

Therefore, the proposal would have an acceptable impact on highway safety in accordance with Local Plan Policies 2, 3 and 36, and Section 15 of the NPPF.

Flood Risk

Section 18 of the NPPF sets out guidance relating to how local authorities should assess and determine applications which are subject to flood risk concerns.

Policy 4 of the Local Plan sets out that development within Flood Zones 2 and 3 will be permitted in instances where specific criteria is met.

The site lies within Flood Zone 3 as identified by the Environment Agency's flood risk maps. Therefore, the proposal is required to pass the sequential test as required by Policy F5 (The sequential test) of the NPPF. As the proposal would comprise a 'less vulnerable' use as defined by Annex F of the NPPF, it is not necessary for the development to pass the exception test.

Paragraph 8.3.6 of the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) sets out that the search area for the sequential test should be the whole of the council area unless the functional requirements of the development justify a reduced search area. Notwithstanding this, National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) sets out that the sequential test should be applied proportionately, and the search area should always be appropriate to the nature and scale of the proposal (Paragraph 027a Reference ID:7-027a-20220825).

The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA); however, there is no evidence of alternative sites being considered and discounted. Notwithstanding this, it is recognised that large parts of the district of South Holland lie within Flood Zone 3 and most of the rural areas where the proposed building could be located are also within Flood Zone 3. Furthermore, the area surrounding Middle Drove is within Flood Zone 3. The building is proposed to be used in conjunction with an existing agricultural unit. As such, it is not considered reasonable or practical for the building to be located on land that is within a lower risk flood zone. Therefore, it is considered that the sequential test is passed in this case.

The South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) provides an overview of how flood risk has been considered in shaping the proposals of the Local Plan; including the spatial

strategy and the assessment of housing and employment sites. The site is within a 'Danger to Most' hazard area as identified by the SFRA. For less vulnerable uses such as the proposed building within these hazard areas, the SFRA recommends that the finished floor levels of buildings should be raised as high as practicable (minimum 300mm above the existing ground level). The submitted FRA does not propose this; however, it is considered that a planning condition could be imposed to require the development to include the recommended floor levels. With the inclusion of such a condition, it is considered that the proposed development accords with Policy 4 of the Local Plan and the intentions of the NPPF in flood risk terms.

The submitted application form indicates that the proposed means of managing surface water is via a soakaway. Whilst this is supported in principle as a sustainable means of drainage, the application is not accompanied by any further details demonstrating the feasibility of a soakaway and as such, it would be considered appropriate to secure further drainage details via a planning condition.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021) requires developers to deliver a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain using standardized biodiversity units measured by statutory biodiversity metrics. This is often referred to as the mandatory requirements for Biodiversity Net Gain.

"Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, subject to some exceptions, every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met ("the biodiversity gain condition"). This objective is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat. This increase can be achieved through onsite biodiversity gains, registered offsite biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits".

The biodiversity gain condition is a pre-commencement condition. This relates to a condition that seeks, once planning permission has been granted, a Biodiversity Gain Plan that must be submitted and approved by the planning authority before commencement of the development, alongside the need to submit a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan.

The effect of Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the "biodiversity gain condition".

The effect of this "biodiversity gain condition" is that development granted by this notice must not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan, or
- (c) the development is exempt from the biodiversity gain condition.

The site comprises 0.179ha of land and as such, the proposal is exempt from the requirement to provide BNG.

Planning Balance

As detailed above, Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposed development would not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, or the amenity of nearby residents. The development is acceptable in terms of highway safety and flood risk particularly through the inclusion of relevant planning conditions. Therefore, the proposed development accords with the Local Plan and the NPPF. In this instance, there are no material considerations that weigh against the proposal and as such, the planning balance is in favour of the development.

Additional Considerations

Public Sector Equality Duty

In making this decision the Authority must have regard to the public sector equality duty (PSED) under s.149 of the Equalities Act. This means that the Council must have due regard to the need (in

discharging its functions) to:

A. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.

B. Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. This may include removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; taking steps to meet the special needs of those with a protected characteristic; encouraging participation in public life (or other areas where they are underrepresented) of people with a protected characteristic(s).

C. Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.

The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The PSED must be considered as a relevant factor in making this decision but does not impose a duty to achieve the outcomes in s.149. It is only one factor that needs to be considered, and may be balanced against other relevant factors.

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case will have a disproportionately adverse impact on a protected characteristic.

Human Rights

In making a decision, the Authority should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as South Holland District Council to act in a manner that is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights. The Authority is referred specifically to Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property).

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case interferes with local residents' right to respect for their private and family life, home and correspondence, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general public interest and the recommendation is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

Conclusion

Taking the above considerations into account, the proposal is considered to accord with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 28 of the Local Plan, along with the identified sections within the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that indicate against the proposal and outweigh the consideration in favour of the proposal and the policies referred to above.

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be approved under delegated authority.