

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H08-0818-25 **Applicant:** Mr O Tyler
Proposal: Proposed Timber Storage Shed
Location: Chespool House Chesboule Lane Gosberton Risegate
Terminal Date: 4th November 2025

Planning Policies**South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019**

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

National Guidance**National Planning Policy Framework December 2024**

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
Section 4 - Decision-making
Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 11 - Making effective use of land
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
Section 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	1	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
RUBEN LOPEZ, HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER	0	0	0	1
WELLAND AND				

DEEPINGS INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	1	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a timber storage shed that is proposed to serve as an outbuilding for Chespool House. The storage building is proposed to measure 9.34m in length and 6.4m in width. The building is proposed to feature a gable end roof form measuring 5.21m up to the ridgeline and 3.18m up to the eaves. The building is proposed to feature vertical treated cladding and a terracotta steel sheeting roof.

Site Description

The site comprises land at Chespool House, Chesboule Lane on the northern edge of Gosberton Risegate. Chespool House is a grade II listed building. The proposed shed would be located to the east of an existing annex building and to the north-east of the dwelling and existing outbuildings within the site.

The site is located within the settlement limits of Gosberton Risegate as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, and the accompanying policies map.

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

Relevant Planning History

H08-0023-09: (Listed Building Consent) Repairs and renovations to dwelling - approved 06 March 2009

H08-0751-10: (Listed Building Consent) Repairs and repointing of brickwork, repairs to windows and doors and also to roof - approved 04 November 2010

H08-0773-13: (Full Application) Partial rebuilding of former outbuildings and change of use to form residential annex - approved 20 November 2013

H08-0808-13: (Listed Building Consent) Partial rebuilding of former outbuildings and change of use to form residential annex - approved 20 November 2013

H08-0594-15: (Discharge of Conditions) Details of elevational and cross sectional plans, roof structure, beams, cladding and hand gates to garden, doors and window frames and external renovation works (Conditions 3, 4, 10 and 11 of H08-0808-13) - approved 07 September 2015

Consultation Responses

The responses received from consultees during the consultation period are summarised below. The responses can be viewed in their entirety on South Holland District Council's website.

Lincolnshire County Council - Historic Environment: The proposal is unlikely to have an impact on significant archaeological remains. Consequently, no further archaeological input is necessary for this application.

Welland and Deepings Internal Drainage Board: No comments.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: No objections. Proposed Timber Storage Shed for domestic & hobby storage - classic car. No commercial or residential purpose and it is well away from the public highway. The proposal will not have an adverse effect on the public highway.

Conservation Officer: I have no objection to this proposal. Paragraph 212 of the NPPF, confirms; "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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance." It is important to note that this paragraph also de facto establishes that harm to the setting of a listed building can be categorised into one of three categories, those being 'less than substantial harm', 'Substantial Harm' and 'Total Loss'. Paragraph 213 of the NPPF further confirms "Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification". In this case, I consider the proposal to represent a form of less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed building, and ascribe that harm to be at the very lowest end of that category. Representing, the most minor form of harm that may be categorised as harm. Harm is identified because the proposal does represent a form of modern development in the setting and context of the listed building, which may in some extremely minor way, reduce the originality and readability of the original plot layout. However, the materials proposed are appropriate, as is the design, and the positioning, located behind extant buildings, so as to reduce visibility from the public realm. As such, I do not consider that this proposal places the appreciation of any listed assets on site at any risk. Due to the low degree of harm identified, I consider the proposal to be justified by the applicant's stated intention to use the site for timber storage, in order to enhance the domestic useability of the site. Referring to the local plan, Policy 29A(3) refers to development within the setting of a listed building and confirms "Proposals that affect the setting of a Listed Building will be supported where they preserve or better reveal the significance of the Listed Building." In this instance, as per the assessment above, I consider this proposal to preserve the significance of the listed building by virtue of a lack of a considerable impact.

Gosberton Parish Council: No objections.

Environmental Protection: No comments regarding land contamination.

Cllr H J W Bingham: No response received.

Cllr M A Geaney: No response received.

Cllr J L King: No response received.

Tree Officer: No response received.

Public Representations

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

Key Planning Considerations

Development Plan

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

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

The policies and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, December 2024 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

There are no adopted Neighbourhood Plans for the area within which the site is located.

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

- Principle of Development;
- Visual and Heritage Impact;
- Impact on Amenity;
- Flood Risk; and
- Biodiversity Net Gain.

These matters are assessed in turn below.

Principle of Development

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

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

The site is within the defined settlement of Gosberton Risegate, which falls under the category of 'Other Service Centres and Settlements'. Policy 1 sets out that within this type of settlement, development will be permitted that supports their role as a service centre for the settlement itself, helps sustain existing facilities or helps meet the service needs of other local communities. Development will normally be limited to committed sites and infill.

There are permitted development rights that allow for erection of outbuildings within the curtilage of dwellings, subject to restrictions and criteria. These rights are set out within Part 2, Class E of the Town and County Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (England) (2015) (as amended). Therefore, the principle of development for an outbuilding is appropriate, provided the development is acceptable in terms of other material considerations.

Visual and Heritage Impact

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan outlines sustainable development considerations for 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, in that 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.

Chespool House is a detached two-storey dwelling set within a spacious plot. There are two outbuildings located to the north and to the east of the dwelling. There is also a residential annex located to the west of the area where the shed is proposed.

As set out previously, Chespool House is grade II listed and is, therefore, a designated heritage asset. Section 16 of the NPPF sets out the importance of assessing the impact of proposals on the setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets, to ensure that proposals preserve and enhance these assets. For example, Paragraph 212 of the NPPF sets out the following:

"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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance".

Paragraph 213 of the NPPF further sets out the following:

"Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification".

Policy 29 of the Local Plan (Section A, Part 3) sets out that proposals that would affect the setting of a Listed Building will be supported where they preserve or better reveal the significance of the Listed Building.

The storage building is proposed to measure 9.34m in length and 6.4m in width. The building is proposed to feature a gable end roof form measuring 5.21m up to the ridgeline and 3.18m up to the eaves. The building is proposed to feature vertical treated cladding and a terracotta steel sheeting roof. By comparison, the annex which is located to the west measures 4.7m in height up to the ridgeline.

The council's conservation officer considers that the proposal represents a form of less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed building. The harm is considered to be at the very lowest end of that category. A degree of harm is identified because the proposal does represent a form of modern development in the setting and context of the listed building, which may in some extremely minor way, reduce the originality and readability of the original plot layout. However, the materials design, siting and appearance of the building is appropriate. As such, the less than substantial harm is considered to be justified in this case by the applicant's stated intention to use the site for timber storage, in order to enhance the domestic useability of the site.

It is considered that the proposals accord with Policy 29 as the development would preserve the significance of the listed building by virtue of the lack of a considerable impact. As such, the visual impact of the proposed development is acceptable and in accordance with Policies 2, 3 and 29 of the Local Plan and Sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF.

Impact on Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that development should create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Policies 2 and 3 of 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 proposed shed would not result in an adverse degree of overshadowing of neighbouring properties due to its scale and siting. Furthermore, the shed would not contain habitable rooms, nor are any windows proposed other than rooflights. As such, the building would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking. The proposals would, therefore, be acceptable in amenity terms.

Flood Risk

Section 14 of the NPPF sets out guidance relating to how local authorities should assess and determine applications which are subject to flood risk concerns.

The site is within Flood Zone 3, however, the site is not within a hazard rating area, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. As the proposal is for an outbuilding, no specific flood risk mitigation is required in this instance as the development would not result in any increased flood risk either at the site or to any surrounding land.

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.

Unless comprising development that is exempt from this mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (10%), a condition would be required, as mandatorily set. When taking the above into account, the development in this instance the application is exempt from the statutory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirements.

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 development hereby proposed does not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, including the listed building within the site or the amenity of nearby residents. 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 29 of the Local Plan, along with the identified sections contained 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.