

**DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING**

**Application No:** H15-0955-25                      **Applicant:** S F Spridgen & Son

**Proposal:** Extension to Existing Agricultural Building for Plant/Machinery, Storage & Workshop - Retrospective

**Location:** Kirk Hill Farm 355 Westhorpe Road Gosberton Westhorpe

**Terminal Date:** 10th December 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
07	Improving South East Lincolnshire's Employment Land Portfolio
28	The Natural Environment
29	The Historic Environment
30	Pollution

**National Guidance**

**National Planning Policy Framework December 2024**

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

**Representations:**

	<b>Object</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>No Obj.</b>	<b>Comments</b>
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	1
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	0	1

OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	1
------------------------	---	---	---	---

## CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

### Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for an extension to an existing agricultural building for plant / machinery, storage and a workshop. The application is retrospective as according to the application form, the extension was completed in September 2025.

### Site Description

The application site comprises land within an agricultural yard to the north of a junction between Westhorpe Road and Chesboule Lane. There are various agricultural buildings to the north-west of the site and 3 dwellings located to the east of the site. The site is otherwise mostly surrounded by open agricultural land.

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

The site is within Flood Zone 1, as identified by the Environment Agency's flood risk maps.

### Relevant Planning History

No planning applications have previously been submitted within the site.

The following applications have been determined on land to the north-west / west of the site:

H08-0265-09: (Full Application) Demolition of existing building and erection of new agricultural building - approved 11 June 2009

H15-1262-21: (Full Application) Agricultural building for cold storage of cabbage - approved 14 February 2022

### 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 demolished building is part of MLI122465 Kirkhill Farm (Kirk Hill House), Quadring: Kirkhill Farm (Kirk Hill House), Quadring. Partially extant 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard of F plan. The farmhouse is detached from the main working complex. There has been a partial loss (less than 50%) of traditional buildings. Large modern sheds are located to the side of the site. This is confirmed by satellite image, the OS Historic Map 1892-1914 and it was identified by English Heritage during their Greater Lincolnshire Farmstead Assessment Framework, English Heritage / Historic England, 2015, Greater Lincolnshire Farmsteads Project, 8170 (Digital Archive). SLI15702. Traditional farm buildings such as this are increasingly becoming redundant in a rapidly changing industry. They play an integral part in giving the landscape of South Holland its sense of place and character, and preserve evidence for the history and development of the area's agricultural industry and fenland social history. These vernacular buildings are now increasingly under threat from conversion or demolition and are a diminishing resource in our countryside. Currently there is insufficient specific information on the heritage potential for the site and the extent of impact to a heritage asset from the proposed development. Therefore, I recommend the applicant to provide the results of a full Heritage Impact Assessment of the building. This is in line with the guidance set out in the NPPF 2024 (paragraphs 207 & 218). The applicant has not adequately described the significance of any heritage assets that

may be affected by the proposed development, and it is not "sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance (the heritage assets)" (Paragraph 207 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)). This in turn does not allow the Local planning authority to "identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal." (Paragraph 208 NPPF).

Conservation Officer: More information is required for an informed decision to take place on this application. The application includes a cursory mention of the fact that an original brick outbuilding has been demolished. Inspection of historic photography of the site shows that this brick outbuilding, whilst in poor condition and substantially altered with a corrugated roof, was an attractive historic agricultural range building forming an inherent part of Lincs HER entry Ref: MLI122465. I would therefore suggest that a full Heritage Impact Assessment should be provided before this case may proceed further

Quadring Parish Council: Rainwater needs to go into a soak away as currently it is going onto the road which already floods during heavy rain.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: It is considered that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Cllr H J Bingham: No response received.

Cllr M A Geaney: No response received.

Cllr J L King: No response received.

Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board: No response received.

Tree Officer: No response received.

Ecology Officer: No response received.

Environmental Protection: 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 Amenity Impact;
- Impact on Heritage Assets; 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.

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. Within the supporting policy text, paragraph 3.2.16 states that "Some land uses may also require a countryside location because of their functionality".

Paragraph 88 of the NPPF sets out that planning decisions should enable the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses.

There are permitted development rights that allow for the erection and extension of agricultural buildings. As the extension has been constructed, the proposal would not benefit from permitted development rights. Nonetheless, permitted development rights for agricultural development are considered to be relevant in this case as a potential fallback position.

There is general policy support for agricultural businesses and proposals and as such, the principle of development is considered to be acceptable in this case.

### Visual and Amenity Impact

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.

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.

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

The extension measures 22.3m by 10.8m, featuring green aluminium profile sheeting on its facades. The sheeting matches the original building. The extension continues the roofline and eaves line of the existing building, and it is considered that the extension is of a suitable scale, appearance and siting. As such, the visual impact of the development is considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

It is also not considered that the building would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the nearest dwellings due to its positioning, scale and use within an existing agricultural yard.

## Impact on Heritage Assets

Section 16 of the NPPF sets out the importance of considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets; advising that development and alterations to designated assets and their settings can cause harm. These policies ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic buildings and environments. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance should be treated favourably.

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".

Policy 29 (Part F) of the Local Plan sets out that proposals that would affect the significant of a heritage asset, including non-designated heritage assets, should be informed by proportionate historic environment assessments and evaluations.

It is acknowledged that Lincolnshire County Council's Historic Environment Team and the council's conservation officer have asked for further information to assess the significance of the former building within the site that has been demolished to facilitate the extension. The Historic Environment Team consider that this building was potentially a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). Whilst the building might have been a NDHA, there are permitted development rights that allow for the demolition of buildings under Schedule 2, Part 11, Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). Class B allows for the demolition of most buildings, other than listed buildings or buildings within Conservation Areas, provided applicants submit an application to the relevant local planning authority to determine if prior approval is required for the method of demolition and any proposed restoration of the site. As such, it is likely that the building could have been demolished under Class B, without any assessment of the historic significance of the building. This has been considered in relation to the requests from consultees and in this instance, it is not considered necessary to require a historic impact assessment.

## 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.

When taking the above into account, the development is considered to be exempt from the statutory BNG requirement as the proposed would fall under the de minimis exemption.

## **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 is appropriate and would not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, or the amenity of nearby residents. Overall, the proposed development accords with the Local Plan and the NPPF.

## **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 and 30 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.