

**DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING**

**Application No:** H23-1090-25                      **Applicant:** Mr T Twigger  
**Proposal:** Change of use of land to domestic & erection of workshop & stores  
**Location:** Acorn Lodge Cranesgate North Whaplode St Catherine  
**Terminal Date:** 5th January 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 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

**Representations:**

	<b>Object</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>No Obj.</b>	<b>Comments</b>
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
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	1	0

OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	1
RESIDENTS	1	0	0	0

## CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

### Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for the change of use of land to domestic use, and the erection of a workshop building and a store building. The buildings are proposed to be located to the north-east of the dwelling, Acorn Lodge, which is located within the site.

### Site Description

The site comprises approximately 0.51ha of land at Acorn Lodge, Cranesgate North, Whaplode St Catherine. Acorn Lodge comprises a detached two storey dwelling. The site is within a rural location, surrounded by agricultural land.

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

The western side of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3, whereas the rest of the site is within Flood Zone 1, as identified by the Environment Agency's flood risk maps.

### Relevant Planning History

H23-0321-07: (Full Application) Proposed two-storey extension - approved 08 May 2007

H23-0725-25: (Full Application) Change of use of land to domestic & erection of workshop & stores - refused 06 October 2025

### 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.

Environmental Protection: No comments or objections. Advisory note: Please note that in some instances rainwater harvesting may constitute a private water supply under the Private Water Supplies (England) Regulations 2016 as amended.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: The proposal is for the change of use of land to domestic & erection of workshop & stores. The workshop will be for personal use only not commercial. The access will be upgraded to Lincolnshire County Council Specification and there is sufficient parking on turning within the site. The sliding gates are set back so as not to cause an obstruction in the highway when vehicles are waiting to enter the site. The proposal will not have an adverse effect on the public highway. Highway informative 03 is recommended.

Whaplode Parish Council: No response received.

Holbeach Parish Council: No response received.

Cllr A C Beal: No response received.

Cllr P A Redgate: No response received.

South Holland Internal Drainage Board: No response received.

Ecology 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, 1 representation has been received from a member of the public. The response sets out the following:

-The plans appear to be a little large for what is being classed as a DIY extension, and the proposal appears to be for a business. If it is a business, there is nothing to include waste disposal i.e oil, and road infrastructure should be looked at.

### **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;
- Design and Visual Impact;
- Impact on Amenity;
- Highway Safety;
- Flood Risk;
- 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 is within the countryside. Policy 1 states that development in the countryside will be permitted that is necessary to such a location / or where it can be demonstrated that it meets

the sustainable development needs of the area in terms of its economic, community or environmental benefits.

The proposal seeks to change the use of the site to domestic use and to erect two outbuildings. The proposals would provide private benefits to the amenities of the occupants of Acorn Lodge rather than community benefits, as required by Policy 1. It is also not considered that the proposals would provide economic benefits nor environmental benefits other than the provision of Biodiversity Net Gain of 10.7%, which is only slightly above the minimum 10% requirement.

The dwelling and existing garden area are shown as an unhatched area on the submitted plans within the western side of the site. This area comprises approximately 0.12ha. The proposal seeks to expand this area to cover approximately 0.51ha. The site comprises approximately half of the area that was proposed for residential use under the previously refused application H23-0725-25. Whilst the proposed garden area would represent a significant increase of the current garden area, it is recognised that the proposals have been reduced significantly compared to the previously refused proposal. The area that is proposed for residential use adjoins the existing curtilage and there is planting around the site boundaries which provides a degree of screening and a sense of enclosure. It also appears that the site has been used for domestic purposes since approximately 2014 based on a review of aerial imagery. For example, it appears that there have been domestic structures within the site since 2014 such as a swimming pool and an outbuilding. It is not considered that this has significantly harmed the character or appearance of the area, particularly as the planting around the site's boundaries helps to screen and soften views of the site. Furthermore, the site is mostly visible from Cranesgate North in terms of public access as there are no public rights of way around the site. There are various mature trees and close boarded fencing along the western side of the site which provides further screening.

Two outbuildings are proposed to the north-east of the dwelling for hobby activities and for the storage of machinery to help maintain the site. Under the previously refused application, the outbuildings were proposed to the north of the dwelling close to the road frontage along Cranesgate North. The amended positions are considered to be an improvement as the buildings would be within an area where there is an existing building. Furthermore, the buildings would be closer to the dwelling within the site helping to contain development within the southern portion of the applicant's land ownership parcel.

As the proposal is for an extension of an existing residential site, the proposal does not strictly accord with the requirements of Policy 1 of the Local Plan when viewed in principle. However, the revised curtilage area and outbuildings are considered to be an improvement on the previously refused scheme. Whilst the proposed curtilage is still relatively large, there is a sense of containment within the site due to planting around the site's boundaries. Planning conditions could be included to restrict permitted development rights within the site to limit the construction of any further structures within the site to avoid overdevelopment. Therefore, on balance the principle of development is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

### Design and Visual 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.

Acorn Lodge comprises a detached two-storey dwelling featuring red brickwork and rendered facades. There is a two-storey rear extension and a detached garage to the north of the dwelling. There are no dwellings next to the site and the surrounding area comprises agricultural land that is flat and relatively open, however, the surrounding landscape is interspersed with ditches, hedgerows and some trees.

The proposed workshop and open fronted store buildings are proposed be located to the north-east of dwelling within the site, where there is currently a building. Previously the buildings were proposed to be located to the north of the dwelling, nearer the road frontage with Cranesgate North.

The workshop is proposed to measure 20.5m by 8.5m. The building is proposed to feature a gable end roof form, measuring 4.9m up to the ridgeline, and 3.3m up to the eaves. This is slightly reduced compared to the previously refused scheme which was proposed to measure 5.1m in height.

The store building is proposed to measure 12m by 6m. The building is also proposed to feature a gable end roof form, measuring 4.5m up to the ridgeline and 3.3m up to the eaves. This is slightly reduced compared to the previously refused scheme which was proposed to measure 4.6m in height.

Both buildings are relatively large for outbuildings. For example, permitted development rights allow outbuildings to measure 4m in height if a gable roof form is used, and both buildings would exceed this height allowance. According to the submission, the buildings are proposed to be as large as they are in order to store tools and machinery. There is a degree of screening within and around the site due to the hedgerow that is located along the site frontage next to Cranesgate North, the dwelling itself and various mature trees around the site. As such, the buildings would be partially screened. The revised placement of the buildings is considered to be more appropriate than under the previously refused proposal. For example, the buildings would be located approximately where there is an existing smaller outbuilding. There is also already a sense of containment within the southern portion of the site due to the location of a fence that runs through the middle of the site from east to west. Furthermore, the proposal seeks to reinforce this boundary through significant planting.

The proposed materials are set out within the application form rather than on the elevation plans. The materials include brickwork up to 0.5m and natural wood cladding on the remainder of the elevations. Dark grey profile metal sheeting is proposed for the roofs of the buildings, with uPVC windows and a large grey roller shutter door is proposed on the workshop building. The timber cladding would potentially be a suitable material choice to respond to the rural character of the site. Further details of the materials could be secured by condition to ensure the materials of an appropriate quality and appearance.

It is considered appropriate to restrict permitted development rights for the erection of further outbuildings and means of enclosure in order to prevent the site from becoming overdeveloped in future as this could harm the character and appearance of the area. This is considered to be necessary due to the size of the proposed residential curtilage.

The visual impact of the buildings and the change of use of the site to domestic use would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. As such, the proposals accord with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 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.

There are no dwellings next to the site and the nearest dwellings are located approximately 270m to the north of the site. The proposed change of use of land to a domestic use is not expected to result in an adverse impact on the amenity of the nearest dwellings. Similarly, the proposed buildings would not result in any adverse effects in terms of the amenity of the nearest dwellings.

### Highway Safety

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF sets out that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe, following mitigation.

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 33 further reinforces the need for developments to be accessible via sustainable modes of transport.

Policy 36 of the Local Plan, in conjunction with Appendix 6, sets out minimum vehicle parking standards.

The proposed development is not expected to result in an increased need for parking spaces. For example, the buildings are proposed to be used by the existing occupants of Acorn Lodge, rather than by the general public.

The proposals seek to close of an existing highway access and to install electric sliding gates within the site, near the other site access. Lincolnshire County Council's Highways Team have not raised any objections to the proposals. Gates are proposed to be located approximately 6m from the highway and as such, there would be sufficient room for vehicles to wait within the site rather than on Cranesgate North. Therefore, the proposal would have an acceptable impact in terms of highway safety. As such, the proposal accords with Policies 2, 3, 33 and 36 of the Local Plan, as well as Section 9 of the NPPF.

#### Flood Risk

Policy 4 of the Local Plan allows for certain types of development within Flood Zones 2 and 3 in instances where specific criteria are met.

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.

Paragraph 176 of the NPPF sets out that some minor development and changes of use should not be subject to the sequential or exception tests. As the proposal is for a change of use and for the erection of two outbuildings, the proposed development is not required to pass the sequential or exception tests. Paragraph 176 does, however, still require proposals to meet the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments.

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. Within the SFRA, areas across South Holland have been identified according to the level of hazard that is posed in terms of flood risk. Appendix C of the SFRA sets out guidance in terms of the minimum measures that are required according to what hazard category areas fall under. The site is not within a hazard rating area and as the proposal is for a change of use and for the rection of two outbuildings, the SFRA does not require any specific mitigation in this case.

Rainwater harvesting and a soakaway are proposed to accommodate surface water run off from the proposed outbuildings. This represents a sustainable means of managing water flow from the proposals.

Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development accords with Policy 4 of the Local Plan and the intentions of the NPPF in terms of flood risk.

#### 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 application is accompanied by a Biodiversity Net gain Assessment which concludes that the proposals can deliver a gain of 10.7%. Further details can be secured via planning conditions which have been agreed with the applicant's agent. Furthermore, according to the submitted information, no protected species are likely to be within the site or using the site as habitat.

## **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 proposal does not strictly accord with the requirements of Policy 1 of the Local Plan when viewed in principle due to the lack of economic, community or environmental benefits. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that the change of use of the land and the proposed outbuildings would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area. There are various trees and hedgerows around the site's boundaries which provides screening and a sense of containment around the site. Planning conditions can be included to restrict further development of the site such as further outbuildings to avoid a sense of overdevelopment. As such, and on balance, it is considered that the proposals can be recommended for approval.

## **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 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.