



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by Helen Heward BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/W/25/3360843

Land to the rear of No 20 Bull Ring, Horncastle, Lincolnshire LN9 5HU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Robert Myers (Myers) against the decision of East Lindsey District Council.
 - The application reference is S/086/00524/24.
 - The development proposed is siting of 1 no. storage container (already on site) and erection of 2.6m high fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Consent was initially sought for the siting of two storage containers but was amended to one, as shown on revised drawing 60324-02 Rev A.
3. On my visit two containers were on site, neither had been clad and the 2.6m high fencing had not been erected. For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the development as shown on drawing 60324-02 Rev A, and as described in the banner heading above.
4. Since the application was refused the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) has been revised. Paragraph numbers changed but there is no change to the Government's planning policy as far as it relates to this appeal.
5. The Reason for Refusal refers to the appeal proposal being within the Horncastle Conservation Area (CA), above a Scheduled Monument (SM) and harm to the setting of nearby Listed Buildings (LBs). Initially, insufficient information was provided to identify all of the heritage assets referred to. At my request, the Council provided more information, and the Appellant submitted a response on 26 November. I have taken these submissions into consideration.
6. As the proposal is in the CA and there are LBs nearby, I have had special regard to my duties under sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

7. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the local area bearing in mind the special attention that should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area and

the duty to have special regard to preserving the setting of the nearby heritage assets.

8. The designated assets considered are:

- i. The Horncastle CA
- ii. The Banovallum, remains of a Roman Wall Grade I LB, Reference 1262504, and SM 1005034
- iii. The Kings Head Public House, Bull Ring, Grade II LB Reference 1168242
- iv. HA Stanley, 9 High Street, Grade II LB, Reference 1244361
- v. Wallis Fashions, 15 High Street, Grade II LB, Reference 1251569
- vi. Leicester Building Society, Lindsey Court Grade II LB, Reference 1262719
- vii. Handley Fruit and Vegetable Shop, Grade II LB, Reference 1063774, and
- viii. Mawer, Mason and Bell, Estate Agents, Grade II, Reference 1252002.

Reasons

The Conservation Area

9. The Horncastle CA covers a large part of the historic town and retains the character and appearance of a traditional country market town with a central Market Place.
10. The Market Place and surrounding commercial streets including High Street and Bull Ring reveal the town's development from probable Anglo-Saxon beginnings and the walled enclosure of the Roman period, through to its medieval and subsequent prosperity.
11. The appeal site is a plot of open land to the rear of 20 Bull Ring. It is part of a larger open area close to, but at the back of the town centre, and which provides access, parking and servicing and has a number of pedestrian routes running through it.
12. Surrounding Georgian and early Victorian buildings of the town centre remain evident. Even though several 'turn their back' on this open area, they nonetheless provide an understanding of the historic proximity and layout of the Market Place and surrounding commercial streets including High Street and Bull Ring.
13. I find the special interest of the CA, as far as it relates to this appeal, to be primarily associated with the layout and legibility of its historic core.

The Listed Buildings

14. Mawer Mason & Bell is a detached 3-storey red brick C19 & C20 building which sits adjacent to the southern end of the appeal site and forms a prominent corner building. A side gable faces the southern end of the appeal site. Close by, Handley Fruit and Vegetable Shop is a rendered brick building with a pantile, mansard roof. A single bay front faces Bull Ring.
15. The King's Head is located just to the north of the appeal site. It dates from the C16 to late C18, is constructed of colour washed mud and stud, thatched roof and has a 3-bay front with central doorway facing Bull Ring. A narrow pedestrian access runs alongside the Kings Head from the Bull Ring close to the proposed development.

16. HA Stanley, 9 High Street, is to the north of the appeal site. It dates from the early C19 and faces the High Street. The pantile roof with rendered brick coped gable and rear façade are visible from the appeal site. The Wallis Fashions building has a 2 storey and attic building with steeply pitched pantile roof. A gabled southern, and a long rear elevation are close to the appeal site. On the other side of Lindsey Court is a modest 2-storey building. The Wallis Fashions Building obstructs views of the container.
17. I find that the setting of these LBs as far as they relate to their special interest and this appeal, to be primarily associated with the utilitarian nature of their rear service yards and the consistent use of traditional materials.

The Scheduled Monument

18. There is a section of the curtilage wall from the Roman settlement, approximately 18m long, running through the appeal site and adjacent to the container which the appeal seeks to retain. The wall is buried beneath the surface here. The special interest of the wall, as far as it relates to this appeal, is in its historical and physical importance in denoting the extent of the settlement at that time and in the buried physical remains. The setting as it relates to the special interest of this asset and insofar as relevant to this appeal, is related to the legibility of the line that the wall takes.
19. The container would be 2.6m high and finished dark green in colour. It is utilitarian and functional in character and appearance, quite at odds with the red brick and colour washed walls with pitched pantile roofs of traditional buildings close by. The container would be situated within a service yard area near to the service area at the back of a modern rear extension to the Co-op. I also noted another container nearby, unrelated to this appeal. Even so, the detached position of the container I am considering adds to its incongruity.
20. The Appellant acknowledges that the container is not of historic character in itself and would be visible from Wharf Road and the walkway to High Street. There would also be co-visibility of the container with rear or side elevations of several traditional buildings in the CA, including some Grade II LBs (References 1244361, 1251569 and 1252002). In the available views the container would detract from the setting of these LBs and views of the historic town centre buildings more generally.
21. The Appellant accepts that the container is not of historic character in itself but argues that the single container would not look unduly prominent if mitigation were provided. The removal of one storage container would result in a change to the current views from Wharf Road and the public footway. However, previous temporary planning permissions have expired and the removal of a storage container which does not have planning permission attracts no weight.
22. The Appellant proposes to clad the container with vertical timber cladding and offers to accept a planning condition requiring a high fence be provided to screen the container and associated paraphernalia stored in the yard area. Even so, the container would remain legible and at odds with the traditional building materials of nearby buildings. The Appellant argues that the site is part of a service yard and parking area used for many years by the Appellant and includes bins, pallets, and other paraphernalia associated with the bakery business, shop, and café, which face onto Bull Ring. The outside storage and five large wheelie bins would likely remain, and the area would continue to be used for associated business use.

23. Delivery vans and vehicles are not development. They come and go and do not become part of the built fabric of the town. The container would be seen in the context of car parking and servicing in the area more widely, but I did not find these activities would materially screen the available views. I attach little weight to suggestions that without a container the Bakery's fleet of vans would increase and have a more detrimental effect on the character of the area.
24. I conclude that the container with cladding and fence would be at odds with and detract from the character and appearance of the historic layout of the town and traditional construction materials. Taken together, the effects would be detrimental to the special interest, as it relates to the setting of LBs 1244361, 1251569 and 1252002, and the character of the Horncastle CA as a whole.
25. The Roman wall SM is a heritage asset of the highest significance being a Grade I LB and a SM. The Container which this appeal seeks to retain, sits above the ground and is not directly over the route of the wall structure. No physical harm to the Roman wall is cited in the Reason for Refusal. However, I agree with the Council, that the physical presence of the container obstructs views and detracts from an above ground appreciation of the alignment and position of the Roman boundary to the settlement. I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the SM.
26. Paragraph 212 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 advises that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have a clear and convincing justification.
27. The Appellant suggests that given the characteristics of the locality, the harm to the CA character would be less than substantial (LTS). I agree and further conclude that harm to the character and appearance of the Horncastle CA, the special interest as it relates to the setting of LBs 1244361, 1251569 and 1252002, and the SM would individually and collectively be at the lower end of the LTS range.
28. Framework Paragraph 215 states that where a development proposal will lead to LTS harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
29. The Appellant explains that the container is needed for storage in connection with Myers Bakery, cafe and shop due to the expansion and demands of the business which has created additional employment. The bakery has been at this site since 1969 and is a well-established and significant employer in the town of Horncastle.
30. The Appellant advises that a 2015 conversion of the first floor of the bakery from storage to a production area and provision of facilities required by Health, Safety and Welfare Regulations on the second floor, left no room for internal storage. They suggest that over time the need for more storage grew to allow for bulk buying of materials, such as packaging bought in quantity for branding reasons.
31. The Appellant hoped that a container would be only a temporary measure. Unfortunately, they say, no suitable premises in terms of scale and location, in close proximity to the bakery and shop became available. The Appellant has tried to acquire additional premises nearby unsuccessfully and also considered renting a

unit on Horncastle Industrial Estate. The Appellant suggests that there are no small units available for sale or rent.

32. The Council acknowledges that the Appellant has attempted to purchase the land for a permanent building and that discussions with the Council to discuss alternative measures, including a screening wall have not come to fruition. The Council is also aware that attempts to purchase premises to the south of the bakery have been withdrawn. The container offers the Appellant a valuable close, dry storage space for many items, including those that have to be ordered in bulk.
33. The planning system supports the creation of employment and town centre uses and the retention of a retail and bakery business is desirable. Policy S14 of East Lindsey Local Plan 2018 supports retail uses in Horncastle and Policy 12 of the Horncastle Neighbourhood Plan looks to strengthening the retail core and the Bull Ring is a Primary Shopping Frontage. I attach a moderate amount of weight in favour of business support and retention as a public benefit.
34. I have found a low level of LTS harm to the setting of LBs 1244361, 1251569, 1252002, the character of the CA as a whole and the Scheduled Monument. I give these harms considerable importance and weight. Having regard to Framework Paragraph 215 I conclude that the public benefits are not sufficient to outweigh the harms to the significance of these designated heritage assets.
35. The retention of container No 1, even with the cladding and fencing proposed, would fail to meet requirements of Policy SP10 of the East Lindsey Local Plan 2018 that development should be well designed and maintain and enhance the character of the district's towns. It would also be contrary to aims of Policy SP11 of the East Lindsey Local Plan and Policy 4 of the Horncastle Neighbourhood Development Plan that seek to secure the continued protection and enhancement of heritage assets in East Lindsey and Preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the District's Conservation Areas.

Other Matters

36. References are made to other sites and other temporary storage facilities. There have also been various previous applications on the appeal site and temporary permissions for the siting of storage containers on the site have been granted in the past. However, I do not know all of the details of any of these cases. I have assessed the proposal on its own merits.

Conclusion

37. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen Heward
INSPECTOR