DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H02-0324-26**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs I Smedley**
Proposal:	External alterations to roof & elevations to include replacement & works to windows, chimney stack, downpipes & colour of joinery on the front & side elevations		
Location:	The Manor House 5 East Street Crowland		
Terminal Date:	14th October 2026		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework August 2026

Sections 14 and 20 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026)

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	1
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
NORTH LEVEL INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	2
RESIDENTS	0	0	1	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This Listed Building Consent Application is for external alterations to the roof and several elevations

to include replacement & works to windows, chimney stack, downpipes & colour of joinery on the front & side elevations

The application is inclusive of:

- Rebuild of chimney stack referred to at Para 4.2.1 of the provided heritage impact assessment
- Rebuild of 2x dormer windows to eastern elevation, referred to at Para 4.2.2 of the provided heritage impact assessment
- Replacement of 3x first floor windows at the front elevation.
- Replacement of UPVC Rainwater Goods (RWG) to the South elevation with cast iron replacements.
- Redecoration of joinery to the North and West elevations.

Site Description

The Manor House (AKA: Crowland Manor) is a Grade II* listed Manor House, within a highly central and prominent posiition within the Crowland Conservation Area.

The Historic England Listing Description describes the property like so;

"Manor house. 1690, with large additions c.1775 possibly by William Sands the Younger of Spalding. Minor C20 alterations. Limestone ashlar north front with red brick south front with ashlar dressings. Plain tiled steeply pitched hipped and canted roofs with coped rear gable and moulded wooden eaves. Various ashlar and brick chimney stacks. 2 storeys and attic.

North, street, front has 6 windows with plinth and first floor band. Doorway to left with plain door surround, overlight and 6-panel door. Single window to left and 2 windows to right with a blocked doorway beyond and a further window beyond. Above 5 windows and single blocked window over the blocked doorway, with datestone inscribed: 'I.H. 1690', above. All the windows with C20 cross mullion casements. Single hipped dormer to east with 2-light dormer.
West return has ashlar ground floor and brick first floor with ashlar first floor band and ashlar band below moulded wooden eaves. Central doorway with overlight and panelled door. Diamond plaque above inscribed: 'I.H.I.C. 1690'. 2 windows to the right, blocked window to the left with another window beyond, 5 windows above, all C20 cross mullion casements.

South, garden, front of c.1775 has 3 window block to right with ashlar quoins and brick parapet. Central Venetian arched ashlar door surround with half-glazed door and fanlight, flanked by single narrow sashes between pilasters. Either side single glazing bar sashes in ashlar surrounds. Above a small central Diocletian window with central sash in ashlar surround flanked by small single glazing bar sashes. Set back to left an earlier gabled wing with central doorway flanked by single glazing bar sashes, all with segment heads. Above two taller segment headed sashes and a small sash in the steep gable.

INTERIOR; has Great Room with full-height C18 panelling, panelled shutters, 6-panel doors and deep coving and simple contemporary fire-surround with pulvinated frieze. Main doorways have moulded surrounds with plain pediments. Panelled hall with round headed doorways and arches. Panelled dining room with full height panelling and shutter, deep plaster coving and round headed niche with original shaped shelves. Fine early eighteenth century three flight dog-leg staircase has square newels, turned balusters and a ramped and moulded handrail. Ramped dado panelling to sides reflects baluster."

History

H02-1488-00

Alteration of East Street boundary wall to provide a new gateway. Approved on 15-02-01

H02-1489-00

Paint windows, doors and guttering deep maroon red. Approved on 15-02-01

H02-0118-02

Details of works to wall (Condition 2 of H02/1488/00). Approved on 21-02-02

H02-0054-12

Replace roof covering and erect steel fence. Non-Determination notice issued 30-01-13

H02-1200-15

Proposed structural repairs. Approved on 04-04-16

H02-0837-25

External & Internal Alterations. Approved on 23-01-26

H02-0182-26

Details of a full method statement outlining method of construction and proposed materials as well as including item-specific elevation drawings relating to reinstatement and rebuilding of chimney, full details of the proposed modifications including a scale of 1:20 construction elevation drawings of the proposed new structure (Conditions 7, 8 and 9 of H02-0837-25). Approved on 06-05-26

H02-0291-26

Details of Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) (Condition 3 of H02-0837-25). Approved on 17-06-26

Consultation Responses

Public Representations

1 consultation response was submitted by a member of the public, this stated the following:

"Many Buildings, mostly older ones sometimes need planning permission to carry out roof repair or renovation and it's often the case that birds nest in these houses and sometimes the nesting birds could be swifts. Most nests are easy to identify in a roof space but swift nests consist of nothing more than old electric cable pieces, bits of insulation and perhaps a feather or two and this minor collection is usually set at the extremes of the roof space. So the nest in the roof space is difficult to find and the swifts point of entry is also difficult to find, unless of course you get lucky enough to see a swift enter a roof. Swifts arrive in early May, find their traditional nest, mate, lay eggs and depart early August often leaving their young to grow enough feathers before also departing.

The problem is that those traditional nest sites, probably hundreds of years old, are being lost to roof repair and renovation or even house demolition. This is why swifts are dangerously near extinction in this country, red listed and losing 60% of its population in 20 years. Swift nesting bricks to new builds in particular are part of the answer but swifts need most of all to continue to nest, probably as a colony in the same roof or nearby roofs, as they have done for possibly hundreds of years.

Can I ask that a thorough search of the roof space is carried out by an ecologist with swift nest experience and hopefully avoiding conflict with the 1981 Act. On the basis that swifts may have or are still using this site please incorporate 10 swift nesting bricks or boxes if using bricks is not possible. I am very happy to provide further advice if necessary."

Crowland Parish Council

CPC leave this to the experts of the planning department, but are pleased to see work being actioned on the historic building in the centre of town

Historic England

Overall, Historic England are welcoming of the proposed works.

However, we highlight that further information would be beneficial regarding the proposed replacement of the three first floor windows. Details of their age and significance would be useful in assessing the impact of works.

The application notes that 'Only 3 no. first-floor windows are deemed beyond repair where the extent of timber decay and damage is such that they cannot be reasonably repaired'. Subject to its significance, this loss of historic fabric could require clear and convincing justification. We note the photographs submitted, however we recommend that the LPA are satisfied with the level of detail provided to justify the loss.

LCC Historic Places Team

Should permission be granted, I recommend that a condition be attached requiring a proportionate programme of building recording prior to the alterations. This should comprise a phased programme of mitigation, including, as a minimum, Level 1 historic building recording of the building, in accordance with Historic England, Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice (2016).

No below-ground archaeological works are considered necessary in this case.

This approach would ensure that the building is appropriately recorded prior to the alterations taken place.

This should be secured through South Holland District Council's standard condition AR04 and is consistent with paragraphs 207 and 218 of the NPPF and Policy 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan.

Evaluation

Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

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, 2026 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

Planning Considerations

Public Representation

The comments of the member of the public are noted with regard to protection of vulnerable wildlife. However, this application only seeks an extremely small scale repair to a minor section of a large roof which is already under the process of complete repair, with the roofing materials having recently been stripped. The applicant's suggested mitigation measures of the installation of 10 swift bricks or boxes would not be appropriate. No aspect of this work requires the use of addiitonal brickwork and both proposals for swift bricks or espeicaly external boxes would risk substantial harm to the exterior character of the building.

Layout, Design, Scale and Consideration of the Character of the Area and Heritage Considerations

Policy Context - Design

Section 14 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places", outlines that planning decisions and policies should "promote high quality, healthy, inclusive and sustainable places".

Paragraph 1 of DP3 outlines 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".

In order to create well-designed places, Paragraph 2 states proposals should reflect seven key principles, as appropriate to the nature of the development and its location. These are: liveability,

climate, nature, movement, built form, public space, and identity.

Paragraph 3 of DP3 is explicit that proposals which conflict with paragraph 1, the relevant aspects of paragraph 2 of DP3, or relevant development plan policies and guidance, should be refused. Conversely, substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals.

Likewise, Policy 2 of the SELLP outlines sustainable development considerations for proposals; providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals. Furthermore, Policy 3 of the SELLP 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.

These policies accord with the provisions of the NPPF and require that design which is inappropriate to the local area, or which fails to maximise opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area, will not be acceptable. Proposals for new development would therefore require the aforementioned considerations to be adequately assessed and designed, including the siting, design, and scale to be respectful of surrounding development and ensure that the character of the area is not compromised.

Policy Context - Listed Building

Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

Policy HE6(1) of the NPPF outlines that "when considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial 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 effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance."

The above assessment of impact should be informed by the submission of an appropriate Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). On this point, Policy HE5(1) of the NPPF outlines that " proposals affecting heritage assets should be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is necessary to understand the potential effect of the proposal on their significance." HE5(2) outlines that this assessment should identify whether the proposal would have a positive effect, no effect or harm to the asset, and the degree of harm caused.

The aforementioned harm can be divided into harm, substantial harm, or total loss. HE6(4) outlines that in such circumstances the harm must be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal, with the extent of benefits required to outweigh harm being determined, in part, by the extent of harm.

Policy 29 of the SELLP outlines that all proposals shall conserve and enhance the character and appearance of designated heritage assets. Section A of Policy 29 outlines criteria which applications relating to listed buildings should conform to. These are as follows:

"1. Proposals to change the use of a Listed Building or to alter or extend such a building will be granted where the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the proposal is in the interest of the building's preservation and does not involve activities or alterations prejudicial to the special architectural or historic interest of the Listed Building or its setting.
2. Proposals involving the demolition of Listed Buildings will not be permitted, unless in an exceptional case, or wholly exceptional case (depending on their grade) where a clear and convincing justification is made in line with national policy.
3. Proposals that affect the setting of a Listed Building will be supported where they preserve or better reveal the significance of the Listed Building."

Assessment

Chimney

From the evidence provided by the Applicant, the chimney stack is in poor repair. The existing stack appears to have been extensively altered and repaired over time That being said, whilst certain elements of the chimney are more modern, the extent of these elements is not outlined by the Applicant. It can be assumed, from the photographs provided by the Applicant, that some elements of the historic stack (i.e., pre 1990) remain, and the contribution these elements make to the historic fabric are not clearly outlined in the submitted HIA.

The existing condition of the stack does warrant remedial works. Nevertheless, the exact details of said remedial works have not been provided at this time, this includes the extent of rebuilding required. The submitted information has clearly stated that in order to gauge the exact extent of remedial works required, intrusive works are required, including the partial demolition of the stack. As a result, the extent of the impact cannot be fully assessed at this time, as there may be a partial loss of an existing, albeit poor quality, feature.

It is considered that further details of the works should be secured via condition. Whilst this would not prevent the impact of any loss, it would secure the quality of the remedial works subsequently.

Although the removal of some unsympathetic features may be somewhat positive, due to the extent of information provided, the effect on the listed building of these works is considered to be harmful. That being said, it has been clearly demonstrated that the existing stack is in a state of disrepair, due to the period of disuse of the building and the poor quality of previous repairs. The extent of impact can also be mitigated somewhat via condition. Further assessment of the extent of harm is found below.

Dormer Windows

Over the course of multiple site visits and the information provided by the applicant, it is clear that the dormer windows are in an exceptionally poor condition and heavily repaired in a very poor and substandard manner. It is therefore evident that direct repair is a necessity to preserve these aspects of the roofline of the property.

The resulting repair should lead to a form that restores the original intended appearance to the dormer windows, removing the historic substandard repairs and materials which left ridged perspex visible on the roof of the property.

As such, although the proposal does lead to the removal of some older timbers, these are not original to the property and are clearly so far gone as to necessitate intervention. As a result what little harm can be identified in the process of restoration is easily outweighed by the substantial aesthetic and preservation benefits of the proposal. As such, in the balance, this aspect of the development is deemed to represent a positive effect.

Windows

Over the course of several site visits, it has become visually clear that most, if not all of the windows situated on the front elevation are in very poor condition with rotted frames. It is therefore self-evident that intervention of some form is required to conserve this feature of the property.

As outlined in the submitted heritage statement (4.2.3) the front windows are in a state that requires replacement, and upon visual inspection, i am minded to agree. Per the comment recieved from Historic England on this case, I am satisfied that suitable justification has been provided for these works, and I have been aware for some time of the adanced state of disrepair of these windows. An adequate recording of these windows has taken place, and conditions shall be used to ensure the replacement is of a matching quality. As such, it is very much in the conservation interest of the listed property to see the restoration of the windows. This process amounts to an act of maintenance

Rainwater goods

The applicant proposes to replace 2 sections of UPVC rainwater goods on the south elevation of the section of the building marked as 'Phase 2'. The proposal is to replace this with cast iron, black painted units of a style matching the remainder of the property.

The benefits of this aspect are self evident. The extant UPVC units are inappropriate to the

character of the property and their removal is considered a positive step toward the conservation of the listed building, yet further improved by the use of appropriate cast iron guttering in replacement.

Redecoration of Joinery

The applicant proposes to repaint fenestration across the property in cream, replacing the existing dark green colour. Photographic evidence shows that the fenestration throughout has changed colour a number of times from white, black, red and more. It is therefore clear that there is nothing especially original about the existing colour scheme. It is likely, although not certain, that the windows would have historically been intended to be painted a light colour like an off white, as is proposed. On the other hand, the existing colour is not harmful to the character of the property either. In this case, this proposal is considered acceptable, by virtue of having no impact upon the material appreciation of the property.

Summary

In summary, the works proposed are chiefly considered to have a positive effect upon the listed building, per HE6 of the NPPF, which per subsection 2 should be supported. Some minor harm is identified via the loss of some older timbers through the repairs to the dormer windows. However, as discussed above, this is deemed necessary for the conservation of the historic property, and thus, securing the optimal use of the property via renovation is considered to greatly outweigh that harm. In summary, this proposal is deemed satisfactorily in line with the requirements of Section 20 of the NPPF, and can be approved.

Conclusion

For the reasons listed above, this application is deemed to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 3 and 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) as well as Sections 14 and 20 of the NPPF (2026). The reccomendation, thereofore, is to approve.

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.