

## Burrell, Becky

---

**From:** Pinna-Morrell, Gillian  
**Sent:** 08 September 2025 13:59  
**To:** \_planningadvice  
**Subject:** General Enquiry

Hi, could you please attach the comments below to application H02-0575-25 as Conservation Officer comments with the code 2STAND, thanks.

My below comment seems to be beyond the SHDC portal wordcount, so please accept this email as my response to the above application.

I write to confirm that I have no objections to this proposal. However, some amendment relating to proposed final materials may be required.

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF(2024) confirms that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

Paragraph 210 goes on to confirm that in determining applications, LPAs should take account of the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 212 confirms that 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, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. This paragraph essentially lays out the different classifications for forms of harm beyond a baseline of no harm.

Referring to the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) Policy 29 covers the Historic Environment and states in the preliminary text that

*“Proposals will conserve and enhance the character and appearance of designated and non-designated heritage assets, such as important known archaeology or that found during development, historic buildings, conservation areas, scheduled monuments, street patterns, streetscapes, landscapes, parks (including Registered Parks and Gardens), river frontages, structures and their settings through high-quality sensitive design.”*

Section B of Policy 29 regards development within conservation areas, and asserts the following:

*“Proposals within, affecting the setting of, or affecting views into or out of, a Conservation Area should preserve (and enhance or reinforce, as appropriate) features that contribute positively to the area’s character, appearance and setting. Proposals should:*

- 1. Retain buildings/groups of buildings, existing street patterns, historic building lines and ground surfaces;*
- 2. Retain architectural details that contribute to the character and appearance of the area;*
- 3. Where relevant and practical, remove features which are incompatible with the Conservation Area;*
- 4. Retain and reinforce local distinctiveness with reference to height, massing, scale, form, materials and plot widths of the existing built environment;*
- 5. Assess, and mitigate against any negative impact the proposal might have on the townscape, roofscape, skyline and landscape;*

6. *Aim to protect trees or where losses are proposed demonstrate how such losses are appropriately mitigated against."*

Assessing against the above local and national policy, I reconfirm that I have no objection to the principal of this proposal. The proposal site is within a central – albeit backland – position in the Crowland Conservation area. Whilst as mentioned, the site is backland and therefore conceivably can be considered to have a relatively limited effect upon the appreciation of wider designated asset (in this case, the Crowland conservation area is the principally affected heritage asset). The Crowland Conservation Area already features backland development and so the principle of the development is not contrary to the existing built form of the settlement. Moreover, the existing buildings due to be demolished would appear to be mid-C20th in nature and of no particular value to the setting. The proposed designs are relatively attractive and modest in scale, utilising a decent standard of architectural details that will allow the development to fit within the local vernacular, provided that any approval would be subject to the application of sensibly-worded conditions which require detail of accoutrements and fenestration to be submitted to, confirmed with and approved by the Local Planning Authority to ensure that the standard of materials remains commensurate with the highly sensitive conservation area setting.

However, I have noted that the applicant intends to utilise some non-vernacular materials, particularly in the roofing material for which the applicant proposes concrete mock slates. Per Policy 29b(4) of the SELLP, I would suggest that materials such as concrete mock slates are not appropriate to the vernacular in terms of material. I would therefore request that the applicant be required to amend the proposed roofing material to a natural slate alternative. It should be noted that this would appear to be the material that was required and installed for the directly adjacent, and notably similar development on Benedictine Square. If the applicant is unable to commit to this amendment at this time, then I would suggest that this could be ensured by means of a condition requesting full details of external materials prior to commencement, that notes the need for natural materials within a central, conservation area setting.

In view of the above, if the application is to be approved, I would similarly recommend that conditions requiring that the detail of windows, doors, rooflights, domestic accoutrements and landscaping should be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA should be applied. Moreover, to reinforce the need for appropriate treatment with materials, I would also suggest the imposition of SHDC standard conditions MD14 & MD42 should be applied to ensure that windows are white painted timber and rainwater goods are black painted metal. Finally, with the imposition of the condition for details of roof lights, a note should be added that an expectation would be that these would be of a conservation style. All of these conditions are considered reasonable measures to enforce under the authority of Policy 29 of the SELLP.

Many thanks.

Kind regards,

**Gregory Watkinson BA (Hons), MA**  
Principal Conservation Officer  
South & East Lincolnshire Councils Partnership

T: 01775 764560  
M: 07584 553350  
E: [GWatkinson@sholland.gov.uk](mailto:GWatkinson@sholland.gov.uk)  
[www.sholland.gov.uk](http://www.sholland.gov.uk) | [www.boston.gov.uk](http://www.boston.gov.uk)  
[www.e-lindsey.gov.uk](http://www.e-lindsey.gov.uk) | [www.selcp.co.uk](http://www.selcp.co.uk)

Please note that any informal officer opinion expressed by this email is without prejudice and is not binding on the Council during the consideration of any formal application.



South & East Lincolnshire Councils Partnership