

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H02-0670-26 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs I Smeadley

Proposal: Alterations to the rear service wing allowing for rebuilding of chimneystack, structural repairs to gable end, replacement of rainwater goods, rebuilding of single storey structure, works to garden wall & internal works

Location: The Manor House 5 East Street Crowland

Terminal Date: 16th September 2026

Planning Policies**South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019**

02 Development Management
03 Design of New Development
29 The Historic Environment

National Guidance**National Planning Policy Framework August 2026**

Section 14 - Achieving well designed places
Section 20 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 16

Representations:

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a listed building consent application for alterations to the rear service wing allowing for the rebuilding of chimneystacks, structural repairs to gable end, replacement of rainwater goods, rebuilding of a single storey structure, works to garden wall and internal works. The works proposed are part of wider works/ development through the house.

It is proposed that an existing chimney stack will be partially rebuilt (a minimum of 8 courses of brick replaced). Said chimney stack was partially rebuilt in the 1990s, as per the submitted heritage impact assessment, due to significant damage sustained pre-1990. These historic repairs appear to have been completed utilising contemporary techniques and materials, including anachronistic cement-based mortar.

The south gable end of "phase E" (the early 18th century wing of the Manor) will be partially rebuilt. Where possible, existing materials will be reused/ retained. The works shall be done, as stated by the Applicant, in a "like for like" manner.

The existing rainwater goods, including the black UPVC elements, within phase E of the Manor would be removed and replaced with black cast iron goods.

An existing rear single storey structure, dated from the 19th/20th century, would be removed in its entirety, and rebuilt in a "like for like" approach. Where possible, the existing materials will be reused. Whilst it is stated that the works would be like for like in terms of proportions and appearance, bar an existing window being converted into a door, the structural elements of the existing design would be altered, to remove the need for support from the garden wall.

The top six course of the west garden boundary wall, running a length of 5m, will be reconstructed. It is proposed that the upper courses would be removed, and replaced utilising lime mortar, rather than the existing cement which has been used to repair the wall recently. Where possible, existing bricks shall be reused, or replaced with a suitable match. The proportions of the wall would not be altered.

To facilitate the aforementioned works to the gable end of the phase E wing, it is proposed that the internal floor would be relayed as appropriate. The existing materials shall, where possible, be reused for this process. These works would be to facilitate the structural repairs previously mentioned.

Four new tie beams, one in room G12 and three in G11, are also proposed. These shall replace existing snapped or damaged beams.

Site Description

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Crowland, as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. It is within the historic core of the settlement, approximately 175m west of Crowland Abbey, and 50m east of Holy Trinity Bridge. The site is within the Crowland Conservation Area.

The Manor House is a Grade II* listed building. The Historic England listing is as follows:
"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."

Relevant History

H02-0539-26 - LBC - Internal works within second floor attic rooms only, to restore plasterwork finishes to all rooms and reinstate floorboards to one room - Ongoing

H02-0324-26 - LBC - External alterations to roof & elevations to include replacement & works to windows, chimney stack, downpipes & colour of joinery on the front & side elevations - Ongoing

H02-0837-25 - LBC - External & Internal Alterations - Approved 23/01/26

H02-1200-15 - LBC - Proposed structural repairs - Approved 04/04/16

H02-1488-00 - LBC - Alteration of East Street boundary wall to provide a new gateway - Approved 15/02/01

H02-1489-00 - LBC - Paint windows, doors and guttering deep maroon red - Approved 15/02/01

Consultation Responses

The responses received from consultees during the initial consultation exercises, which can be viewed in their entirety through the South Holland website, can be summarised as follows:

Historic Environment Officer

Thank you for consulting us on this application. It is noted that the applicant has provided an assessment of the heritage potential of the site (Heritage, Design and Access Statement for Works of Structural Repair and Alteration to the Manor House, 5 East Street, Crowland (Phase Four Work) Specific to Works to the Rear Service Wing), as outlined in the NPPF (paragraph 207) The submitted heritage assessment acknowledges the significance of the Grade II listed Manor House at 5 East Street, Crowland, Spalding, PE6 0EN, as well as the potential impacts of the proposed works on its historic fabric and the possible exposure of previously unknown heritage elements within the building. The proposed development comprises 'Alterations to the rear service wing of the building allowing for rebuilding of 1 no. chimneystack, structural repairs to gable end, replacement of rainwater goods, taking down and rebuilding single story structure, partial rebuild of upper parts of garden wall, partial lifting and relaying of pammnet flooring in 1 no. room and replacing 4 no. tie beams. ' In this context, the alterations could result in the impact upon historic fabric.

Recommendation: No archaeological condition is recommended in this case. The submitted Heritage, Design and Access Statement includes information broadly equivalent to that required for a Level 1 historic building record. This is considered to be policy-aligned, fit for purpose, reasonable and proportionate to mitigate the impact of a development of this scale and nature. Consequently, no further archaeological input is necessary for this application. It is not necessary to consult us on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like advice from us, please contact us to explain your request

CIlr Harrison

Support - Having only ever seen this property in a state of disrepair and surrounded by scaffolding, it is great to see that this historical building is being lovingly and carefully restored to its former glory

Crowland Parish Council

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

North Level Internal Drainage Board

Please note that North Level District Internal Drainage Board have no comments to make regarding the above planning application.

Historic England

The proposal seeks to rebuild 1 no. chimneystack, structural repairs to the gable end, replacement of rainwater goods, taking down and rebuilding a single storey structure, partial rebuild of upper parts of garden wall, partial lifting and relaying of pamment flooring in 1 no. room (alongside other works).

Historic England remains supportive of the works to improve the building's condition. However, the application would benefit from some further detail as specified below, which your authority may wish to condition prior to any approval.

Historic England Advice

Impact

It is proposed to rebuild the chimney stack to the phase E ridge. The application notes that 'The precise specification of works to be undertaken to the chimneystack need to be finalised secured by condition'. There is currently insufficient detail to describe the extent of the work, so we underline the importance of securing by condition to prevent harm.

Similarly, structural repairs are proposed to the south gable (of phase E). The extent of works required are currently unknown, pending the demolition of the adjacent single storey outbuilding. If the extent of gable end brickwork proposed to be rebuilt deviates significantly from that indicated on structural drawing ref 22757/R/30 (Rev -) your Conservation Officer should be informed. We also recommend that proposed new brick is specified.

Your authority may also wish to seek further detail of the following items prior to approval:

- Specify colour of replacement rainwater goods
- Specify proposed matching bricks for rebuild of garden wall plus proposed mortar mix
- Specify proposed replacement pamment tiles to room G12

Recommendation

Historic England advises that your Council should seek the above further details and conditions in order to prevent harm to significance. If there are any material changes to the proposals beyond those we have suggested, please contact us. If you propose to determine the application in its current form, please inform us of the date of the committee and send us a copy of your report at the earliest opportunity. Please also advise us of the decision in due course.

Conservation Officer

I wish to raise no objection to this proposal, and in fact, I do support this proposal as I believe that it represents positive and necessary steps in the incremental renovation of this most important and prominent listed building.

Some extremely minor harm may be identified in the loss of some historic materials, particularly in the repair aspects to the interior of the kitchen range. The single storey projection proposed to be rebuilt is far more recent and is largely not comprised of materials which are visually compatible with the main house and as such, there is no particular value in its preservation where a rebuild is an option, and this is especially the case when it is so obviously in need of repair, as a visual inspection of the site shows that this projection was constructed poorly and is consequently in an extremely precarious condition, having contorted and buckled substantially.

Regardless, even extremely minor harm to the significance of the asset requires justification if it is to be approved. In this case, I would, based on the positions put forth under HE6(4) of the NPPF suggest that the minor scale of this harm is absolutely outweighed by the public benefit of the restoration of this building and the subsequent securing of a viable use.

I note the contents of the comment of my colleague from Historic England and agree that further details are required for a full assessment. However, I do not believe that these are strictly necessary

for a determination at this time and may be secured via condition. As a result I recommend that should the officer be minded to approve conditions securing the following are implemented as pre-commencement conditions:

- Details of rainwater goods
- Details of bricks, mortar mix and bond to be used.
- Details of replacement pavement tiles in room G12.

Moreover, in line with the recommendation of Historic England, an informative condition should be applied informing the applicant that should the works necessary to repair the south gable of phase E deviate from those included in drawing 22757/R/30 or the Statement of Justification for Structural Repairs, that the applicant or their representatives should contact the SHDC planning department's conservation specialist prior to those works taking place to discuss if those deviations require separate consents.

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

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.

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 be of fairly modern in construction and of poor quality, considering the historic significance of the asset. The use of cement currently in situ is an anachronism, and does not appear to have received consent; and therefore, the reintroduction of lime mortar would be an enhancement. It should also be noted that extensive works to the stack were approved under H02-1200-15, although these were never implemented. 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.

In light of the comments of Historic England and the Conservation Officer, 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.

Gable end wall

The existing wall is in poor condition. This was evident during the Officer's site visit, where a large crack was evident. It would appear that past attempts to address the structural integrity have been unsuccessful and broadly unsympathetic to the historic importance of the asset. A justification document has been provided by the Applicant, in which it is stated that this wall is unstable in its current form. There is no evidence before the Council to refute this claim.

The remediation and reconstruction proposed is considered to be proportionate and necessary to secure the long-term use of the building. There would be some loss of historic fabric arising from the works, including the loss of seemingly originally brickwork where this cannot be salvaged. There would therefore be some degree of harm to the asset, due to the loss of this original fabric. Said harm may be exacerbated if the substitute materials are not suitable; and therefore, a condition is recommended requiring further material details in the event the application is approved.

This element therefore, taken in isolation of the wider development, is likely to constitute harm to the listed building, through the loss of the historic fabric. However, it should be noted that said harm is necessary to ensure the long term integrity of the building and would result in an existing underused element being brought back into use.

Rainwater Goods

The existing rainwater goods appear inappropriate for the setting and the asset. Their removal and replacement with appropriate cast iron goods is therefore considered to be beneficial.

Reconstruction of single storey structure

It is stated that this element of the dwelling is newer than its counterparts, being a late 19th or early 20th century addition. However, this newness does not diminish its importance necessarily. The structure is an example of how the building evolves over time, and was seemingly present at the time of listing.

That being said, it is evident, from the information provided and the Officer's site visit, that this structure is in poor repair. Extensive cracking is present and the structural integrity of the building appears questionable as a result. The building is also, as outlined by the Applicant, harming the garden wall and the gable ended wall (discussed above). The structure, due to its existing construction and relationship with the wider site, is detrimental to the listed asset in the view of the Applicant. There is nothing before the Council to refute this claim.

It is proposed that the structure shall be reconstructed on a like for like basis, retaining the same brick type/ using salvaged bricks, and using the same brick bond. Bar a door replacing a window, which itself is a minor change, the proportions and appearance of the structure would be broadly unaltered.

The works would see the loss of an existing feature, which would be harmful to the asset. Nevertheless, it is clear that the works are necessary to ensure the long-term viability of that asset. Alternative approaches have been briefly explored by the Applicant, with these found to be unsuitable. There is nothing before the Council to refute these conclusions.

Garden Wall

It has been stated and evidenced by the Applicant that the upper courses of the wall are in need of repair. There is nothing before the Council to conclude differently. As many of these faults and defects are deep into wall, there is a need for a more extensive repair as proposed. This would include removing inappropriate cement mortar repairs.

The works appear proportionate and necessary. Subject to an appropriate brick match for where existing bricks cannot be reused and the finalised specification of the join being provided, it is considered that the effect would be neutral, and that no harm would be caused. These two elements can be conditioned.

Works to flooring

The proposed works to the flooring are intended to facilitate the works to the collapsing gable wall, discussed previously. The finish of the floor would not be altered significantly, and the extant appearance would largely be preserved. An appropriate condition to secure this is considered necessary.

These works would have no harm to the asset.

Tie Beams

The proposed replacement of the collapsed or faulty tie beams is, as stated by the Applicant, necessary for the structural integrity of the building. There is nothing before the Council to refute this. The evidence provided is thorough and shows that these structural elements are no longer suitable.

The beams proposed are considered appropriate. As such, it is considered that these elements would preserve the historic fabric of the building

Summary

Much of the work proposed, if properly conditioned, would have no harm to the asset. The works proposed are generally necessary to preserve the structural integrity of the asset.

Nevertheless, the more intrusive elements would result in the loss some historic fabric. This is considered to constitute harm. Policy HE6(4) of the NPPF states:
"Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal. Important public benefits can include securing the long-term reuse of a vacant or underused listed building, and enabling energy efficiency and low carbon heating measures to be employed."

The works proposed are considered to be necessary to secure the long term structural integrity of the asset. The limited loss of existing brickwork is unfortunate; however, the neglect of the structure and the poor quality of these elements have left no viable alternative. The proposal would therefore secure the long term reuse of a currently underused listed building and would help to preserve the asset in the long term by stopping further collapse and degradation.

Therefore, on balance, it is considered that the harm identified is outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.

Planning Balance

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 works proposed are extensive, and would result in the loss of the historic fabric of the building to a certain extent. That being said, this loss has been justified and is necessary to secure the integrity of the asset in the long term. The proposal would therefore still align with the provisions of HE6 of 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 these factors into consideration, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2, 3, and 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019), as well as Sections 14 and 20 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2026), and section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be approved under Delegated Authority.