DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H02-0837-25**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs I Smedley**
Proposal:	External & Internal Alterations		
Location:	The Manor House 5 East Street Crowland		
Terminal Date:	23rd January 2026		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019	
01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
29	The Historic Environment

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	1
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
RUBEN LOPEZ, HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER	0	0	0	1
NORTH LEVEL INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	2

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This Listed Building Consent application is for external and internal alterations to The Manor House, 5 East Street, Crowland.

it should be noted that the application's content contains information relating to additional proposed work not addressed by this application, as the complete restoration is proposed to be conducted in phases, of which this application forms phase 1. For the avoidance of doubt, this application covers only the following works;

- External alterations to roof allowing for the reinstatement of a missing chimneystack.
- Rebuilding of an existing, structurally faulty chimneystack.
- Replacement of rainwater goods.
- Modification of late 20th century roof link.
- Removal of 1 no. 21st century rooflight.
- Replacement of 1 no. 21st century rooflight.
- Replacement of 1 no. sash window to south elevation.
- Internal alterations allowing for removal and reinstatement of wall panelling and floorboards in 3 no. rooms to facilitate structural investigations.
- Removal of 20th century stairhead.

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

Consultation Responses

LCC Archeaology

t is noted that the applicant has provided a detailed and very comprehensive assessment of the heritage potential of the site (Heritage, Design & Access Statement and Statement of Significance), as outlined in the NPPF (paragraph 207).

The submitted assessment of the heritage potential acknowledges the heritage significance of the Grade II* listed building, The Manor House, 5 East Street, Crowland, Spalding (PE6 0EN), as well as the potential impacts on its historic fabric and the possible exposure of previously unknown heritage elements within the building.

The proposed development comprises 'External & Internal Alterations'. Including Internal alterations allowing for removal and reinstatement of wall panelling and floorboards in 3 no.rooms to facilitate structural investigations. This might have a significant impact on any surviving fabric elements, resulting in total or partial loss, if present. NPPF (paragraph 218).

We therefore recommend that if permission is granted, there be an archaeological condition for a mitigation strategy to effectively deal with this site. A programme of archaeological monitoring during works affecting the designated building, particularly where any structural material is to be removed, is recommended as a mitigation strategy and as a complement to the detailed information submitted as part of the heritage impact assessment.

This will comprise a phased programme of archaeological mitigation work including but not limited to a continuous archaeological monitoring (watching brief) to enable protect and preserve the significance of the Manor and record any exposed unknown significant fabric elements.

This should be secured by South Holland District Council's standard conditions AR01, 02 and 03 and is in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 207 and 218 and the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (Policy 29).

Historic England

Historic England initially responded to the case with the following:

"We note that some opening-up work is essential to facilitate understanding of the building's construction and to inform a plan to rectify defects.

The proposed opening-up work appears to impact a large extent of historic fabric in rooms F9, G6 and G9. We note that some of the investigative work has been previously consented, however we still encourage that the extent of opening-up works is kept to the minimum required.

We recommend that further information is provided to justify the extent of panelling proposed to be removed, to assist in balancing harm against benefit and to ensure that any unnecessary harm to

historic fabric can be avoided.

We also recommend that further detail is provided of the chimney stack proposed to be to be reinstated (such as design and materials) to allow a fully informed impact assessment, and evidence of the poor condition of the other chimney stack to justify its removal.

Without this further information outlined above, the proposal has the potential to cause harm to the significance on the building. "

Following the receipt of additional information, as requested, Historic England relinquished their concerns with the proposal in the following response:

"We thank the applicant for the additional information provided in the Heritage Statement in response to our previous comments regarding the rebuild of the chimney (to south end of phase A). We still consider that a chimney reconstruction plan is necessary (which has not yet been provided) however we are happy for this to be dealt with via condition discharge, along with details of materiality.

We also previously recommended that further information is provided to justify the extent of panelling proposed to be removed. We have seen additional information regarding this (omitted accidentally from H02-0837-25 amendment application) but provided to us separately. The additional information document (Photographs - Additional Information provided by Hutton + Rostron) consists of photographic evidence of the removal of panelling from the Great Room dating to 2001. We acknowledge that panelling has previously been altered and in light of this we refer to your Conservation Officer for further guidance on this matter going forward."

JCNAS - SPAB

Via the JCNAS, SPAB commented on the application by stating the following;

"Thank you for notifying the SPAB of the above application affecting this 17th-century Grade II listed building. Having carefully reviewed the application documents, we now offer the following observations and advice.*

We are pleased to see that the applicant is committed to repairing this building of more than special interest, and we are grateful for the detailed report and drawings provided in support of the application.
We do not object to the sensitive opening up of the panelling for structural assessment. However, we note that the application includes reinstatement of a chimney and other works, and that the Preliminary Assessment document prepared by Hutton & Rostron recommends extensive repairs that may result in the loss of historic fabric.

We therefore request additional information on all proposed works that could affect the building's special interest.

We would also be happy to attend a site visit at the point of opening up to offer further advice."

These comments are noted, however, following an attempt to reconsult with the SPAB via JCNAS, no response was received. It is considered that the SPAB's comments may be based upon a misunderstanding of the scheme as including all works featured inside the Preliminary Assessment Document, which this proposal does not and only features the above mentioned elements, chiefly amongst which is the chimney work, details of which can be secured via means of condition.

The preliminary assessment document is a holistic document intended only to inform later phases of development which are not yet subject to this consent request, and the applicant shall be reminded that should they seek consent for any of this additional work, greater detail must be supplied at application stage.

Crowland Parish Council

No objections.

North Level Internal Drainage Board

No objections

Planning Considerations

Heritage Impact

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.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess as well as the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. Any adverse effect on a heritage asset, even if slight or minor, would not preserve the asset or its setting.

Furthermore, the importance of considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets is expressed in the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (NPPF). The NPPF advises that development and alterations to designated assets and their settings can cause harm. These policies ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic buildings and environments. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance should be treated favourably.

Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) states 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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance".

As such, Para. 213 of the NPPF sets out that where proposals could lead to 'substantial harm' to a grade II listed designated heritage asset, clear and convincing justification should be necessary and that this justification should be exceptional.

Para. 214 of the NPPF then goes on to confirm that where a proposal would lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm, or that all of the following apply

"a) The nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
b) No viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
c) Conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
d) The harm of loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use."

Finally, Policy 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) (SELLP) confirms that in order to respect South Holland's historical legacy all proposals shall conserve and enhance the character and appearance of designated heritage assets. Additionally, Section A of that policy confirms that 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.

With the above in mind, the Local Planning Authority does not consider the proposal to represent a form of harm.The proposed external works are all either restorative, or alterations of a relatively small scale to clearly non-original features. The most substantial of which is the proposed modification of the existing link structure on the roof, which bridges the gap between the two principal roof slopes. The existing structure is crude in construction, with photographic evidence showing it to have been built during or after the 1980s, formed of timber boards as well as a glazed roof, it is clear from internal inspection that this feature was cut into the roofline to allow greater and

easier access between the rooms within each of the roofspaces, from the central access staircase, presumably for use of the attics as domestic space. The structure in question is of no value to the historic asset, and in fact could be itself considered to be a harmful force upon the overall qualities of the asset, with its influence over the site thankfully limited by this portion of the roof's near total lack of visibility from common aspects of the public realm. No substantive details of the final design of the replacement have yet been provided, however, the current indicative drawings show a much less substantial structure, sitting far lower within the roof structure, making this modern alteration much less visible from the streetscene. Additionally, we can say that the removal of the existing, and replacement with a much more intelligently and sympathetically designed solution would certainly be a minor positive force upon the site. Details of the final design shall be secured via a suitably worded condition which ensures that the existing cannot be removed until such a time as the details of its replacement are submitted and agreed.

The next most significant alteration to the exterior of the building is the rebuilding and reinstatement of two chimneys. The chimney to be rebuilt is the chimney on the south end of the western frontage wing of the property. The proposal is for the chimney to be rebuilt like for like as it is currently of structural concern. A like for like rebuild is obviously not of any harm to the overall character of the asset. However, given the significance of the roof design and engineering to this listing, the rebuild will require scrutiny over methods and materials. Therefore, in line with the recommendation of Historic England, a suitably worded condition shall be applied ensuring that full details of the rebuild including method statement and item specific drawings shall be applied.

The chimney to be reinstated sits between the roofslopes of the two primary frontage wings. Visual inspection of the roof shows that the 'stump' of a former chimney remains, sitting proud of the roof valley floor at around waist height. Historic photographic evidence shows the scale and design of the chimney as it once was, and appears to show the chimney still standing in full during the 1980s. The proposed design, illustrated in limited detail on the proposed elevations drawing appears to well-replicate the original and consequently, the case officer is satisfied that the proposal would not risk harm to the special character and interest in the heritage asset, and, indeed, the reinstatement of a historic feature, no matter how minor, can be considered to be a positive contribution to the site, provided that the details are satisfactory. Therefore, similarly to the chimney rebuild, this should be subject to a method statement inclusive of drawings, and consequently, a relevant condition shall be applied.

The replacement and expansion of the existing rainwater goods system is proposed. Visual inspection of the site makes it clear that the current RWGs are entirely insufficient to handle the volume of water that the very large and complex roof impart onto it and this is quite obviously leading to aesthetic (and presumably structural) issues, chiefly with the principal elevation, namely the badly blown masonry, rotting fascia panels and moisture run staining across the principal elevation. As mentioned, structural issues may be resultant from the over-topping of the existing RWGs by introducing un-managed standing water around the base of the building. Historic photography of the site (as well as obvious visual tells, such as the pattern of moisture staining to the front elevation), show that historically the RWG system has been larger than at present, with the front downpipe as proposed. The existing system is a mix of some older cast iron RWGs (which is visually unremarkable, and in poor condition) with unlawfully installed PVC sections in parts. The proposal is to restore the historic extent of the RWGs, replacing the existing system with Alumasc Heritage range. Some harm is identified in the loss of the more historic remaining cast sections and replacement with a modern aluminium alternative. However, given the overall damage to and relative insignificance of the existing units, as well as the suited heritage style of the proposed units, it is deemed that this harm is limited to the very lowest end of 'less than substantial harm'. The proposal is justified by the above, but also, the proposal to use aluminium is borne of a convincing argument that the scale of the RWG system required would add substantial weight to the roof structure if done in cast iron, whereas aluminium offers the same appearance at common viewing distances, whilst avoiding additional weight to the building. In totality, the LPA views that the appropriate design of the new RWG system, mixed with the need to move the large volume of rainwater away from the property mean that this proposal is again, very much in the interests of the preservation of the asset.

Finally, to the exterior, several aspects of fenestration are proposed to be changed, namely; a small sash window in the gable end to the south side of the westernmost roof of the principal building which is in very poor condition, as well as two rooflights in the roof valley of the principal frontage building. Neither of these existing rooflights are original and appear only to be crudely installed perspex sheets in a similarly crude frame, seemingly likely to have been installed during the 1980s, or perhaps during the partial renovation works that are known to have occurred during the mid-

1990s. One is to be replaced with a new, more appropriate and permanent rooflight, the other is proposed to be changed to a hatch, to allow maintenance access to the roof valley, which is currently achieved via a hatch included in the link structure proposed to be removed. Neither the window, nor especially the two rooflights are of any particular significance to the listed building, and the proposal to introduce a better standard of construction to the rooflights will be of benefit to the site in general. Therefore, dependent upon final details - secured via conditions - the proposal is deemed acceptable.

On the inside there are additional proposed works, including the removal, storage and reinstatement of timber panelling and floorboard in the rooms marked as G6, G10 and F9 on plans 438-44.P21A and 438-44.P22 respectively. This work is requested purely for investigative purposes, and the consent shall be for the reinstatement of the existing back in the same order following structural investigations. Therefore, with the application of suitably worded conditions requiring the proper storage of the panels and boards and reinstatement, there should be no overall impact upon the site whatsoever.

Finally, the removal of the C20th stairhead on the 2nd floor is considered to be entirely appropriate. The subdivisions are not historic and nor do they add any character to the property. Removal of this non original feature is therefore not considered to be at the detriment of the significance of the heritage asset.

With regard to archaeology, the council's archaeological advisers requested the full archaeological scheme combination of conditions. Given that this work involves no subsurface proposals, it is considered that this is an overly onerous and unreasonable request. Instead, the LPA will seek to apply a building recording condition, and impose an informative reminding the applicant of their duty to halt works and notify the LCC HER immediately should they discover any element of potential significant archaeological interest.

For the reasons listed above, it is deemed that - with the suitable application of conditions - this proposal meets all requirements of both Policy 29 of the SELLP, in addition to Section 16 of the NPPF.

Other Matters

The Local Planning Authority must consider the impact/harm the proposal has on the significance of the heritage asset as outlined above. It is not the requirement of the Local Planning Authority to assess other matters, such as residential amenity impacts or highway safety within a Listed Building Consent submission or matters that do not relate to the host listed buildings.

The assessment of these other matters and additional elements of a proposal would take place within the Full Planning Permission, should this be required.

Notwithstanding the above, legal acts independent from planning, serve to protect matters outside planning control. Any legal requirements or independent acts that governs these matters must still be followed and are not superseded by the Local Planning Authority grant of listed building consent.

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

For the reasons listed above, this application is deemed to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 3 and 29 of the SELLP, in addition to Section 16 of the NPPF. The recommendation, therefore, is to approve.