DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H08-0726-26**	**Applicant:**	**Mr G Hastie**
Proposal:	Replacement of 10 timber windows & 1 external timber door		
Location:	207 Westhorpe Road Gosberton Spalding		
Terminal Date:	9th October 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

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	0	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a listed building consent application for the replacement of 10 windows and one external door. The replacement windows would timber framed, slime-line heritage double glazing models.

The existing four-panelled door would be replaced by a "like for like" panelled door.

Site Description

The site is outside of any of the settlement boundaries outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019, and can therefore be considered to be within the Countryside from a planning perspective. The site is within a small cluster of linear residential and agricultural developments along Westhorpe Road. Whilst not a recognised settlement, the area is within the area identified in the Historic Environment Record as the medieval Hamlet of Westhorpe (MLI20082).

207 Westhorpe Road is Grade II listed. The Historic England listing reads as follows:
"House. Early C19. Red brick in flemish bond, slate roof, 2 brick gable stacks. 2 storey, 3 bay front with central flush panel door and lattice porch, flanked by single margin light sashes, all with brick segmental heads. To first floor 2 similar windows to eaves. To right a lower later range and small fixed light to dentillated eaves. Included for group value only."

The adjacent 203 Westhorpe Road is also Grade II listed.

Relevant History

H08-0805-12 - Full - Renovation and alterations to dwelling and detached garage - Approved 21/12/12

H08-0806-12 - LBC - Proposed refurbishment and alterations - Approved 31/12/12

H08-0177-13 - Condition Discharge - Details of Conditions 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12(i), (ii), (iv) and (v) of H08-0806-12 - Approved 29/04/13

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. Having reviewed the application documents and the updated available Historic Environment information for this application, the proposal is unlikely to have an impact on significant archaeological remains. 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

Conservation Officer

I do not wish to raise any objections to this application, particularly in reference to the proposed replacement windows, which i am satisfied appear to be of a high quality of matching design and materials.
However, I do wonder if the applicant may be open to revisions relating to the proposed front door. The proposed plank door is significantly more rustic in appearance than the existing 4- panel door, and I'm not particularly convinced that it would match as well aesthetically with the property. I understand the applicant's desire to allow the entrance of more natural light and am happy to support that aim in principle, but I just wonder if the applicant may well be open to a design which replicates the existing but with the two upper panels glazed

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, 2024 (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

The existing door is a clear modern addition, stated to have been installed circa 1989. However, the official listing description does explicitly mention a panelled door. Therefore, whilst the existing unit itself may not be of significant value, the actual design and style is. Following the comments from the Conservation Officer, a revised door design was proposed. This shows a more traditional panelled door, comparable to the existing feature. On the basis of the similarity of the design to the existing, and the materials proposed, it is considered that this change, in isolation, would have a neutral impact.

The Heritage Impact Assessment outlines that the existing frames are, for the most part, late 20th century features. The style of windows proposed appear to broadly be on a like-for-like basis, albeit double glazer, in so far as the key details and profile would be largely maintained in the new additions. The window frames themselves therefore appear to broadly be appropriate for this property. A single window is identified as being an original feature. However, this window is in extremely poor condition, and is original to a later part of the house. Whilst the loss of a historic feature is regrettable, its contribution to the character and heritage of the property is limited, particularly in light of the frame's condition.

Historic England's guidance note 18, "Adapting Historic Buildings for Energy and Carbon Efficiency" outlines that the installation of slim-profile or vacuum double-glazing within historic frames would generally be acceptable, and that the replacement of windows which do not contribute to the interest of a building with appropriate double-glazed windows would generally be acceptable also. Whilst it is accepted that the windows do contribute positively to the interest of the building, the frames are not necessarily "historic frames" as implied by the Historic England guidance. The proposed glazing would broadly match the proportions of the existing glazing, and the heritage style double glazing would not appear overly bulky. As such, the alteration is not considered to harm the asset. The Conservation Officer is satisfied with the design of the windows and their overall appearance.

As such, it is considered that the proposal would, when taken as a whole, would have no effect on the significance of the asset, in line with HE5 of the NPPF.

Even if harm was considered to be caused, this would be at the lowest end. Policy HE6 of the NPPF is clear that "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". As the proposal would improve energy efficiency through the introduction of double glazing, in a manner which would also align with the guidance produced by Historic England for development of this type, the proposal would meet the requirements of HE6 of

the NPPF in any event.

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 proposal is considered to represent appropriate alterations to a listed building, which conforms to the relevant guidance produced by Historic England, and the provisions 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 comply with Policies 2, 3, and 29 of the SELLP, as well as Sections12 and 16 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the benefits of the proposal; therefore, the planning balance is in favour of the proposal.

Recommendation

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