

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

In this case, the proposal would replace the existing shopfront with something completely different and therefore cannot be seen to preserve. Instead, it must be demonstrated that the replacement shopfront would represent an enhancement to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The building is clearly historic, likely of Georgian origin, and is situated amongst other historic buildings, including the listed Mansion House and 1–6 Albert Street. The building itself makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Given its age, character, and prominent location within a historic streetscape, there is an opportunity for a well-designed shopfront to further enhance both the building and its contribution to the Conservation Area (HE9.1.b, NPPF).

The submitted Heritage Statement does not adequately assess the significance of the building, nor does it sufficiently explain how the proposed shopfront responds to that significance. As such, the submission does not satisfy the requirements of Policy HE5.1 of the NPPF (HE5.4). Whilst a new shopfront is proposed, no clear justification has been provided to demonstrate how the design has been informed by the building's historic character or why it would represent an enhancement over the existing arrangement. Consequently, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (HE6.1, NPPF).

As a building of probable Georgian origin, symmetry is an important aspect of its architectural character. Whilst the existing shopfront has eroded this quality, the replacement of the shopfront presents an opportunity to reinstate a greater degree of symmetry and better reveal the building's historic character. The current proposal does not appear to take advantage of this opportunity.

The historic photographs found below, demonstrate that the building formerly possessed a traditional shopfront (the left in particular). The reinstatement of a shopfront informed by this earlier arrangement, or one that draws upon its proportions, detailing and composition, would have the potential to enhance both the building and the wider Conservation Area.



The existing elevation seems to have a structural pillar, rather centrally located to the building. No explanation has been provided how an open shopfront like the one proposed will achieve the structural equivalent.

The proposal also includes raising the roof height. Due to the building being historic, there's a high chance that the roof could be of historic interest. We require a historic building survey level 3/4 to understand the significance of the roof and the impact of the proposal in its entirety. This should be provided upfront as supporting evidence.

Whilst window detail has been provided, no other details have been submitted, including new roof materials.

Overall, the application has failed to demonstrate a sufficient understanding of the building's significance or its contribution to the character and appearance of the Holbeach Conservation Area. The proposed design does not appear to have been informed by the building's historic development, architectural character, or the wider historic context of the surrounding streetscape. Rather than drawing upon the qualities that contribute to the building's significance, the proposal introduces a fundamentally different shopfront without providing any heritage justification for why this approach would represent an enhancement. Insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed works would better reveal the building's significance, reinforce its historic character, or make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. Consequently, the proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of Section 72 (LB&CA 1990) and the NPPF.

Policy

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 72(1): special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

National Planning Policy framework (2026)

HE4.2: Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification.

HE5.1: Development 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.

HE5.4: Decision-makers should be satisfied that assessments accurately reflect the effects on heritage assets caused by development proposals.

HE6.1: 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. This is irrespective of whether any potential effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance.

HE9.1(b): Consider the area's special architectural or historic interest (as identified as part of the designation of the conservation area) in the design of development.

Regards,

Imogen Colenutt

BA (hons) MA| Assistant Conservation Officer | South & East Lincolnshire Partnership