DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H09-0573-26**	**Applicant:**	**Mrs P Fisher**
Proposal:	Re-Roof Existing Dwelling		
Location:	Town Farm Cottage Pennyhill Road Holbeach		
Terminal Date:	14th 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

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	3

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a listed building consent application to re-roof the Grade II listed Town Farm Cottage, Holbeach. The existing red, clay pantiles would be replaced with William Blythe Barco Weathered

Pantiles. A new permeable membrane would also be installed.

Site Description

The site is outside of any of the settlement boundaries outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019, lying approximately 50m north of Holbeach. The site is on the north side of the A17. The property is Grade II listed, with the following description provided by Historic England: "Farmhouse. c.1800. Colourwashed, rendered brick. Pantile roof with 2 gable stacks. 2 storeys, 3 bay front with central doorway with plank door. Doorway flanked by single glazing bar sashes. Single glazing bar sashes above flank a blind opening."

Relevant History

No relevant planning history

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:

Initial Consultation Responses, received between 19/06/26 and 08/07/26

Historic England

Do not offer guidance or comments.

Conservation Officer

We have no objection to this proposal in principle. However, we would wish to see as many of the existing roof tiles retained and reused as possible as part of the works. Whilst the Heritage Statement notes that the original tiles are crumbling and in poor condition, it is not clear what proportion of the existing tiles are affected or whether any could be salvaged and reused. It would therefore be helpful for the applicant to provide further information on the condition of the existing roof covering and the extent to which the existing tiles could be retained as part of the scheme. We would also request samples of the proposed replacement tiles (the details look good), either submitted prior to determination or secured by condition, to ensure they are an appropriate match to the existing roofing material in terms of colour, size and texture. In addition, further details should be provided regarding the proposed roofing felt. It is important that this is as thin and unobtrusive as possible, as modern roofing membranes can alter the way the roof sits and, in some cases, affect the appearance of the roofscape. The specification should therefore demonstrate that the chosen material will preserve the existing character and profile of the roof.

Historic Environment Officer

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

Revised Comments, following amendments received 02/09/26

Conservation Officer

Following the most recent amendment to this application, updating the proposed roof materials, I am satisfied that the conservation team can withdraw objections to this proposal

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 where harm is identified, 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 new tiles are clay pantiles, matching what is currently on site and what has historically been on site. The chosen tiles are of high quality, and a pre-weathered. This means their installation would be less jarring with the historic fabric of the building, and would appear appropriate in this setting. The tiles are therefore considered appropriate for the listed building. Whilst they would ensure the longevity of the asset, it is considered on balance there is a neutral effect, as per policy H5 of the NPPF.

The existing tiles on the site are relatively modern features. They are in poor condition, and detract from the appearance of the building. The tiles are an appropriate solution, offering a traditional appearance, akin to what is already in situ. The Conservation Officer has raised no objection to the replacement of the existing tiles or the proposed tiles.

A permeable membrane is proposed. This is appropriate for listed buildings, and may be considered a betterment over the existing membrane.

As such, the proposal is considered to preserve the historic significance of the asset. The proposal would therefore conform to Policies 2, 3, and 29 of the SELLP and Sections 14 and 20 of the NPPF.

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 preserve the listed building, representing an appropriate development on the site. The proposal would have no significant effect on the heritage asset, in line with Policy HE5 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 Sections 14 and 20 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.