

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	H13-0059-25	Applicant:	Mr & Mrs M Jarrett
Proposal:	Alterations and refurbishment of dwelling, stable block and coach house		
Location:	Seas End Hall Hall Lane Moulton Seas End		
Terminal Date:	8th April 2025		

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

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER	0	0	0	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This Listed Building Consent application is for alterations and refurbishment of dwelling, stable block and coach house at Seas End Hall, Hall Lane, Moulton Seas End

Site Description

Seas End Hall is a grade II listed Georgian Manor house, situated on an extensive plot, featuring a number of outbuildings.

Historic England describe the building like so:

"Farmhouse. Early C19. Red brick. Hipped slate roof with 4 stacks to rear. 2 storeys, 3 bay front with 3 steps leading up to the central doorway with pilastered, semi-circular headed doorcase, ornate traceried fanlight and panelled door. Doorway flanked by single 3 light plain sashes, with 3 glazing bar sashes above. All the sashes with segmental heads. Tall two and a half storey wing to rear."

The site is on a very large plot and therefore can effectively be considered to be set in open countryside, with no adjacent development of any meaningful contribution to the building's setting.

History

H13-1044-15

Change of use of agricultural land to formal gardens, paddocks and cricket pitch. Approved 13-06-16.

Consultation Responses

Historic Buildings and Places

No comment. Defers to the LPA's conservation specialist advisor.

Lincolnshire County Council Historic Places Team

Recommends that should consent be granted, a building recording should take place in the form of SHDC standard conditions AR01, AR02 and AR03

Lincolnshire County Council Lead Local Highways and Flood Authority

No objections

Planning Considerations

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 require 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, the NPPF sets out that where proposals could lead to 'less than substantial harm' to a designated heritage asset, the consideration of such an application must be weighted against the public benefit.

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 that affect the setting of a Listed Building will only be supported where they preserve or better reveal the significance of the Listed Building, and that proposals that seek to alter a listed building shall be granted where the LPA is satisfied that the proposal is in the interest of the building's preservation and does not involve alterations that are prejudicial to the special architectural or historic interest of the Listed Building or its setting.

The desirability of preserving the asset in this instance, should of course be given extremely great weight; it is in this spirit that the works proposed are considered not to bear any risk of negative impact to the value or significance of the historic asset. In this instance, the site has borne the brunt of vacancy for some time, and it is clear that some extent of non-sympathetic or potentially unconsented works have occurred without oversight under the previous ownership. This application seeks to correct some of these issues and restore decent condition. A major aspect of this will be to ensure the site has functioning rainwater goods and fascias to prevent water damage. Therefore, new black, cast iron rainwater goods, soil pipes and softwood fascias are proposed throughout. These are deemed to be fully appropriate and sympathetic. A full replacement leaded roof is also proposed on the rear, single storey projection, which is again fully appropriate in material and should not present a character risk to the asset.

Works to the stable block is the most substantive aspect of the proposal and it should be noted that the stable block is C20th in origin and resultantly holds little value to the overall character of the wider listing. Nevertheless, it is proposed to brick-up existing openings on the south openings but retain the external doors for appearance purposes. On the northern elevation, existing openings are to be removed to make way for 2 large new gabled timber garage/barn doors, with gables constructed using reclaimed bricks taken from the dismantling of existing openings. Overall, these works are not considered to represent a form of harm to the asset, as the proposals appear to be relatively inoffensive, and the host structure (the stables) does not hold great value to the wider character of the listed building.

Overall, the repair/replacement of existing roofing, drainage, rainwater goods etc is considered to be of benefit to the character of the asset, and overall the impact of the proposal would be of NET benefit to the character of the site.

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

Conclusion

For the reasons listed above, this application is deemed to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 3,

29, 36 and Appendix 6 of the SELLP, as well as Sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF. The recommendation, therefore is to approve.

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.