DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H13-0186-25**	**Applicant:**	**Mr M Jarrett**
Proposal:	Removal of incorrect and poorly refurbished materials from walls and floors and replace with breathable materials, removal of fireplaces and timber and concrete tiles/floors to ground floor		
Location:	Seas End Hall Hall Lane Moulton Seas End		
Terminal Date:	29th May 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

Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (NPPF)
The 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
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a Listed Building Consent application for the removal of incorrect and poorly refurbished materials from walls and floors and replace with breathable materials, removal of fireplaces and

timber and concrete tiles/floors to ground floor

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.

H13-0059-25

Alterations and refurbishment of dwelling, stable block and coach house. Approved 08-04-25

H13-0069-25

Replacement of existing grey cement render to lime render to external & internal walls. Approved 08-04-25

Consultation Responses

LCC Historic Places Team

The LCC historic places team submitted a comment on this application claiming that - in relation to works to the stable block - the supporting documents would be insufficient and that a level 3 building recording should take place. This appears to have been erroneously submitted, as this application does not relate to works to the stable block. This application seeks only the replacement of internal wall and floor surfaces, which is unlikely to have any archaeological impact.

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 that the proposed works are fully in the asset's interests. It is clear from internal inspection of the building that a great deal of inconsiderate resufacing of ceilings, floors and walls has occurred without oversight or informed guidance, meaning that several locations within the building are beset with concrete floor tiles, as well as gypsum based renders. The applicant proposes to replace concrete floors with timber and lime screed tile finish in the kitchen, as well as lime renders throughout. Minor layout changes are proposed in the utility room, which has no effect upon the character value of the asset.

Some harm can be witnessed in the proposal to replace existing timber floors with new timber in both lounge rooms. However, the LPA is sympathetic to the argument that this is done to achieve visual parity between the lounges and the hallway, which is required work due to the hallway currently being furnished in concrete tiles. The applicant has also committed to using the reclaimed timber floorboards for repairs to the upstairs surfaces, and so the integrity of the materials on site is retained and the proposed works can be said to be in the interest of the asset.

It is proposed to remove and replace the fireplaces in the Lounges however, a visual inspection shows that these appear to be late c20th facsimiles, and therefore, of little to no value to the asset.

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.