

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H13-1036-25 **Applicant:** Mr M Jarrett
Proposal: Removal of rotten timbers with replacement of new & erect new sleeper walls to the ground floor
Location: Seas End Hall Hall Lane Moulton Seas End
Terminal Date: 19th December 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

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 listed building consent application is for the removal of rotten subfloor timbers and replacement with the erection of new sleeper walls in the lounge room of the ground floor of Seas End Hall.

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.

H13-0186-25

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. Approved 28-05-25

H13-0187-25

Removal of existing modern radiators and replace with new radiators and pipework, removal of first floor wall. Approved 01-10-25

H13-0198-25

Removal of lime wash from basement beams and treatment for rotten and infected timbers. Approved 01-10-25

H13-0342-25

Repairs and refurbishment of windows and doors including replacement of handles and locks and repointing of main house and coach house. Approved 01-10-25

Consultation Responses

LCC Historic Places Team

No further archaeological input required.

Key Planning Considerations

Heritage Impact

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 requires 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, Para. 213 of the NPPF sets out that where proposals could lead to 'substantial harm' to a grade II listed designated heritage asset, clear and convincing justification should be necessary and that this justification should be exceptional.

Para. 214 of the NPPF then goes on to confirm that where a proposal would lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm, or that all of the following apply

- "a) The nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- b) No viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
- c) Conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- d) The harm of loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use."*

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 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.

The desirability of preserving the asset in this instance, should of course be given extremely great weight; however, in this instance, following inspection of the plans, it has been determined that these proposed works are considered to represent a form of harm, via the loss of original timbers - however, as these timbers are visually and obviously no longer viable structurally to the floor, and their replacement is like for like and not visible during normal conditions, the harm is considered to be at the very lowest level of 'less than substantial harm'. Nevertheless, that harm must be justified, and the justification provided - in that the works are necessary for the structural security of this portion of the building is both obviously true and therefore, accepted. For this reason, the works are considered to be both necessary and justified, and therefore in the interests of the building's conservation.

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.

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

For the reasons listed above, this application is deemed to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 28 and 29 of the SELLP in addition to Sections 12, 15 and 16 of the NPPF. The application is therefore recommended for approval.