

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H16-0526-25 **Applicant:** Mr S Brown

Proposal: Conversion of loft space into additional bedrooms, internal alterations, provision of conservation rooflights to west elevation and complete re-roofing and reinstatement of historic windows

Location: Monks House Bourne Road Spalding

Terminal Date: 10th October 2025

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 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
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
SPALDING & DISTRICT CIVIC SOCIETY	1	0	0	0
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	0	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	4

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This application seeks Listed Building Consent for alterations to Monks House, Spalding. These alterations are: the conversion of a loft to habitable space, the installation of roof lights, the creation of new stairs, the reinstatement of former windows and the retiling of the roof.

Three additional bedrooms are proposed in the attic conversion, alongside two new bathrooms. This loft conversion would be accessed via three newly proposed stairs, with each bedroom being served by a different set of stairs. To create a link between the shower room and bedroom 4, an existing wall would be partially demolished to create a new opening.

Three roof lights are proposed on the western elevation. No details of the exact design or materials of the roof lights have been provided.

It is also proposed that two windows, located on the gable end of the east and south elevations, would be reinstated. Both are currently bricked up. It is proposed that this infilled brickwork would be removed, and double glazed units within bronze casements are put in place.

It is proposed that the existing clay pan tile roof would be replaced for handmade clay plain tiles.

Site Description

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Spalding, as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The site is located towards the west of the settlement. Monks House is well obscured from the road by more modern residential developments and a scheme of planting. The dwelling is within relatively large grounds, which, coupled with the historic nature of the building, juxtaposes with the more contemporary character of the wider area.

Monks House is a Grade II* listed building. The Historic England entry reads as follows:

"Early C16 house in ashlar. Said to have been a Grange of the Priory. L plan. Pantiled roof. Main block is of 2 storeys, the gabled end of 3. Ground floor has 2 mullioned and transomed windows of 3 and 5 lights, with moulded stone labels. Small central doorway with 4-centred arch and moulded label. The gable end windows have no transoms and are of 6, 4 and 3 lights. Windows of 3 lights and modern door to gable end to road. 2 early brick stacks, 1 much restored. Moulded string course, and low plinth. Modern glazing in most windows- some have early casements. Interior has 2 good moulded stone fireplaces with 4-centred arches."

Relevant History

H16-0250-25 - Full. Conversion of loft to habitable space, internal alterations, addition of dormer window to west elevation, re-roof & reinstatement of historic windows. Refused 20/05/25.

H16-0251-25 - LB. Conversion of loft to habitable space, internal alterations, addition of dormer window to west elevation, re-roof & reinstatement of historic windows. Refused 20/05/25.

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 Comments

Historic Environment Officer

"The proposed development will comprise 'Conversion of loft space into additional bedrooms, internal alterations, provision of conservation rooflights to west elevation and complete reroofing and reinstatement of historic windows.'

The heritage Impact Assessment accompanying the application identifies the listed building significance as well as the impact of the proposed alterations. It also describes its limitations as a detailed archaeological record.

Although the submitted Heritage Impact Assessment, provide relevant information, it is insufficient, and the required information should be presented in accordance with the recommendations outlined

below.

A Level 3 Historic Building Record (HBR) should be undertaken by a qualified heritage professional, such as a heritage consultant, buildings archaeologist, or architectural historian, with expertise in recording and analysing historic structures. The work should be carried out by specialists from recognized archaeological units, consultancies, or chartered surveyors with heritage expertise. It is recommended that the appointed professional be a member of a relevant body such as the CfA (Chartered Institute of Field Archaeologists) or IHBC (Institute of Historic Building Conservation).

Recommendation: I recommend that if permission is granted, there be a condition for a mitigation strategy to effectively deal with this site.

This will comprise a phased programme of mitigation work including, but not limited to, a level 3 historic building recording of the listed building, in accordance with Historic England's document 'Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice. (2016).' This will enable the buildings to be recorded prior to conversion, alterations and refurbishment. This should be secured by South Holland District Council's standard conditions AR01, 02 and 03 and is in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 200 and 211 and the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (Policy 29).

Finally, considering the Listed Building significance and potential impacts to the setting, the SHDC Conservation officer must be consulted before a decision is made."

Historic England

Historic England welcomes the amendments made to omit the proposed dormer and proposed ground floor window replacement from the proposal. However, there is still insufficient information provided about proposed works in order to adequately assess the potential harm to heritage significance.

Impact:

Staircases

The application seeks to introduce three new staircases to facilitate loft access. As mentioned in our previous advice (of 22 April 2025) further detail is needed regarding proposed works to install the new staircases. The Heritage Impact Assessment states that 'the proposed adaptions to the first floor are relatively simple with seemingly no loss of historic fabric', however no details are provided. Without this detail, the installation of the three staircases has the potential to cause harm to the significance of the listed building. Detail should be provided of the proposed three new staircase installations to allow the LPA to properly assess potential impacts.

Rooflights

The application also seeks to install three rooflights to the west-facing roof slope. At present no details of the proposed rooflights have been provided, therefore they have the potential to cause harm to significance. Sufficient detail should be provided including the size, specification, material and colour of the proposed roof lights, in order to allow the LPA to make an informed impact assessment.

Policy

In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance .

Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal .

Further to the general duty upon the authority in the 1990 Act S66(1) to have special regard, the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that all harm to designated heritage assets requires clear and convincing justification and in the case of less than substantial harm to be balanced against public benefits, 'great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be) .

Recommendation

Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. We consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraphs 207, 208, 212, 213, 215 of the NPPF.

In determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duty of section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice. If there are any material changes to the proposals, or you would like further advice, please contact us."

Spalding and District Civic Society

Objections "Therefore, we would urge that the applicant is requested to make further amendments to their proposal to reflect these unaddressed concerns regarding this application"

Revised Comments, received following Amendment 1, all dated post 29/07/25

Historic Environment Officer

"We reiterate our previous comments. Also, No objection to amendment 1."

Historic England

Summary:

We note that some additional information has been provided, however it only partly addresses the concerns we have raised twice before (22 April 2025, 23 June 2025) and therefore our position remains the same. We are concerned with the proposal due to the insufficient information provided which prevents an informed assessment of harm to heritage significance.

Historic England Advice:

Impact Insufficient Impact Assessment

Monks House is a highly significant listed building. Proposed works therefore require a thoroughly informed Heritage Impact Assessment in a level of detail proportionate to the assets' importance. We previously advised that details of the proposed three new staircases should be provided to enable an adequate impact assessment. The Heritage Statement has not been updated, and the Impact Assessment section still does not adequately describe, or assess the impact of, proposed works. No further understanding is provided of works required to facilitate the new staircases and their impact on fabric at first and second floor.

Some section elevations of the proposed staircases have been provided, however the information is limited and of low digital quality, so much so that some annotations are illegible.

The information submitted is insufficient, therefore an informed assessment of impact on significance is not possible. Without this, the application has the potential to harm the significance of the GII* listed building.

Insufficient Justification:

The proposed installation of three staircases seeks to substantially alter the interior of the GII* listed building. Any harm to a building of this significance requires clear and convincing justification. Without the appropriate justification, the proposal has the potential to cause harm.

The justification provided for proposed works is as follows; 'The house in its current arrangement contains only two bedrooms. For a house of this size and status, having just two bedrooms is highly unusual. As a consequence, this lack of amenity must surely represent a significant threat to the building's long-term viability, as it will likely reduce the pool of potential future owners willing to take the building on and support its considerable burden of maintenance'.

We do not consider that this is the clear and convincing justification required for the proposed works.

We have previously suggested reallocating the existing room functions within the house to provide

additional bedroom accommodation. This could present a less harmful way of achieving further bedroom accommodation and reduce the number of new staircases required.

The Heritage Statement notes that; 'Despite extensive investigation, it has not proved possible to provide access to all areas of the loft space with fewer stairs due to the restricted available space'.

An options assessment has not been provided, nor has information to support the investigation mentioned above.

This is required to furnish any presentations of justification.

Policy

In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance .

Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal .

Further to the general duty upon the authority in the 1990 Act S66(1) to have special regard, the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that all harm to designated heritage assets requires clear and convincing justification and in the case of less than substantial harm to be balanced against public benefits, 'A?????¢?|great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be)

Recommendation

Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. We consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraphs 207, 208, 212, 213, 215 of the NPPF. In determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duty of section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess."

Council for British Archaeology

"Noting the 20th century date of the roof structure, the CBA are broadly supportive towards adapting this space into useful accommodation. Plans suggest that there is no staircase to the second floor at present. Based on photographs showing second floor windows in both gables, there will have been historically. Is it known where?

Was the entire floor between the first and second floors lost at the same time? We advise that the historical location is likely to be the most appropriate location for any new staircase. We advise that three staircases between the first and second floor appears excessive and lacks the justification required by NPPF paragraph 213. There are clearly impacts on all three first floor rooms from the introduction of these staircases, which is not explored sufficiently. It may be that the second floor can only practically accommodate two bedrooms rather than three. Whilst we accept the point that it would be a reasonable expectation for a house this size to have five bedrooms; there are three rooms with substantial volumes at first floor. Different occupants may use the Living Room as a bedroom - we do not believe there is an 'optimum viability' (NPPF, paragraph 215) argument here to support the introduction of three staircases.

The CBA are concerned that aspects of these proposals are insufficiently detailed for the application to meet the requirements of NPPF paragraph 207 at present. This also jeopardises your LPA's ability to discharge the duties placed on you by paragraph 208.

We welcome the proposed works to introduce a breathable membrane to the roof structure and a roof coving that is more sympathetic to the building. We also welcome the reinstatement of both second-floor mullioned windows, subject to your Conservation Officer being content these works are suitably detailed.

Recommendations

The CBA advise that the impacts of these proposals on the first floor require greater detailing and either clear and convincing justification, or otherwise revision."

Final Comments, received following Amendment 2, all dated post 18/09/25

Historic Environment Officer

"Thank you for consulting us on this. The submitted, revised Heritage Impact Assessment meets the required standards. Furthermore, the proposed alterations represent a positive impact; for example, the reinstatement of mullion windows. We therefore raise no objection to Amendment 2: Amended Heritage Impact Statement & Plans"

Historic England

"We appreciate the improved digital quality of the information provided, making it now fully legible. We also note the updated Heritage Statement which does now detail the fabric to be altered and address the impact of proposed works to a greater extent - information which was previously lacking and therefore prevented any assessment of harm.

We do not require any further information and refer you to the expert advice of your Conservation Officer.

In determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duty of section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess."

Council for British Archaeology

The CBA are grateful to the applicants for the improved level of detail that now supports these proposals as well as the revised proposals for the second floor and reduced number of staircases that are now proposed. We are happy to defer to the expertise of your Conservation Officer in securing appropriate details to any permissions you are minded to grant.

Conservation Officer

"I write to confirm that I am satisfied with this proposal.

Historic England have rightly requested numerous alterations to the documentation supporting this case. Following the receipt of the latest HIA, the detail of the scheme and the history of the site are now much clearer. Historic England have now deferred the matter to the LPA's specialist heritage advisor.

Firstly, it is imperative to state that the reinstatement of glazing to the external mullion windows lost in the fire during the late C20th is an unequivocal positive aspect. Whilst they are proposed of double glazed format, the frames as extant have been bricked-in, and therefore there is no value in existing frames for there to be an argument based on retention of single glazing.

Similarly, the proposed re-roofing is positive, restoring handmade pegtiles to the span of the roof. The Historic illustrations of the site would appear to suggest a history of peg tiles over pan tiles. Moreover, the handmade finish should act as a means of improving the overall historic appearance of the site. However, to avoid risk of denuding the site of characterful roof undulations, I would suggest a condition requiring detail of the proposed underlay to be submitted and approved, with an emphasis on the proposed being as thin and as lightweight as possible. Some alterations to the roof structure are required for this work and for the installation of rooflights. However, none of the affected material pre-dates the 1970s fire, and so the loss is restricted to material of little to no historic value.

The installation of rooflights themselves is a form of harm, although ascribed as 'less than substantial' according to Para. 212 of the NPPF as well as the definition of harm provided by Para. 018 of the PPG. Per Para 213 of the NPPF, clear and convincing justification is required for such a form of harm, which I believe in this instance, is provided by the updated HIA. Para. 215 of the NPPF does require weighing of harm against the public benefit.

There is very little public benefit involved in this project as it is for works to a private residential property. However, Para. 215 does allow for public benefit to include the securing of an optimal viable use, and allowing some natural light into a roofspace which has been proven to historically contain living quarters, I think can be used to justify a public benefit in the form of securing a viable use for this space - this is especially the case given the overall extremely low amount of actual harm I suggest to be caused by this proposal.

At first, the internal alterations, proposing to install several new staircases were entirely unsupported by evidence. However, the applicant has now provided such evidence and has been able to support claims of historic staircases. Much of the layout alterations necessary effect only clearly later additions, likely added after the 1970s fire. Substantial alteration of the loftspace is required to create living spaces. However, clearly as a result of the fire, any layout of servants quarters has been lost, and there is little to no value in preserving the space as a bare loft, with exposed modern roofing materials, when we have evidential support for this space historically having been used as living space.

For the above reasons, I bear no objections and commend the officer's recommendation to the LPA.
"

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, 2024 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

Heritage and Conservation

Policy 29 of the SELLP, alongside Section 16 of the NPPF, relates to the preservation of the historic environment. Both outline that all applications within the Conservation Area or which effect heritage assets, such as listed buildings, should preserve or enhance these assets.

Section 16 of the NPPF 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".

Paragraph 213 of the NPPF outlines that "any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification." In other words, should a proposal result in harm to an asset, this should be weighed against the public benefits arising from the proposal. Paragraph 215 expands upon this, stating that "where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use."

The above assessment of harm should be informed by the submission of an appropriate Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). On this point, Paragraph 207 of the NPPF outlines that in "determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of

any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary".

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."

Historic England and the Historic Environment Officer have both withdrawn their comments requesting further information. It is considered that the submitted HIA and plans sufficiently explore the significance of the asset and the impact upon the historic environment. As such, the requirements of Paragraph 207 have been met.

It should be noted at this stage that the submitted Heritage Statement outlines that the proposed rooflights would have a "low" impact. Under the definition found on Page 19, low impact is defined as:

"An alteration that represents some harm to the significance of the building or its setting."

This point within the HIA clearly identifies, in the assessment of the applicant's agents, that there would be some level of harm resulting from the works. That being said, following review of the submitted information, it is not considered that there proposal would cause any harm to the significance of the heritage asset, that would not otherwise be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.

The installation of the roof lights would primarily impact upon the roof itself, which, due to a fire in the 1970s, is a relatively modern feature which does not significantly contribute to the historic importance of the asset. Moreover, roof lights, whilst not historically present in the building, or not entirely anachronistic to the period, and reflect the evolving need of modern residents. The changes are sensitively approached, ensuring no level of harm is caused. In any event, the changes would help to ensure the optimal viable use of the attic, adhering to the principles of Paragraph 215 of the NPPF as a result and would somewhat provide a very minimal benefit; and as such, this benefit would outweigh any identified harm, which would itself be less than substantial.

Internally, the alterations would also primarily impact upon the modern elements of the house. Staircases were present within the property historically, and therefore, the proposal would not detrimentally impact upon the internal layout of the dwelling. Much of the proposed works, such as the reinstatement of windows, would involve returning the building to a state more aligned with its previous appearance. The installation of the stairs would not impact significantly or negatively upon the historic fabric of the asset.

The comments of the Conservation Officer have been positive, and have identified several elements, such as the reroofing, which would be a net positive.

On balance, it is considered that no harm to the heritage asset would arise as a result of the proposed works, that would not otherwise be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal. Therefore, the proposal is considered acceptable and the provisions of Policy 29 of the SELLP and Section 16 of the NPPF have been met.

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.

It is considered that the proposed alterations to the building would not detrimentally impact upon the significance of the heritage asset. The changes are minor, and generally would involve the reintroduction of historic features, or the introduction of new features in a sensitive manner.

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 the above considerations into account, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with policy 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019), along with the identified sections contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024). There are no significant factors in this case that indicate against the proposal and outweigh the consideration in favour of the proposal and the policies referred to above.

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be approved under Delegated Authority.