DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H16-0690-26**	**Applicant:**	**Mr M Calitri**
Proposal:	Proposed replacement roof		
Location:	6 Pinchbeck Road Spalding		
Terminal Date:	12th October 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
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
SPALDING & DISTRICT CIVIC SOCIETY	0	0	1	0
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	2

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a listed building consent application for the replacement of existing roof slates with Spanish slate at 6 Pinchbeck Road, Spalding. Each slate would be approximately 400mm x 200mm.

Site Description

The site is within the defined town centre boundaries of Spalding, as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. It is located within the Conservation Area, towards the edge of the retail centre of the town. It is located towards the junction of Westlode Street and Pinchbeck Road.

The property is Grade II listed, with the official list entry reading as follows:
Early C18 house of 2 storeys and attics in brick with slate roof with 2 gabled dormers. 5 windows, centre blocked, new glazing bars. Ground floor has 1 modern window of 3 lights and 3 other windows (1 in place of former door). Extension to east of 2 storeys with 2 windows, segmental arches and 1 3-light segmental-headed window (later) and modern doorway. Rendered plinth.

Relevant History

H16-1101-25 - Condition discharge - Details of cross sectional drawings, brickwork panel, samples of brick to be used for external walls and details of any acoustic/thermal insulation and fire precautions works (Conditions 3, 7, 10 & 12 of H16-0589-10) - Approved 06/01/26

H16-1100-25 - Condition discharge - Details of cross sectional drawings, brickwork panel, samples of brick to be used for external walls and details of any acoustic/thermal insulation and fire precautions works (Conditions 3, 7, 10 & 12 of H16-0589-10) - Approved 06/01/26

H16-1027-10 - Condition discharge - Details of boundary wall coping, gate pier caps, external staircase, handrailing, boundary gates, dormer window frames, doors, external materials, brickwork repointing and stonework (Part Condition 3, Conditions 4, 6, 8, 9 and 11 of H16-0589-10) - Approved 04/02/11

H16-0923-10 - Full - Change of use to form restaurant (A3) and retail unit (A1) and alterations to building - Approved 21/02/11.

H16-0589-10 - LB - Proposed rear extension, external staircase, new boundary railings, internal and external repairs and alterations - Approved 21/09/10.

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:

Conservation Officer

Initial comments, dated 17/08/26

We have no objection to the principle of the proposed re-roofing works. However, further information is required before we can fully support the application.
It is noted within the supporting documentation that existing slates deemed to be in sound condition will be reused where practicable, with new slate introduced to supplement any shortfall. However, we do not support the mixing of salvaged slates with the proposed Spanish slate on the same roof slope, as there is a difference in colour and appearance between the two materials. If there is sufficient quantities of existing slate salvaged, these should be used to complete an entire elevation. The different slate types should not be intermixed, as this is likely to result in a patchwork appearance that would detract from the character of the building.
To assist in assessing the proposal, please could a roof plan be provided showing all roof slopes affected by the works, together with details of whether the re-roofing is to be undertaken in phases. This would help clarify the extent of the proposed interventions and how the salvaged and replacement materials are intended to be distributed across the building.
In addition, Google Street View imagery from 2022 appears to show that the rear roof slope is covered with a material other than slate. Could it be confirmed whether this reflects the current condition of the building? If so, clarification is also requested as to whether this roof slope forms part of the proposed re-roofing works

Revised comments, dated 30/09/26

The response letter dated 10/09/2026 sets out a clear and appropriate methodology to the re-roofing.
I am happy with the intention to complete roof slope 2 using reclaimed slate where sufficient slates

can be salvaged. If there is not enough reclaimed slate available to complete the entire slope, I am also satisfied with the proposed alternative of re-roofing slope 2 with the Spanish slate, like the other slopes. This will ensure a consistent appearance and avoid mixing different slate types on the same roof.
The re-roofing of the building entirely in slate is supportable and would reinstate a more appropriate roofing material (it is highly likely that slate would have originally covered the entire roof). The replacement of the existing clay tiles with slate is considered a betterment to the character and appearance of the building.
The photographs of the proposed Spanish slate show that they are a good colour match so will not change the character of the building by being the wrong colour (too blue, too purple etc). As the methodology avoids mixing the existing and new slates on individual roof slopes, any minor differences between the materials are unlikely to be readily noticeable. Overall, I am happy that the amended plans, and proposed methodology will preserve the buildings character and significance. Therefore, I have no objections.

Spalding and District Civic Society

Support

Historic England

No substantive comments offered

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.

Layout, Design, Scale and Consideration of the Character of the Area and Heritage Considerations

Policy Context - Design

Section 12 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places", states that the "creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve" and as such, it is generally accepted that good design plays a key role towards sustainable development.

Paragraph 135, contained within Section 12 of the NPPF, states that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area (including beyond the short term) and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. This goes on to establish that it is important that new development should be of the highest quality, to enhance and reinforce good design characteristics, and that decisions must have regard towards the impact that the proposed development would have on local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting such as topography, street patterns, building lines, boundary treatment and through scale and massing. Developments should create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, among other considerations.

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.

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."

Assessment

Several existing slates have slipped, some have cracked, and the many others are well weathered. That being said, from a visual inspection, it would appear that many of the slates are still in good order and would still function well. There would therefore be some scope for the reappropriation of some materials, albeit in a controlled manner as per the comments of the Conservation Officer.

In this vein, it is proposed that Roof Slope 2, which faces the highway and is the largest length of front facing slope, would utilise salvaged slate so far as practicable. All other slopes would be covered in entirely new slate. This would provide greater uniformity in appearance over the current arrangement which features a mixture of materials. Whilst the loss of the existing materials would result in the loss of some historic fabric, the materials lost are in poor repair and are not necessarily

integral to the historic or architectural significance of the asset.

It has been stated that purchased reclaimed slate could not be used, as the cost would render the scheme unviable. No evidence to support this claim has been provided. That being said, whilst reclaimed slate would be preferable, the proposed slate is a decent match for the roof, and would not appear immediately incongruous in the setting. Once weathering occurs over time, the proposed slates would appear more in keeping with the existing, and the alteration would become less obvious.

As such, it is not considered that the proposal would result in harm to the listed building. In line with Policy HE5(2) of the NPPF, it is considered that the works would, on balance, have no effect on the significance of the heritage asset.

In any event, even if harm was identified, it would be at the lowest end. Accordingly, the benefits of repairing the roof, which would preserve the integrity of the asset and prevent further deterioration, would be considered to outweigh the harm identified.

As such, the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

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 would create a homogenous appearance, and would remove sections of existing inappropriate material. On that basis, the proposal is considered acceptable on balance.

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.