Burrell, Becky

From: Niland, Mark
Sent: 23 November 2026 10:33
To: _planningadvice
Subject: FW: H18-0937-26

Hi,

H18-0937-26 - Bridge Hotel

Please can the conservations officers' comments be captured into the DIP. 2CSV

Thanks
Mark

From: Watkinson, Gregory <GWatkinson@sholland.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 November 2026 15:10
To: Niland, Mark <Mark.Niland@sholland.gov.uk>
Subject: H18-0937-26

Hi Mark

Please take this email as the conservation team's formal response to H18-0937-26.

I write to confirm my objections to this application in the strongest possible terms.

The Bridge Hotel, despite being unlisted, is – apart from the nearby listed swing bridge – the most significant and influential character building in Sutton Bridge. Its ability to influence the setting of the settlement is obvious and as a characterful, substantial historic property, largely sets the tone of Sutton Bridge to all traffic coming to and from Lincolnshire across the Nene river. Indeed, its decorative Victorian style belies its inherent relationship to the Cross Keys Bridge, as it was originally a railway hotel servicing passing rail traffic. It therefore forms an important part of the social history of the settlement as well as having been highly attractive as a physical asset in the town.

Consequently, the building is undoubtedly a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA). This application is therefore subject to judgement under Section 20 of the NPPF, as well as Policy 29 of the SELLP.

Policy 29 of the SELLP confirms the following:

> *"To respect the historical legacy, varied character and appearance of South East Lincolnshire's historic environment, development proposals will conserve and enhance the character and appearance of designated* ***and non-designated heritage assets****, such as important known archaeology or that found during development, historic buildings, conservation areas, scheduled monuments, street patterns, streetscapes, landscapes, parks (including Registered Parks and Gardens), river frontages, structures and their settings through high-quality sensitive design*.

Section 20 of the NPPF has recently undergone significant alterations to reinforce the importance of conserving NDHAs within planning assessments. This is newly governed by subsection HE7, which confirms the following;

1. *Development proposals which would have a positive effect on a non-designated heritage asset should be supported*.
2. *Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, this should be weighed against the benefits of the proposal and a balanced judgement made, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the non-designated heritage asset*.
3. *Where a development proposal would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of, the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, it should only be supported where the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefits of the proposal, having regard to the scale of the harm or loss and the significance of the non-designated heritage asset*.

This application is a retrospective case. This is because the applicant went beyond the scope of the approved details of H18-0463-24 by removing the characterful parapet roof by raising the eaves height to create a full pitched roof, as well as the fundamental change (and grey render) to the rear proposed staircase extension, as well as a few other smaller alterations.

More than any other aspect of this development, I believe that the alterations to the roof are substantially harmful to the character of the building, and totally removes the original readability of this highly significant building, to the point that there is now no way of knowing beyond telltale signs of recent construction and local knowledge that the building was originally constructed to feature a parapet roof. In doing this work, they have removed that character feature and also significantly increased the height of the building which is harmful not only to the character of the building, but also harmful more broadly to the visual amenity of the area. In essence, the applicant has unlawfully and fundamentally altered the character of the building, and hence I consider this to represent substantial harm.

Moreover, the rear extension is now significantly more blocky than the approved plans and is rendered in an insipid grey that is totally uncomplimentary to the remainder of the building. It appears totally out of sorts with the property, but as an addition, rather than an alteration, it does not fundamentally alter the character of the site, unlike the other aspects of this proposal, and therefore, this should be considered to represent 'harm'

Moreover, it is contextually important to understand that the applicant made use of significant amounts of pre-application advice prior to the submission of this application, having had their breaches of planning control raised to them. Within this pre-application advice, including meetings with the Conservation Officer, the applicants were furnished with details of the work this office felt was necessary to return the proposal to an acceptable state. It is noted with disappointment that the applicant has chosen to entirely ignore this advice and the opportunity to rectify by simply attempting to regularise the breach without any notable mitigation attempts.

Therefore, assessing against the above, we find that the proposal neither conserves nor enhances this NDHA. Furthermore, the application contains aspects considered to represent substantial harm to the NDHA; no satisfactory justification has been provided for these unlawful alterations, and nor has it been

demonstrated that there are any benefits inherent to these specific alterations, in fact, this office cannot see any reason why the development could not have been implemented as approved. The proposal therefore categorically fails to meet the requirements of Policy 29 of the SELLP as well as HE7 of the NPPF.

Consequently, I may only conclude that this application should be refused.

Many thanks.

Kind regards,
Greg

Gregory Watkinson BA (Hons), MA
Principal Conservation Officer
South & East Lincolnshire Councils Partnership

T: 01775 764560
M: 07584 553350
E: GWatkinson@sholland.gov.uk
www.sholland.gov.uk | www.boston.gov.uk
www.e-lindsey.gov.uk |www.selcp.co.uk

Please note that any informal officer opinion expressed by this email is without prejudice and is not binding on the Council during the consideration of any formal application.

