DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H18-1006-25**	**Applicant:**	**Ms E Rowe**
Proposal:	2 Replacement Windows		
Location:	Bridge House West 2 Bridge Road Sutton Bridge		
Terminal Date:	10th 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	1	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 2 replacement windows; 1 situated on the front (western) elevation, and another on the side (southern) elevation.

Site Description

Bridge House West is a Grade II listed bridge house, in intrinsic connection to the directly adjacent Grade II* listed Cross Keys Bridge.

Historic England describes the house like so:

"*Lodge. Mid C19, some C20 alterations. Red brick with ashlar dressings and quoins. Fishscale tile roof with sprocketed eaves and decorative ridge. Single central ridge stack with single external gable stack to rear wing. Stone coped gables with decorative ridge finials. T-plan. Single storey plus attic, 2 bays. West front with left projecting bay window with main roof projecting over. Single tripartite cross casement with single similar single light casements in the side walls. To the right is a single 2 light cross casement in flush ashlar quoin surround. Gabled half dormer to the right with single small casement with flush ashlar quoin surround. North front with canted bay with single quadripartite cross casement. Above is a single 2 light mullion window with flush ashlar quoin surround and in the apex a single decorative arrow loop with similar surround. To the left and projecting slightly is the gabled porch with chamfered pointed arched ashlar doorway with plank door. Further left and set back is a single storey plus attic single bay with single 2 light cross casement with flush ashlar quoin surround and single gabled half dormer with single small casement with similar surround. Some alterations to other fronts.*"

As the site is in connection to the bridge, the Historic England listing of that site describes it like so:

"*Road and rail hydraulic swing bridge, now road bridge. Opened 1897, erected by A. Handyside & Co. Ltd. Steel, iron and wood. The-swing span has 3 parallel bowstring braced girders carried on a pivot pier. There are 2 fixed spans of steel plate girders at the east end. Bridge topped with wooden podium surmounted by hexgonal wood and glazed viewing chamber. Plaque to north west inscribed 'Made and erected by A. Handyside & Co. Ltd. Derby and London 1897. Hydraulic machinery by Sir W. G. Armstrong, Whitworth & Co. Ltd. Steel for girders made by the Staffordshire Steel Co., Bilston.' The first bridge of 1830/1 designed by Rennie was timber with cast iron opening spans. This bridge replaces the second bridge of 1850, designed by Stephenson, which was used for rail traffic when the line from Spalding to Sutton Bridge was extended to King's Lynn in 1866. The bridge is connected underground to The Engine House, Sutton Bridge, item 5/85.*"

The site is in visual proximity to a number of other, unrelated listed buildings, such as the Grade II listed 8 and 10, Bridge Road.

History

None relevant

Consultation Responses

LCC Historic Places Team

No archaeological input required.

Sutton Bridge Parish Council

Supports the proposal.

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.

With the above in mind, the Local Planning Authority considers the proposal to represent a form of harm. That harm is identified as being on the very lower end of 'Less than substantial harm' and is borne of the fact that the proposed works seeks consent for double glazed windows to replace single glazing. As less than substantial harm is identified, justification is required. In this case, the justification for the proposed windows, which lays in the visually obvious fact that the windows to be replaced are in extremely poor condition is accepted.

It is also enhanced as justification by Para. 82 of the Historic England published guidance on adapting listed buildings for carbon efficiency, which states *"Replacement of windows which do not contribute to the architectural or historic interest of a building with double-glazed windows of appropriate material and pattern, will generally be acceptable."* The windows in question, whist attractive are not an aspect which forms a principal influence behind the site's special interest. Given then that all aspects otherwise of the proposed windows seek to replicate the existing (material, design, glazing pattern, glazing bars etc), it is sound reasoning to state that the proposal meets the requirements of this guidance. Given this, I am satisfied that the very minor amount of harm identified is justified, and that the proposal therefore meets the requirements of P29 of the SELLP in addition to Section 16 of the NPPF.

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 considered to be in compliance with Policy 29 of the SELLP, in addition to Sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF.

Therefore, the recommendation is to approve.