
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 1 October 2025

by Jennifer Wallace BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/Z2505/W/25/3366606

88 High Street, Boston, Lincolnshire PE21 8TA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J Hobbs against the decision of Boston Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is B/25/0090.
 - The development proposed is rear ground extension to the rear of building.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Z2505/Y/25/3366560

88 High Street, Boston, Lincolnshire PE21 8TA

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J Hobbs against the decision of Boston Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is B/25/0089.
 - The works proposed are rear ground extension to the rear of building.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A: The appeal is dismissed.
2. Appeal B: The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. These decisions address both planning and listed building consent appeals for the same site and the same scheme. To prevent duplication and for the avoidance of doubt, I have dealt with both appeals within a single decision letter.
4. The appeals relate to a listed building within a conservation area in proximity to a number of other listed buildings. I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) which require me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building(s) or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
5. Notwithstanding the description on the application form, other development and works are referenced in both the plans and supporting information. These include the installation of an EV charger to the side elevation of the single storey projection and the installation of gutters, downpipe and fascia boards. The plans also indicate reclaimed roof tiles to be used, however the Design and Access Statement (DAS) suggests a range of options are available with respect to the roof of the projection. The extension had been constructed at the time of my site visit. The roof tiles appeared to be new. However, it had not been rendered as proposed on the

submitted plans. Nor did it appear that the electric vehicle charging point had been installed. Consequently, I have assessed the appeals on the basis of the submitted plans.

6. The submitted plans show three windows on both the existing and proposed rear elevation of the multi-storey part of the property. This is not consistent with my observations of that elevation at my site visit. However, as I am dismissing both appeals, it has not been necessary for me to address this matter further.

Main Issue

7. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building 88 and 90 High Street, the effect on the setting of surrounding listed buildings and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Boston Conservation Area.

Reasons

Special Interest and Significance

8. 88 and 90, High Street¹ is a Grade II listed building, adjacent to the junction of High Street with Whitehorse Lane. It dates from the late 18th century, with further alterations in both the 19th and 20th centuries. While originally designed as two houses, the listing description notes it as being a pair of houses, now with a shop in one house. This appeared to be the case at my site visit. It is constructed from red brick on the front and rear elevations, with the listing description noting the building as being in Flemish bond. The appeal property, known as 88 High Street, forms part of the listed building.
9. From the evidence before me, the special interest and significance of the listed building as it relates to these appeals lies in its architectural and historic interest as an example of late 18th century housing, adapted to respond to changing economic conditions and reflecting the influence of Boston's history as a trading port on local architecture. This includes the traditional construction techniques and materials that have been used in its phased development.
10. The appeal site lies within the setting of 84 High Street², 83, 85 and 87 High Street³, 89 and 91 High Street⁴, Baptist Chapel and Schoolroom, High Street⁵ and Memorial in Baptist Chapel Forecourt, High Street⁶. Insofar as they relate to this appeal, the significance of these buildings lies in their contribution to understanding the historic development of Boston. The setting of these buildings consequently extends along High Street and so the appeal site lies within their setting.
11. The site lies within the Boston Conservation Area (CA). Its character and appearance are mainly derived from its evolution as a historic port and key settlement. This is reflected in its street pattern, relationship to the river and the appearance of the buildings, some of which are likely influenced by the architecture of other ports visited by traders. 88 and 90 High Street contribute in a positive way

¹ List Entry Number: 1388886 Date first listed: 14 February 1975

² List Entry Number: 1388885 Date first listed: 14 February 1975

³ List Entry Number: 1388884 Date first listed: 14 February 1975

⁴ List Entry Number: 1388887 Date first listed: 14 February 1975

⁵ List Entry Number: 1388899 Date first listed: 27 May 1949 Date of most recent amendment: 15 November 1999

⁶ List Entry Number: 1388900 Date first listed: 14 February 1975 Date of most recent amendment: 15 November 1999

to this by aligning with the position of buildings to the rear of the footpath reflecting the layout of High Street.

Proposal and Effects

12. The proposal consists of a single storey extension onto an existing single storey rear projection and it is proposed to render both. The Council has raised no objection with respect to the siting and scale of the extension in principle. I am satisfied that the special interest of the listed building would be preserved given the limited size of the extension and the way it relates to the dimensions of the existing projection. Furthermore, given the position of the extension to the rear of the property, and not within views along High Street, there would be a neutral effect on the setting, and therefore special interest of the surrounding listed buildings.
13. However, at my site visit, the extension was clearly constructed from modern brick. The increased height of this means the brick courses do not align, making the extension appear as a poorly related addition. It is proposed to render the full extent of the single storey projection. This would harm the special interest and significance of the listed building by obscuring historic fabric. While the poor condition of the original bricks has been highlighted by the appellant, there is no evidence before me demonstrating the severity of this issue or that the application of render would be the only way to address any issue. I also observed the side elevation of the property was rendered. This is not sympathetic to the special architectural interest of the building as it appears to be a cement based render. This contrasts unfavourably with the historic fabric of the red brickwork. It therefore would not justify the application of render to the single storey extension. The use of lime render and the application of a colour treatment to it would not alter my assessment.
14. Although the extension is set to the rear of the property, it is nonetheless clearly visible in the CA. Brickwork makes an important contribution to the character and appearance of the CA. Erosion of its quality through extensions which do not relate well to the brick bonds of the host or seek to obscure historic fabric would lessen the positive qualities of the CA as a whole, albeit in a modest way.
15. Only limited information is before me with respect to the EV charging point. While the elevation drawing indicates a position, I do not have details of the precise appearance of the charging point. Nor is there any evidence before me of any wiring works that may be necessary to provide the appropriate electricity supply. It is not clear if the guttering in place at the time of my site visit is the more appropriate system the appellant proposes as there is no substantive detail of the intended guttering, only pictures within the DAS. This further adds to my concerns with respect to the effects of the proposal on the significance of the heritage assets.
16. The roof tiles appeared to be new, however this may be due to the fact they are clean in comparison to the existing roof tiles. However, they reflect the size and pattern of the materials to the roof of the existing extension. Over time, weathering would lessen any distinction between the two sets of roof tiles. Consequently, they preserve both the special interest of the listed building and character and appearance of the CA. However, this amounts to a lack of harm and so would be neutral.
17. While I find that the settings of the surrounding listed buildings would be preserved and their significance not harmed, I find that the proposal would have a harmful

effect on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building 88-90 High Street. This would be contrary to the requirements of sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Act. It would also fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA, contrary to s72(1) of the Act. Consequently, the proposal would harm the significance of both designated heritage assets.

Public Benefits and Balance

18. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether this would amount to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to significance. Paragraph 213 further advises that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.
19. Given the scale of the development and works to the listed building, I find that the harm to its significance I have identified would be less than substantial and at the lower end of that category. I find that the harm to the significance of the CA would also be less than substantial and would be at the very lower end of that category given the recessed position of the extension. Nonetheless, these harms carry considerable importance and weight. In such circumstances, paragraph 215 of the Framework confirms that these harms should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes securing the asset's optimum viable use.
20. There are economic benefits while the development and works are carried out, however these would be limited given the small scale of the proposal. There is no evidence before me to suggest there would be additional economic benefits beyond those already generated by the use of the property for residential occupation. There would be an environmental benefit from the installation of an electric vehicle charging point. However this would be limited given it is a single charging point and there is no certainty that occupants of the property would use an electric vehicle.
21. There is no evidence before me as to the demand for parking in the area, and the appeal site is in a central location with good access to services and facilities. The provision of an off-street parking space would therefore be a private benefit for occupiers of the property.
22. There is no substantive evidence before me that the development and works are required to secure the optimum viable use of the asset as a dwelling. Nor is there a clear and convincing justification for the development and works where I have found harm. Overall, in giving considerable importance and weight to the identified harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets, I find that this would not be outweighed by the public benefits arising from the proposal.
23. The proposal would not preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building 88 High Street and would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This would be contrary to the requirements of sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act, and the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment. It would also be in conflict with South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (March 2019) Policies 3 and 29 which taken together require development to complement, conserve and enhance designated heritage assets.

Other Matters

24. Planning permission was granted⁷ for a larger extension. The appellant's statement of case confirms that permission was subject to a condition which made clear the bond should match the existing. The appellant's failure to realise this condition was attached to the permission would not alter my assessment of the harm that would arise as a result of the development and works.

Conclusions

25. Appeal A: The appeal proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate the decision should be taken otherwise. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.
26. Appeal B: For the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

Jennifer Wallace

INSPECTOR

⁷ B/18/0478 approved 14 February 2019