Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2026

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6010876
34 High Street, Moulton, Spalding, PE12 6QB

- 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 Paul Matthews against the decision of South Holland District Council.
- The application Ref is H13-0230-26.
- The development proposed is erection of first floor extension, including creation of a dormer window, rear one and a half storey extension and erection of single storey side and rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice, as this more accurately describes it, than that given on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, bearing in mind it would be within the settings of the grade I listed Moulton Mill and the Moulton Mill Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a modern single storey dwelling on the east side of High Street in the village of Moulton. The boundary of the Moulton Conservation Area (CA) lies approximately 80 metres to the north and the grade I listed Moulton Mill (Moulton Mill) is approximately 120 metres away in the same direction.

Significance

5. Moulton Mill is a traditional tower windmill. At around 100 feet tall, it is the tallest tower windmill in the United Kingdom. It sits prominently and is widely visible within the village and the surrounding flat Fenland landscape, evidencing the area's agricultural and industrial heritage. Finished in brick with arches over numerous windows it also displays a range of high quality traditional industrial architectural features. Thus, insofar as is relevant to this appeal, its significance derives from its special architectural and historic interest as a landmark tower windmill which is visually related to the rural landscape and settlements nearby.

6. The CA covers an area surrounding Moulton Mill including the village and part of the surrounding rural landscape. Moulton Mill is its dominant feature, but there are also a variety of other high quality traditional buildings which are arranged in a

historic street pattern and display a range of traditional architectural features. Thus, insofar as is relevant to this case, the significance of the CA is founded on the relationship between Moulton Mill and its surroundings including the rural landscape and the historic settlement pattern and the traditional architectural detailing of the buildings within it.

Effect on significance

7. The appeal property sits relatively close to the High Street footway. It is on the end of a row of four single storey buildings which extend along the east side of the High Street frontage towards the heritage assets from the junction of High Street with East Cob Gate. The proposal would raise the height of the dwelling to create accommodation within the roof space, creating a one-and-a-half-storey dwelling. The proposal also includes a dormer window, a one-and-a-half-storey rear extension and a single-storey side/rear extension, thus creating a building much taller than the others in the row.

8. Between the appeal site and the heritage assets there is an area of land on the east side of High Street which is allocated for development (Mou035[1]) in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (2019) (LP). At the time of my site visit, this land appeared disused, free from significant structures, but was secured by solid timber fencing which was approximately 2 metres tall. I note the comments with regard to planning permission[2] granted by the Council in 2008 for alterations to the elevations of the Gardman building. However, that scheme is not before me and the site has been cleared. I also note that there are protected trees[3] and other vegetation in view approaching the appeal site looking towards the heritage assets and between the appeal property and the heritage assets.

9. I acknowledge that high quality traditional materials would be used which would match those of the existing dwellings and traditional buildings nearby. I also acknowledge that the proposed extensions overall are relatively modest and would not result in an excessively large dwelling and would be partly screened by vegetation when walking along High Street from East Cob Gate towards the heritage assets.

10. However, these features would not fully screen the proposal from view when looking towards the designated heritage assets. There are also no substantive details of the type of scheme that would be brought forward for Mou035, particularly the density of development, any proposed landscaping, any safeguarded views, and the height of the proposed buildings and how close they would be positioned to High Street.

11. Whilst I accept any development of Mou035 would change the relationship between the appeal site and the designated heritage assets, the fact remains that the appeal property is positioned close to High Street and is prominent when travelling north along High Street towards Moulton Mill and the CA. This will remain the case even after Mou35 is developed.

12. The proposed noticeable increase in the height of the appeal property, including the introduction of a large dormer window would result in a building which would appear taller and bulkier than the neighbouring dwelling. As the end property in

[1] Mou035 Former Gardman Premises, High Street
[2] Council Reference H13-0636-08
[3] TPO/13/14/2005, Moulton TPO No. 14 2005

the row of single storey buildings, it would be particularly noticeable in views when travelling north, towards the appeal site on High Street from East Cob Gate. In those views, the development would draw the eye and would interrupt the visual relationship between Moulton Mill and its surroundings. Consequently, the proposal would appear as an incongruous feature within the setting of the grade I listed building, diminishing its prominence as a landmark and causing harm to its significance. For the same reasons, the proposal would also detract from the contribution that these views make to the setting and significance of the CA.

13. Thus, having regard to all the evidence, including the 3D visualisations, in my view, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and the settings and significance of Moulton Mill and the CA, failing to preserve the designated heritage assets. The harm I have identified to Moulton Mill and the CA combined would be less than substantial and towards the lower end of any range. Paragraphs 212 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) require great weight to be attached to such harm and for it to be balanced against the public benefits of the scheme.

14. The proposals would improve the living conditions for the occupiers in terms of improved and additional internal living space. I also acknowledge the economic benefits of construction. However, overall, any public benefits there may be are clearly modest and their combined weight would, in my view, be insufficient to outweigh the great weight I attach to the combined harm I have identified to the designated heritage assets.

15. For these reasons the scheme conflicts with paragraphs 212 and 215 of the Framework and fails to accord with Policies 2, 3 and 29 of the LP. These policies, taken together, seek to achieve good design and avoid harm to heritage assets, where that harm is not outweighed by public benefits.

Other Matters

16. I have noted the comments with regard to the Council's handling of the proposals including being given the opportunity to respond to consultee comments and amend the proposals whilst the planning application was being considered. However, I have had regard only to the planning and heritage merits of the case, and none of these other matters are sufficient to outweigh my earlier findings.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR