
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2025

by **C Walker BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/D/25/3358549

1 Herdsman Close, Deeping St. Nicholas, Lincolnshire PE11 3AE

- 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 Jane Wenman against the decision of South Holland District Council.
 - The application Ref is H03-0797-24.
 - The development proposed is described as 'garage extension to form an annexe.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of four modern detached dwellings located in a cul-de-sac setting off Littleworth Drove. Comprising a two-storey dwelling, it faces onto Herdsman Close and benefits from a linked double garage located side on to Littleworth Drove, set behind a fence, hedgerow and estate railings. The appeal property is not identical to others within the Close, although shares some design features and a similar material palette. 4 Herdsman Close sits opposite, on the other side of the vehicular access but is orientated to front the main road.
4. Littleworth Drove is a main thoroughfare that accommodates an eclectic mix of dwelling types and designs. There are a limited number of properties placed side on with the main throughfare. Most dwellings in the area front the road and are generally set back a similar distance from the back edge of the footpath, behind hedgerows and mature soft landscaping. This placement of built form creates a sense of spaciousness in the street scene, allowing the greenery along the roadside frontages to dominate, giving it a verdant character and appearance.
5. Due to its elongated form and scale, the increased height and length of the annexe would add considerable bulk and massing to this component of the host property. The resulting change to its architectural composition would raise the status of the currently subservient linked garage relative to the main body of the house. Its roof form, at this scale, would jar with the existing dwelling and despite being slightly set down in height, would still visually compete with it in the street-scene. Its prominence would be exacerbated by it being set further towards the highway than the existing garage and other built form in the locality. Overall, these changes would harmfully disrupt and undermine the sense of spaciousness generated

through the careful placement and limited scale of development adjacent to the highway.

6. The appellant asserts that approximately 90m from the appeal site, permission has been granted for 119 dwellings which will impact on the street-scene and overall appearance of the area. Details of this scheme are not before me in evidence. Therefore, I am unable to give this any meaningful weight in my considerations.
7. The appellant also draws my attention to the roof forms of 2 and 3 Herdsman Close, which despite being differing house designs to the appeal site, are said to have a similar roof hierarchy. Both dwellings have slightly lower perpendicular projecting garage elements, topped with dormers which match the half dormers within the house. However, unlike the appeal proposal, these projections are an integral part of the house design rather than a competing element that has been added on. Furthermore, contrary to the appeal before me, these enjoy a significant setback distance from the roadside, such that these do not feature prominently within the street-scene. Consequently, this does not alter my findings on this main issue.
8. I find the proposal would be unacceptably harmful to both the appeal property and the character and appearance of the area. This runs counter to the guidance contained within Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. It also conflicts with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (2019) (SELLP) which together, amongst other things, set out expectations for high quality inclusive design and layout that are appropriate for the local area, its character and appearance and the relationship with existing development.
9. The Council's decision notice cites conflict with Policy 1 of the SELLP, but as this relates to the Spatial Strategy, I find no conflict with it.

Other Matters

10. The appellant sets out that the extension would meet the needs of their family, allowing multiple generations to live together. They assert it would assist with caring responsibilities, improve sustainability by reducing the need for frequent journeys when care is required and reduce demand on the NHS. Limited evidence is before me with regards to caring responsibilities and health needs. Therefore, I attach limited weight in favour of the appeal scheme to the personal circumstances of the appellant. There are likely to be benefits arising from carers living on site, which, in turn, could improve sustainability by reducing the need to travel by car. This attracts positive weight but would not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. In conclusion, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

C Walker

INSPECTOR