



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2026

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6006860

14 Hickory Close, Holbeach, Lincs, PE12 7QA

- 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 and Mrs Overson against the decision of South Holland District Council.
 - The application Ref is H09-0007-26.
 - The development proposed is a car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a car port at 14 Hickory Close, Holbeach, Lincs, PE12 7QA in accordance with the application Ref H09-0007-26, subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: SD25-028/1.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a recently built, detached bungalow on a modern housing development. It is sited at the head of a cul-de-sac at the end of a row of two storey detached houses and is one of only two bungalows in Hickory Close. Most of the houses have double garages with bedrooms above, set back from the front elevations. Despite the set down of ridge heights above the garage elements, the gaps between most of the dwellings are very narrow and the row is perceived as a continuous block of development. Nevertheless, they face an area of open space and it is this which is the main contributor to the spacious, open character of the area. The adjacent bungalow is sited at 90° to the appeal dwelling and faces the entrance to the road. The gap between the two dwellings is greater than that between the other dwellings in the road and whilst it makes a small contribution to the openness of the area and affords a view of a tree in a field to the rear, the gap is not a prominent feature of the area given its the position at the head of the cul-de-sac and its distance from the entrance to the road.

4. The proposed double car port would occupy part of that gap between the front elevation of the appeal dwelling and the gable end of the adjacent bungalow. It would have a pitched roof and would face towards the road. Although its siting would differ from that of the existing garages that are set back from front elevations, the appeal site's position at the end of the row has a different context to that of the other dwellings. Whilst the proposed siting would obscure views of the tree to the rear, the structure would be lower in height than the tree which would remain visible when seen in the approach along the road. Its width would not occupy the whole of the gap between the two dwellings and this, together with its open form, would maintain a sense of space between them and at the head of the cul-de-sac.
5. There are no other car ports within the immediate area but I disagree with the Council's view that this is a utilitarian structure. Car ports are a common feature of many residential areas and have a domestic rather than utilitarian character.
6. The Council has not objected to the size and scale of the car port and the plans show that it would be sufficiently subservient to the size and scale of both the bungalow and its neighbour. It would be similar in size, scale and roof form to the existing double garage at the site. Neither has it objected to the proposed materials of a timber frame with felt roofing shingles and those would be acceptable in this location.
7. I conclude then that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of siting, size, scale, form and materials. As such, it would not form a focal point in the area and would represent a modestly sized, domestic feature that would not result in harm to the residential character and appearance of the surrounding properties or the open character of the area. It would accord with development plan policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (adopted 2019) which together seek to ensure that proposals take into account considerations such as quality of design, size and scale and the impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Other matters

8. The Council has not objected to any other matters. Although the proposal would be close to the rear/side boundary fences with the adjacent bungalow, the nearest elevation of that to the proposal is a north facing, blank side elevation and the proposal would be outside a line of 45° from the rear windows in that dwelling. The main part of the rear garden to that property is separated from the proposal by a projecting rear element. It would not, therefore, have a significantly harmful impact on the light or outlook of the neighbouring property and would not harm the living conditions of those occupiers.
9. Due to the scale of the proposal and the existing drainage provisions on the site, the Council does not consider that the proposal would significantly detrimentally impact upon surface water drainage and I have no evidence before me that would lead me to disagree.
10. In regards to any potential fire risk, the Building Regulations would address such matters and that matter does not carry significant weight in this appeal.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, to provide certainty.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be allowed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR