Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2025

by D Ellis MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/D/25/3360510
20 Cley Hall Drive, Spalding, Lincolnshire PE11 2EB

- 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 Dexter Scase against the decision of South Holland District Council.
- The application Ref is H16-0862-24.
- The development proposed is rear, side and garage extension to domestic property.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has confirmed that their name was incorrectly entered on the original application form. I have therefore corrected this in the header above.

Main Issue

3. The Council has not raised any objections with regards to the proposed rear extension. Based on the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree. The main issue therefore is the effect of the proposed side and garage extension on the character and appearance of the existing property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling of a simple design. The properties in the street have a variety of designs and are set back from the road with generous front gardens and driveways. Most of the front boundaries have walls and hedges of various heights and, overall, the street has an open and spacious character.

5. The lack of any development in the front garden and driveway area of the appeal property contributes positively to the spacious and open character of the area. The proposed garage would be a sizeable addition that would be sited adjacent to the front boundary and would have a minimal set back from the road. The garage would significantly reduce the sense of spaciousness at the front of the property and would therefore be an unsympathetic addition to the street scene which would detract from the open and spacious character of the street.

6. Furthermore, the garage would have a hipped roof at the front and a gable to the rear, while there would be a very noticeable overhang of the eaves above the garage door. The single-storey side element behind the garage would have a pitched roof that is shallower than that of the rest of the property. Overall, this

complex roof form would result in an unduly confused appearance that would fail to reflect the simple and balanced proportions of the existing property.

7. The proposed garage would be in very close proximity to the front boundary and no landscaping between the garage and the street is shown on the submitted plans and elevations. The Site Plan as Proposed only shows landscaping between the remaining front garden area and the street. Nevertheless, the provision of additional landscaping would not overcome the unacceptable visual impact.

8. My attention has been drawn to garages which have been constructed to the front of dwellings in Halmer Gate and Woolram Wygate. Drawings have been provided for two of these garages, although I do not have the full details of any planning permissions before me. Notwithstanding this, the property in Halmer Gate is on a corner plot and the adjacent property does not appear to be set back from the street as much as the properties in Cley Hall Drive. The properties in Woolram Wygate are a considerable distance from the appeal site and as such they have no influence on the street scene in Cley Hall Drive. For these reasons, these examples are not directly comparable to the proposal before me and do not justify the appeal scheme.

9. For these reasons the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing property and the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (March 2019), insofar as they require high-quality design where the scale and layout relates to the character and appearance of the area and existing development.

Other Matters

10. The appellant states that the proposal would create two additional off-street parking spaces at the appeal property, which would also increase the security for the appellant's vehicles. However, as the increase in off-street parking would be modest in context, and as there does not appear to be any restrictions to on-street parking, this matter would not outweigh the harm identified above.

11. While the proposal may not cause any harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents and no objections have been submitted by nearby residents, these are neutral matters which would not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

D Ellis

INSPECTOR