
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 04 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/D/17/3173806

44, Holton Mount, Holton-Le-Clay, Lincs DN36 5EQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Rowlands against the decision of East Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref N/085/00091/17, dated 11 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a dormer bedroom and ensuite.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The site is located close to the junction of Holton Mount and Louth Road and is occupied by a bungalow with an existing rear extension and another currently under construction. Although, there are several other dormers in the surrounding area, the immediate character of this part of Holton Mount is of modest, single storey bungalows, and while I note the two-storey dwellings nearby, which front onto Louth Road, these are visually detached from the dwellings on Holton Mount. Overall, the area has an open, suburban character, with a relatively consistent appearance to the dwellings.
4. The development would introduce a large dormer to the front and rear of the property which would extend across much of the existing roof and would sit above the ridge line of the bungalow. The overall size, scale and height of the dormer would add a dominant feature which would appear visually incongruous with the existing modest bungalow. This would introduce an element that would not be in keeping with, and would appear prominent within, the immediate street scene, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the area.
5. I viewed other properties along Holton Mount and Lindsey Drive which also had dormers present, some of which were above the ridge heights of the original dwellings. However, I am not aware of the circumstances behind these and consider that they do not represent positive contributors to the existing

character or appearance of the area. Each application and appeal must be considered on its own merits and I can give little weight to these in my considerations.

6. I note the reasons for needing the dormer extension. While I have some sympathy with these aims, these would represent personal benefits for the family and are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
7. Given the above, the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of Policy A5 of the East Lindsey Local Plan Alteration, which seeks to ensure that development reflects the character of the area within which it is set, and therefore it does not accord with the Development Plan as a whole. Furthermore, the proposal fails to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires new development to take opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR