
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2021

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/D/20/3264405

258 Bridge Road, Sutton Bridge, Spalding, Lincs PE12 9SH

- 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 & Mrs K Wiles against the decision of South Holland District Council.
 - The application Ref H18-0826-20, dated 23 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The existing store /garage building (outbuilding) within the site has been the subject of previously dismissed appeal decisions¹. I have noted the planning history in coming to my decision.
3. The appeal proposal includes recladding the existing outbuilding in weatherboarding. In his statement of case the appellant indicates that the outer skin could be constructed in brick. However, this is not in accordance with the detail shown on the submitted drawings and I have determined the appeal based on these.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. No 258 is a two-storey detached house prominently located on the corner of Bridge Road and Granville Terrace. There is a commercial premise on the corner opposite the appeal site, however, the area is more generally characterised by residential development with a variety of dwelling types mostly set back from the road behind front gardens. The properties immediately to the east of the appeal site along Bridge Road follow a similar building line.
6. The existing single storey clad outbuilding is of a substantial size and is located close to the Granville Terrace frontage, separated from this road by an existing

¹ APP/A2525/D/14/2229757; APP/A2525/D/15/3139449; APP/A2525/C/17/3185451

privet hedge that has grown to screen the building. The existing structure is also sited forward of the elevation of No 258 facing Bridge Road. Due to the position of the hedge, the garage building is not particularly prominent from Granville Terrace. Even so, I agree with the conclusions of the previous appeal Inspectors that due to the size, siting and materials of construction, the outbuilding when viewed from Bridge Road is a prominent and obtrusive structure and is a discordant feature in the street scene.

7. The proposed link to connect the outbuilding to the existing house would be of limited width and set back from the Bridge Road elevation of the dwelling. It would be of limited height and would not be a significant feature of the street or inappropriate to the character of the dwelling. Nevertheless, the proposed pitched roof addition to the outbuilding and new weatherboarding would further accentuate its prominent and incongruous siting, size and design. As a result, the outbuilding, even when attached to the main house and altered to include a pitched roof and new cladding, would remain an obtrusive and discordant feature within the street scene.
8. Although the appellant indicates that the existing privet hedge would be retained to the Granville Terrace frontage, the hedge is in very close proximity to the outbuilding and I cannot be certain that the alterations could be implemented and the existing privet hedge retained. In any case, while landscaping can soften and integrate built development into its surroundings, vegetation is not permanent, and it should not be relied upon to screen inappropriate development from view.
9. I appreciate that the Parish Council does not raise any objections to the development, but I do not agree with their conclusion that the development would be in keeping with the street scene for the reasons I have set out.
10. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011- 2036 (adopted 2019) which seek to ensure development is appropriate to the character and appearance of the area and would improve its character and quality. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework where it states that development should add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR