



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2022

by J Downs BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/W/21/3288895

Corner Cottage, Main Road, West Keal, Lincolnshire PE23 4BE

- 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 D Cook against the decision of East Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref S/204/01913/21, dated 3 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing outbuilding into dwelling including two extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The outbuilding is a modest former agricultural outbuilding of a traditional appearance. It makes a positive contribution to the rural character of the area including through its scale, roof shape, materials and openings that reflect its former use.
4. The distinctive multi-slope roof would be lost and replaced by a hipped roof which would substantially increase the massing of the building. The proposed extensions would not reflect the traditional features of the existing building with the use of a hipped roof and openings which have a modern pattern. The scale and massing of the extensions would result in the original building no longer being readily discernible. The new windows would be clearly modern features in a modern material which would relate poorly to the original character of the openings. The appeal proposal would therefore diminish the character and appearance of the existing building and the contribution it makes to the quality of the surrounding area.
5. I note the extract from the Lincolnshire Housing Design Guide and the disagreement between the parties as to the applicability of this document. Even if it were a justification for the proposed layout, it would not overcome the harms I have identified in terms of the detailing, scale and massing of the proposal. In addition, the majority of the building's openings are not visible from any public area and landscaping could obscure the building from public

view. Any available views are of limited duration. Similarly, this would not be sufficient to allow the development.

6. The open nature of the site and position in relation to the public highway would result in the access road being visually prominent. However, the site is clearly the edge of the settlement where the character is changing from rural to a rural village. Careful use of materials could minimise the impact of the access road, and this is a matter which could be controlled by condition.
7. That said, and for the above reasons, the appeal proposal would not maintain or enhance the character of the area due to its detailing, scale and massing, contrary to East Lindsey Local Plan (ELLP) Policy SP10. It would not add to the overall quality of the area and would not be sympathetic to local character, contrary to paragraph 130 of the NPPF.

Other Matters

8. The proposal would not conflict with a number of the criteria contained within ELLP Policy SP10. However, this compliance would be as a result of a lack of harm which, by definition, cannot be used to weigh against it, or any conflict with the development plan.
9. The appellant has referred to the potential fallback position of permitted development under Class Q. That has its own separate prior approval process and considerations which are not before me, therefore I attach limited weight to this.
10. There is no objection in principle to residential use and provision of an additional dwelling would be a benefit of the proposal. However, this benefit would be at the expense of harm to the building and the area and as such insufficient to allow the appeal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

J Downs

INSPECTOR