



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2023

by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/W/22/3307019

1 Grosvenor Road, Louth, Lincolnshire LN11 0BB

- 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 Phil Bentley against the decision of East Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref N/105/00613/22, dated 28 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'erection of a detached bungalow and alterations to existing vehicular and pedestrian access. Existing garage to be demolished'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

3. Grosvenor Road is located within a residential area, comprising of a mix of two storey and single storey detached and semi-detached dwellings. The dwellings here are relatively modest in scale with clearly defined frontages that face the road. Those on corner plots tend to be positioned at an angle to reflect the curvature of the road. Dwellings are reasonably well spaced, although outbuildings occupying the space between them are relatively common. These include garage buildings that tend to be set back behind the front elevation of dwellings. These buildings are typically modest in scale and not prominent features of the streetscene. I saw that substantial garage buildings, including double garages are rare.
4. 1 Grosvenor Road is a detached dwelling located adjacent to the road junction with Keddington Road. Being a corner plot, the dwelling is sited at an angle, consistent with the character described above. Its flat-roofed garage building is orientated parallel with Grosvenor Road immediately adjacent to that of its neighbour, 3 Grosvenor Road. No 3 is also a corner plot, lying adjacent to the junction with Grosvenor Crescent. Its angled orientation is consistent with that described above.
5. It is proposed to demolish the existing garage building at No 1 and replace it with a single storey dwelling, extending over the side and rear garden that is currently open. The roof would consist of a hipped roof to the frontage with a

flat roofed section extending to the rear. Whilst the appellant argues that the proposal would have the appearance of an outbuilding, this would nonetheless be a substantial building with a footprint equivalent to or greater than that of the existing dwelling.

6. The proposed structure would occupy much of the space between the garage of No 3 and the side elevation of No 1. It would be significantly taller with a greater footprint than the building it would replace or that of its immediate neighbour. Due to its height, width, massing and close proximity to adjacent buildings and boundary treatments it would appear as a dominant and incongruous structure within the streetscene, at odds with the prevailing character of well-spaced dwellings.
7. Furthermore, its siting immediately adjacent to the flat-roofed garage at No 3 would result in an awkward juxtaposition of the two buildings. In this regard, the modest scale of the garage at No 3 would likely serve to emphasise the excessive scale and mass of the proposal within the streetscene.
8. The appellant argues that the full extent of the building would not be prominent, with the flat roofed section being located to the rear. However, given the proposed height of this section, it is still likely to be glimpsed from Grosvenor Road, including when viewed across the low-level garage building at No 3. It would also be visible from neighbouring properties.
9. The proposal includes two garage type double doors to the frontage to give the appearance of a double garage. However, double garages and outbuildings of this scale are not typical features of the streetscene here. Moreover, the scale of the building as well as the separate curtilage, parking, refuse and other facilities would allude to the proposal being a separate dwelling without a clear frontage, at odds with the prevailing character.
10. For the above reasons, the proposed dwelling would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy SP3 of the East Lindsey Core Strategy Local Plan (2018) (the LP) which supports housing on windfall sites where proposals do not significantly harm character and appearance. There would also be conflict with LP Policy SP10 which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure new development is well-designed, with a layout, scale, massing, height and density that is reflective of the surrounding area.
11. Conflict would also occur with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires that planning decisions ensure developments add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and landscaping, and are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR