
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2023

by R Gee BA (Hons) Dip TP PGCert UD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/D/22/3307257

32 West Street, Long Sutton PE12 9BN

- 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 K Bunn against the decision of South Holland District Council.
 - The application Ref H11-0546-22, dated 25 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2022.
 - The development is described as 'change of roof materials'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At my site visit I saw that the roof is tiled as described on the application form and as shown on a number of photographs submitted with the appeal. No elevational plans have been submitted of the works and I have therefore assessed the works as shown on the photographs, as seen on site, and as described in the heading above.
3. I have had regard to the statutory duty set out in Section 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) in reaching my decision.
4. The appeal site is covered by an Article 4 Direction, which has the effect of requiring planning permission to be obtained for a range of alterations which would otherwise be covered by "permitted development" rights under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). I understand that in this circumstance, the Article 4 Direction requires, amongst other things, consent to be sought and granted for works to any roof surface which fronts onto any highway, waterway or public open space.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Long Sutton Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

6. 32 West Street is a residential dwelling located in a prominent roadside position in the CA. It is a two-storey mid-Victorian terrace, regarded as a non-designated heritage asset.

7. The immediate surrounding area is characterised largely by C19th residential and commercial development. Within close proximity to the site are a number of grade II listed buildings and the grade I listed Church of St Mary. There are also a number of other locally listed 'buildings of local heritage' near to the site. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that the appeal site is within a sensitive part of the CA.
8. With regard to the architectural and historical interest the terrace is of medium significance as domestic vernacular buildings of local importance. The CA derives its significance from its rich collection of historic buildings, but also the form and layout of the settlement with detached, semi-detached and terraced properties mostly with pitched tiled roofs following the main routes through Long Sutton.
9. Notwithstanding that the roof at the appeal property has been replaced the uniform slate roof across the terrace is an integral part of the terrace design and is a visually harmonising feature that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
10. The works to the appeal property have introduced a modern replica slate and whilst the tiles are of a similar size and colour, they have a much smoother appearance which lacks the variation and character of a natural slate. Located in the centre of the terraced row the introduction of the fibre-cement materials disrupts the uniform appearance of the roof. Their smooth and shiny appearance emphasises the contrast of the materials with the slate of the remainder of the properties within the row. Given the prominence of the terrace roof the replacement materials at the appeal property appear incongruous in the streetscene and from the parkland.
11. Furthermore, fibre-cement tiles will weather in a different manner to natural slate and therefore the harmful contrast with the slate on the neighbouring roofs will remain. Overall, the new roof materials have a detrimental impact on the significance of the terrace as a non-designated heritage asset and fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA.
12. As required by paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset, irrespective of the amount of harm identified. In this case, I consider that the harm to the significance of the heritage asset is less than substantial.
13. Paragraph 202 of the Framework states that if a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, then this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Whilst the appellant states that the new roof covering was necessary in order to repair the roof and prevent leaks, this could have been achieved by replacing the roof with slates to match those removed and is largely a private benefit. Even if there is a small public benefit associated with the maintenance of the property this does not outweigh the great weight that should be given to the asset's conservation.
14. For the above reasons, I conclude that that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The development is in conflict with Policy 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2019 (the development

plan) and the Framework which together seek to secure high quality design that respects local details, character and heritage.

Other Matters

15. The site is identified as having low archaeological potential. Given the nature of the development I agree that the development has not involved any below ground intervention and/or disturbance and that the development has not had any impact on any below ground archaeology.
16. I have had regard to s66(1) of the Act and I am satisfied that the development would preserve the setting of nearby listed buildings.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh the conflict. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

R. Gee

INSPECTOR