



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2023

**by K Ford MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 4 September 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/23/3323852**

**Hillside, Lower Road, Hough on the Hill, Lincolnshire NG32 2BB**

- 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 Sidney against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
  - The application Ref S23/0331, dated 20 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2023.
  - The development proposed is single storey extension incorporating a living space, garage and porch.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area, including the Hough on the Hill Conservation Area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is a 2 storey rendered detached house set back from the highway on Lower Road. There is variation in the design and layout of buildings. However, there is cohesiveness in the use of brick and stone and common boundary treatments with a mix of vegetation and low level walls. The site is within the Hough on the Hill Conservation Area, the significance and importance of which includes the architectural style and materials of buildings and rural character.
4. Whilst the proposed extension would be subordinate in height to the original dwelling, the overall scale and massing of the elongated extension, when combined with the flat roof and pitched roof design would create an incongruous addition that would not assimilate well with the original dwelling. The proposed use of matching external materials would be insufficient to overcome the harm.
5. The proposed 1.8 metre close boarded timber fencing would not be characteristic of the area in terms of height, appearance or materials. The contrast to the surroundings would be notable and would be detrimental to the street scene.
6. Whilst some of the proposed development would be screened from public view the overall scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area and the Conservation Area. As the harm to the Conservation Area would be

localised the proposal (using the terminology contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)) would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area as a designated heritage asset. Nevertheless, this harm is of considerable importance and weight.

7. The harm is such that the development would conflict with Policy DE1 of the South Kesteven Local Plan 2011-2036. Amongst other things the policy requires new development to be of high quality design and make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness, vernacular and the character of the area. Development should also be of an appropriate scale, massing and materials given the context of the area.
8. Whilst not referenced in the Council's decision notice the officer report also makes reference to Policy EN6 of the Local Plan. The development would conflict with this policy as it requires new development to protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings and identifies that development that is likely to cause harm to the significance of a heritage asset or its setting will only be granted permission where the public benefits of the proposal outweigh the potential harm.
9. Similarly, the development would conflict with Policy HoH2 of the Hough on the Hill Neighbourhood Development Plan (Neighbourhood Plan) and in particular the requirement for new development to be sympathetic to the existing form, scale and character of its location and be appropriate to its rural context. It also requires materials and boundary treatments to be sympathetic to the character and landscape.
10. Whilst not referenced in the Council's decision notice, the development would also conflict with Policy HoH3 of the Neighbourhood Plan which supports development in the Conservation Area where it preserves and enhances the character and local distinctiveness of the Conservation Area, is sympathetic to the site's context and characteristics, uses materials that are appropriate to the Conservation Area and is of a scale and form that is appropriate to the Conservation Area and its setting.

### **Planning Balance**

11. The NPPF requires that less than substantial harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. There would be some economic and social benefits generated by the development but they are largely personal and given the scale of the development the public benefits are limited and I attach limited weight to them accordingly.
12. I note the absence of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, identified by the appellant. Nevertheless, I give these neutral weight in the planning balance.
13. Against this I have found significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The less than substantial harm to the heritage assets should be afforded great weight. I do not find that the benefits of the proposal amount to public benefits that outweigh the harm that would be caused to the significance of the Conservation Area.

## **Conclusion**

14. For the reasons identified and taking into account all other matters, including the absence of objection from consultees, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*K Ford*

INSPECTOR