



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2023

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/D/23/3324965

Mere House, Mill Mere Road, Corringham, Gainsborough, DN21 5QZ

- 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 Mark Smithson against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref 146341, dated 24 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. These are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and on the setting of the Church of St Lawrence; and the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of number 2A Church Lane (number 2A), with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character, Appearance and Setting

3. The appeal property is a dwelling house, which is situated on the corner of Mill Mere Road and Church Lane, within the small settlement of Corringham. The character and appearance of the area is mixed and it contains a variety of buildings in terms of their age, appearance and scale. The Church of St Lawrence, which is situated to the north-east of the appeal site is a listed building. The church is partly visible across the appeal site from Church Lane and the appeal site is partly visible from the grounds of the church.
4. The proposal is to construct a two-storey extension which would infill an existing gap between two buildings within the garden of the property. It would be constructed of a mixture of brickwork and glazing with much of the glazing at first floor level. The extension would abut the driveway number 2A. The plans show that the extension would be used for storage.
5. Policy S53 of the adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (LP) and Policies CNP4 and CNP5 of the Corringham Neighbourhood Plan (NP) generally seek (amongst other things) to ensure that new development is of high-quality design that contributes positively to local character. These policies accord with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (The Framework). Policy

S53 does allow for innovative design and new technologies, but both the LP and the NP also require external materials to reinforce local distinctiveness and respect the predominant materials used in the area.

6. Although, the area is mixed in terms of building ages and designs, the use of traditional external materials predominates. These include brickwork or render and tiled roofs. The proposed glazed section of the extension, which would be clearly visible when viewed from Church Lane, would be at odds with this prevailing character and it would appear as an incongruous and alien feature in the locality. Consequently, it would conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan, as referred to above.
7. Turning to the effect on the setting of the Church of St Lawrence, the setting is generally regarded as the surroundings in which the heritage asset is experienced. Policy S57 of the LP and Policies CNP6 and CNP7 of the NP seek to protect and conserve heritage assets, including the setting of listed buildings. Chapter 16 of The Framework also contains similar provisions. I note that the NP identifies 'key views', but the list does not include any views from or towards the church from the appeal site or its immediate surroundings.
8. The Church occupies a central position within this part of Corringham and it is visible or partly visible from different vantage points, including from Church Street. In addition, the appeal site would be partly visible from the church grounds.
9. Although the extension would appear at odds with its surroundings, for the reasons given above, I am not persuaded that the setting of the listed building would be harmed. Whilst the surroundings of the church are characterised by buildings constructed of traditional materials (notwithstanding their different ages and styles), when viewed from Church Lane, both the Church and the proposed extension would not generally be viewed in association with each other, due to the separation distance and angular relationship between them.
10. Furthermore, although the proposed extension would be partly visible from the churchyard, I am not persuaded that this would be harmful, because of the limited extent of the view and the separation distance between the buildings. In my opinion, the features and characteristics that contribute to the setting of the Church would predominate and the setting of the heritage asset would be preserved.

Living Conditions

11. Policy S53 of the LP and Policy CNP1 of the NP state that development proposals should not result in harm to people's amenity, including neighbouring residents. I note that the occupants of number 2A did not object to the proposal and I have taken this into account in reaching my conclusion on this issue.
12. The proposed extension would infill an existing space between buildings at first-floor level adjacent to the side boundary/driveway with number 2A. Although the use of glazing would, to a certain extent, have less of an impact than a solid wall, the proposed extension would be an imposing feature and would have a strong physical presence that would overbear and have a domineering effect on number 2A. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the amenity of the occupants of

number 2A and, therefore, it would conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan, as referred to above.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR