



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2025

by J D Clark BA (Hons) DpTRP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/W/25/3365968

6 Bridge Street, Marston, Lincolnshire NG32 2HL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Vicky Moore-Jones of E A Sheardown & Company Ltd against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref is S25/0150.
 - The development proposed is sub-division of number 6 to form a pair of semi-detached dwellings with two storey rear and single storey side extensions, modified access and ancillary outbuilding & car port.
-

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 dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a single detached two-storey house and its garden areas to the front, side and rear. Historically, 6 Bridge Street would have originally been two dwellings but has been converted to a single dwelling at some point in the past. The house is in need of some repair and the gardens have become overgrown. It bears a date stone, 1869 and the initials JHT. There are similar properties in the road, a neighbouring property has a similar date stone and initials but for the year 1867. Another property also appears to have a similar date stone but the date is obscured by vegetation. These properties appear to have been refurbished as single dwellings. Other properties along the road are of a different design but share similar features such as red/brown brickwork, roof tiling and front boundary walls. The overall character of the surrounding area is one of a village setting in a semi-rural area.
4. The proposal includes substantial extensions to the property to enable its conversion to two dwellings. These would include projecting out to the side at both ground and first floor level together with a large single storey rear extension. Whilst the resulting pair of semi-detached houses would be symmetrical in design, the additions would over-dominate the form and appearance of the existing dwelling.
5. Although the gable front feature of the existing house would remain, it would be flanked by extensions projecting sideways at almost ridge height and above the existing eaves. The use of similar materials would not limit the impact of the bulk

and dominance of these additions nor would their set-back from the front elevation. I disagree that they would appear as subservient additions. At ground floor level, the existing house has two small porches on either side, reflecting their former purposes as entrances to two dwellings, but these are small and part of the character of the building. The proposed single storey additions to the side and rear are proposed to be timber clad which, rather than add a visual break in materials as described by the appellant, would appear out of keeping in design terms and add to their visual disharmony.

6. The proposal also includes two outbuildings to serve each of the dwellings. These would be two stories high and provide ancillary accommodation for each dwelling. A car port would be added to each which together with the long driveways to either side of the property would provide off street parking. Whilst the site can accommodate such outbuildings, the bland design bears no resemblance to the existing building. The long driveway and rear parking would result in an excessive loss of garden land and contributes to the unsatisfactory appearance and intrusiveness of the proposed development.
7. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Local Plan¹ Policy DE1 which seeks to ensure that all development proposals make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness, vernacular and character of the area and not have an adverse impact on the street scene, amongst other things. It would also fail to meet the high quality of design required by Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Other Matters

8. The appellant refers to permitted development rights and I accept that the property could be extended within the constraints of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). However, limited details of what development could take place has not been submitted and so I am unable to judge whether such development would be more harmful than that proposed. The weight given to this as a fall-back position is therefore limited.
9. I note that the principle of sub-dividing the property is acceptable to the Council but I cannot agree that the proposed approach to achieve that aim is acceptable. I note that the appellant considers that different opinions have been given from different Officers in the Council but that is not a matter that can carry any weight in my assessment.
10. I also note that there would be no impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, heritage, ecology, flood risk or highway safety. I agree that a suitably worded condition could address any information lacking with regard to existing trees on the site. I also note that any requirements under Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) would be capable of being secured off-site. However, the lack of harm in these matters does not override the harm I have identified in my main issue.

¹ South Kesteven District Council Local Plan 2011 – 2036, January 2020.

Planning Balance

11. The Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land as required by the Framework, although the extent of the shortfall is not disclosed. In such cases it is necessary to engage paragraph 11 d) of the Framework. This establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development unless the adverse effects of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the Framework taken as a whole.
12. The proposal would result in an additional dwelling. This would be a benefit and, although small, would contribute numerically to the housing requirements within the district. However, this proposal would create two 2 bedroomed dwellings to replace a single 4 bedroom dwelling. Therefore, in terms of bedspace there would be no difference. The appellant describes the existing dwelling as being sub-standard and although it includes uneven floors and low roof heights in some parts, this reflects its age and former function as two smaller properties. Whilst in need of refurbishment therefore, I disagree that the existing dwelling is in such a poor condition as to warrant it incapable of being brought up to modern standards. As such it would provide a 4 bedroomed family home.
13. Furthermore, I note that the appellant describes the proposed dwellings as providing opportunities for first time buyers, small families and for people wishing to downsize. The Council accept that returning the dwelling to two smaller dwellings responds to the changing household needs in the village. However, I have no evidence whether any analysis has been carried out to determine a demand for smaller two-bedroom properties as opposed to larger four bedroom family homes. In the absence of any such evidence, I afford this benefit moderate weight.
14. The proposal would have an economic benefit in the short term by providing construction work for the development. It would also have a social benefit in terms of creating two modern dwellings which would enable future occupiers to contribute to the local community. Its environments benefits would mainly be linked to improving the standard of accommodation and its subsequent impact on carbon emissions and climate change. However, these would be offset by the harm caused to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area as I have outlined above.
15. Thus, the adverse effects of the proposal would not significantly and demonstrably be outweighed by the benefits, when assessed against the development plan and the Framework taken as a whole.

Conclusion

16. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR