



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2025

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B2002/D/25/3371644

12 Thornton Court, New Waltham, Grimsby, DN36 4LS

- 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 Michelle Newman against the decision of North East Lincolnshire Council.
 - The application Ref is DM/1061/24/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'single storey extension to rear and side of semi-detached bungalow'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear/side extension, demolition of the existing detached garage and the erection of a detached garage and store with various associated works at 12 Thornton Court, New Waltham, Grimsby, DN36 4LS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM/1061/24/FUL, subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; Proposed Block Plan dated 7 May 2025; Proposed Site Plan and Garage Plans and Elevations dated 7 May 2025; Proposed Plans and Elevations dated 2 May 2025.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) Surface water drainage shall be via the water butts shown on the Proposed Plans and Elevations received 2 May 2025 and the Proposed Site Plan, Garage Plans and Elevations received 7 May 2025, which shall be installed before the extension and garage are brought into use and shall thereafter be so retained unless an alternative is submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Preliminary matter

2. I have noted that the Council's decision notice and the plans include the demolition of the existing detached garage and the erection of a new garage, store and associated works. The Council has not objected to that part of the development and from what I have seen that would be acceptable so I have included it in the formal decision above.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed development on:-

- the character and appearance of the area;
- the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a hipped roof, semi-detached bungalow in a street of similar properties. It is tucked into the head of the cul-de-sac and has a small area of garden to the rear of the dwelling with a larger area of garden to the side of the dwelling.
5. The proposed extension would be sited at the rear of the dwelling, attached to an existing rear projection. A small existing conservatory would be demolished. It would have a flat roof form of some 3.1m in height which would be seen in the context of an existing flat roofed dormer on the rear elevation. There are many flat roofed dormers on both front and rear elevations in the street and the flat roof form and design proposed here would therefore be acceptable.
6. It would project some 6.53m beyond the original rear wall and would have a width of some 8m, projecting beyond both side walls of the existing projection. However, due to its siting at the rear of the dwelling, it would not be seen clearly, if at all, from the street or from any other public view points and the high surrounding boundaries would screen most of the extension even in private views from nearby dwellings.
7. Although it would be a large extension, given its siting away from public views and the limited private views, it would not be dominant in the street scene and its scale and massing would be assimilated within the context of this large plot. As such, the proposed extension would not result in significant harm to the character or appearance of the street scene or the wider area. The proposal would therefore accord with development plan policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (2018) (LP) which seek to ensure that regard is paid to the size and scale of developments and that a high standard of design is achieved.

Living conditions

8. The dwelling has a rear boundary with several properties to the rear on Moorland Drive and around the corner at Peaks Avenue. The proposed extension would be particularly close to the rear boundary with nos 2 and 3 Moorland Drive, some 3.7m and 2.2m respectively from those properties, which have first floor windows that overlook the appeal site. However, those properties are at a significantly higher ground level than the appeal site and separated by very high boundaries. Given the position of the extension close to those rear boundaries, its relatively low height, the lack of openings in the rear elevation and its orientation to the north of those neighbouring gardens, I agree with the Council that the proposal would not result in harm to the outlook, privacy or light of those properties or others at the rear of the site.
9. The adjoining dwelling at no 11 has not been extended to the rear and has two rear facing windows. The closest is a patio window sited close to the side boundary.

Although the extension would project along some 6.53m of the side boundary, it would be set in from the boundary by some 1.75m and its low height would mean that it would not be unduly dominant in the outlook from those rear windows. The open area in front of the patio windows to bedroom 2 at the appeal dwelling and immediately adjacent to the patio window of no 11 would be retained and would offer an adequate degree of openness in the outlook from and light to that property. No 11 has a south facing aspect and the proposal would not lead to a significant loss of light or sunlight to that property.

10. I have noted that no 11 is in the ownership of the appellant's family and whilst that could change in the future, future occupiers would be aware of the presence of the extension. In any case, I am satisfied that the proposal would not significantly harm the living conditions of those occupiers in terms of outlook, light or sunlight. It would accord with development plan policies 5 and 22 in the LP which also seek to protect neighbouring land uses and ensure that developments have regard to the site's context.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans to provide certainty. A condition for matching external materials is also necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the site and the area. I have also included the Council's suggested condition for surface water drainage which is necessary in the interests of flood risk and drainage.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be allowed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR