



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2025

**by J Hobbs MRTPI MCD BSc (hons)**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 18 November 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/W/25/3370758**

**4 Holme Hall Avenue, Bottesford, North Lincolnshire DN16 3PY**

- 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 TES Property Services Ltd against the decision of North Lincolnshire Council.
  - The application Ref is PA/2025/742.
  - The development proposed is construction of rear extension (infill), conversion of garage into study room, and change in fenestration in front elevation.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of rear extension (infill), conversion of garage into study room, and change in fenestration in front elevation at 4 Holme Hall Avenue, Bottesford, North Lincolnshire DN16 3PY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA/2025/742, 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 drawing nos UPRN: 200000872607, A01/2130/05 and A01/2130/10, and “proposed site plan”.
  - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
  - 4) Before the proposed extension is occupied, the windows serving the first-floor ensuite bathrooms, as shown on drawing no. A01/2130/10, shall be obscure glazed to a minimum of Privacy Level 4 in accordance with the Pilkington Scale of Obscuration and shall be retained in that condition in perpetuity.

### Applications for costs

2. An application for costs has been made by TES Property Services Ltd against North Lincolnshire Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

### Preliminary Matters

3. There is a slight difference between the appellants name on the Application Form and Appeal Form. It has been confirmed in correspondence with the appellant’s agent that the company name is “TES Property Services Ltd”. Therefore, this is specified in the banner above.

4. Several interested parties have made representations in relation to the use of the building as a house in multiple occupation (HMO) and a potential increase in occupancy. My appeal decision concerns the proposal that was before the Council, which was for an extension of the building, conversion of the garage and a change in fenestration. For clarity, the planning application did not propose a change of use nor did it seek to increase the permitted occupancy of the HMO. It is also not possible for me to reconsider previous approvals relating to the appeal property.
5. Bottesford Town Council contends that the correct Ownership Certificate was not completed on the Application Form. It has been confirmed in writing with the appellant's agent that the appellant is the owner of the property and was at the time of the making the planning application. However, there has been a delay in updating the land registry details. As such, I am satisfied that the planning application was valid, and I will continue to determine the appeal.

## **Main Issues**

6. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (i) the character and appearance of the area, and (ii) highway safety, with particular regard to the provision of off-street parking and vehicle movements.

## **Reasons**

### *Character and appearance*

7. The appeal property is a detached two-storey building. The design of the property is similar to many in the local area, which tend to be two-storey, detached or semi-detached, and set within spacious plots. Most of the properties, including the appeal property, are set back from the road and have large driveways. Whilst there is a parade of shops in proximity to the appeal property, the area largely comprises of residential properties. The area is suburban in character.
8. The proposed extension would increase the footprint-to-plot ratio of the appeal property. Nonetheless, the proposed extension would largely infill a gap between the sun room and the day room. The property would be extended towards the boundary with 2 Holme Hall Avenue by a very small amount. As such, the amount of circulation space around the appeal property would be largely unchanged.
9. The proposed cycle store in combination with the proposed extension would reduce the amount of usable garden space, and the garden would be smaller than most neighbouring properties. However, the appeal property would still benefit from a large garden, and it would be of an acceptable size for the permitted level of occupancy. Moreover, the proposed extension would be to the rear of the building and would be largely screened from public views and from neighbouring land. Taking this into account, the proposed development would not appear cramped or as overdevelopment of the plot. It would continue to be viewed as a large property within a spacious plot and would appear similar to neighbouring properties.
10. Multiple cars parked on large driveways is a common feature of the area. Therefore, the proposed parking arrangements would not appear out of place.
11. I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would comply with saved Policy DS1 of the

North Lincolnshire Local Plan, May 2003 (LP), and policies CS1 and CS2 of the North Lincolnshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy, June 2011. These policies indicate that proposals for poorly designed development will be refused, amongst other matters.

### *Highway safety*

12. The appeal property's front garden comprises of a large area of hardstanding and a lawn. The Proposed Site Plan shows parking spaces for 5 cars. However, these spaces are small and adjoin one another. As such, it may be impractical to use the spaces and for vehicles to manoeuvre in and out of them. Notwithstanding this, there is space for the parking of at least 4 cars on the existing hardstanding, and further parking could be made available by extending this hardstanding. There is also space for cars to turn around on the driveway. The proposed conversion of the garage to a study room would remove the ability to park vehicles in the garage, but the proposed development would not alter the amount of parking available on the driveway.
13. The Parking Provision Guidelines<sup>1</sup> specify minimum parking standards for developments. For a HMO in Bottesford with up to 6 occupants, the Guidelines state the minimum parking standard is 2 spaces. Consequently, even with the loss of the garage, the appeal property would have at least double the provision required by the minimum parking standards. Whilst I accept occupiers of the appeal property may have more than 2 cars, there is no cogent evidence before me to explain why the minimum standard should not apply in this instance. Moreover, as the appeal property is used for residential purposes, disabled or parent and child parking would not be expected to be formally laid out.
14. Although the appeal property has a good provision of off-street parking, there may be times when vehicles would need to be parked on the road. There are no parking restrictions near to the appeal property and there is no reason why vehicles could not be parked safely away from the junctions with Manor Road and Timberland. Furthermore, there is anecdotal evidence of parking stress in the area, but this is not supported by photographic evidence and not highlighted as a concern by the Local Highway Authority. Accordingly, there is no compelling evidence before me which indicates that vehicles could not be parked safely on the road.
15. The provision of cycle storage and the proximity of nearby shops would promote the use of sustainable transport modes to access services and facilities necessary for occupiers' everyday needs. This could reduce the demand for cars and, in turn, reduce demand for car parking. Even if this does not significantly reduce demand for car parking, there is still an acceptable provision of off-street parking.
16. Following the proposed development, the property could still only be occupied by up to 6 occupants. Therefore, the proposed development would not generate extra traffic on the local highway. Consequently, the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, and the residual cumulative effects of the road network would not be severe.
17. I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on highway safety, with particular regard to the provision of off-street parking and vehicle movements.

---

<sup>1</sup> Parking Provision Guidelines for New & Change of Use Developments, North Lincolnshire Council

It would comply with saved LP policies T2 and T19 which indicate that provision will be made for car parking where it would comply with the Parking Provision Guidelines, amongst other matters.

### **Other Matters**

18. The proposed development would not increase the occupancy of the appeal property. It would also not introduce any balconies or raised outdoor areas. Consequently, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to noise and disturbance.
19. There is no substantive evidence to indicate that, even if the hardstanding is extended, the proposal would increase flood risk or result in drainage problems.
20. The Town Council has raised several questions in relation to taxation, business relationships and restrictive covenants. These are matters outside of the scope of the appeal and would not be a reason for withholding planning permission.
21. The installation of internal ventilation and its efficacy is controlled by other legislation. Similar to above, any concerns with the proposed ventilation would not be a reason to withhold planning permission.
22. The planning system is concerned with the public interest. The effect of the proposed development on neighbouring house values is a matter of private interest. Similarly, interested parties concerns with the conduct of the Council's officers and the appellant, are matters between them and do not alter my assessment on the acceptability of the appeal proposal.

### **Conditions**

23. The Council has indicated the conditions that it considers would be appropriate if I were to allow the appeal. I have considered the suggested conditions in light of the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
24. Conditions specifying a time limit to implement the planning permission and approved plans are necessary in the interest of certainty. A condition requiring the external finish of the extension to match the existing building is necessary to conserve the character and appearance of the area. A condition requiring the ensuite bathroom windows to be obscure glazed is necessary to preserve the living conditions of occupiers of the appeal property.
25. The proposal is for the extension of, and alteration to, the appeal property. The permitted level of occupancy and use of the property would remain the same. Therefore, it would not be reasonable to impose conditions which require the installation of electric vehicle charging points or restrict the occupation of the HMO to a specific group of people.

### **Conclusion**

26. In reaching my decision I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty set out under the Equality Act 2010. Interested parties contend the proposal would have a harmful effect on elderly neighbours and children walking to school. The protected characteristic of age would be relevant to some of the neighbours. The proposal would not cause harm to their living conditions or to highway safety. As

such, granting planning permission would not be contrary to the need to eliminate discrimination of people with protected characteristics, advancing equality of opportunity for those persons, and fostering good relations between them and others.

27. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed and planning permission should be granted.

*J Hobbs*

INSPECTOR