

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2018

**by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/D/17/3192054**

**15 Brook Street, Hemswell, Gainsborough DN21 5UJ**

- 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 Lane against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
  - The application Ref 136850, dated 3 October 2017, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2017.
  - The development proposed is alterations and extensions to existing semi-detached house to provide two new bedrooms, dining room extension, utility room and wc facilities.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene and, linked to that, whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hemswell Conservation Area.

### Reasons

3. 15 Brook Street is a modest semi-detached house constructed in the late 1940's as part of four similar pairs of properties. The properties, which are symmetrically designed, feature a distinct steeply pitched roof, prominent chimneys and a single storey side addition with a hipped roof. The dwellings have a wide but narrow plan form. Although I noted that there have been some alterations to the buildings, including photovoltaic panels on the front roofslope of the appeal property which are removable, the character and appearance of the pairs of dwellings has been retained.
4. The application sought permission for the demolition of the existing single-storey element of the dwelling and its replacement with a part single, part two storey extension to the side and rear.
5. The proposed extension would be substantial in terms of its size and scale such that the footprint of the first floor would be almost doubled. The two storey element would extend across much of the rear of the dwelling and project out at the side and, as a result of its design, form and massing, would fail to integrate well with or respect the modest character of the existing property. The impact of the scale of the extension would be compounded by the design

of the roof which would have a shallower pitch and a hipped form, at odds with the form of the main roof. I acknowledge that some design features, including brick detailing around the windows and doors would reflect those on the existing building and that the height of the two storey element would be lower than the ridgeline and set back from the frontage. Nevertheless, the extension would appear incongruous in terms of its massing and form, and its scale would dominate the property. Consequently the extension would detract from, and thereby harm, the character and appearance of the host building and the symmetry of the pair.

6. There is a gap between the appeal property and the neighbouring property no. 17 and as such the side elevation and the general form and scale of the building is apparent in the street scene. The extension would therefore also be visible. Given the harm it would cause to the host property as set out above, the development would also have a detrimental impact on the street scene.
7. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area and paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out the desirability for new development to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
8. Nos 1-15 Brook Street are not specifically referred to in the Conservation Area Character Appraisal, but nevertheless, because of their rhythm, style and appearance, the four pairs of houses currently make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Whilst I recognise that there have been some modest changes to the buildings over time they have retained their character and distinctiveness. For the above reasons the proposal would fail to reflect the distinctiveness of the row and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
9. The approach in the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 134, is that where the harm to the significance of the building would be less than substantial, as in this case, it should be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal including securing its optimum viable use.
10. I acknowledge that the proposal would be of private benefit to the appellant in terms of enlarged, and more thermally efficient, accommodation. However the public benefits of this would be limited. Accordingly the benefits of the scheme do not outweigh the harm
11. Moreover, for the above reasons, the proposal would be contrary to Policies LP17, LP25 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan which seek in various ways to ensure that development protects features which positively contribute to the character of an area and retain and reinforce local distinctiveness.
12. For these reasons, and taking into account all other matters raised including the pre-application advice given by the Council, the appeal is dismissed.

*S Ashworth*

INSPECTOR