



## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

### APPEALS LIST - 25TH SEPTEMBER 2020

**APPLICATION  
NUMBER & SITE  
ADDRESS**

**APPEAL REFERENCE &  
STATUS**

**OFFICER &  
PROCEDURE**

DM/0679/19/TPO  94 Station Road Great Coates Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN37 9NN	AP/017/19  INPROG	Paul Chaplin  Fast Track
DM/0235/20/FULA  128 Scartho Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN33 2AX	AP/008/20  INPROG	Bethany Loring  Fast Track
DM/0454/20/ADV  Royal Oak Chambers 190 Victoria Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire	AP/009/20  INPROG	Jonathan Cadd  Commercial Appeal Service



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2020

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th September 2020

---

Appeal Ref: APP/B2002/D/20/3254103

175 Mill Road, Cleethorpes, North East Lincolnshire DN35 8JB

- 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 Derek Holroyd (Circuit Treasurer), The Methodist Church against the decision of North East Lincolnshire Council.
  - The application Ref: DM/0882/19/FULA, dated 17 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2020.
  - **The development proposed is described as "re roofing in Sandtoft Lindum, sand faced tiles."**
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Mill Road Conservation Area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a well-proportioned detached house that is located on the corner of Mill Road with Trinity Road. It dates from the early to mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. Despite some more recent alterations, it displays a number of attractive features. These include its expansive main roof area which is constructed of smooth plain clay tiles. The roof of a rear single storey extension contains more modern tiles.
4. The site lies in the Mill Road Conservation Area. Mill Road is a narrow thoroughfare with period properties dating from the late 19<sup>th</sup> to the early to mid-20<sup>th</sup> century that are set on either side of the road, along with some examples of more modern infill. The conservation area is subject to an Article 4 direction that control works so that the character of the area is maintained.
5. A number of the more traditional properties in the conservation area retain smooth plain clay tile roofs. As these materials relate to the era of the properties and add favourably to their appearance, they also contribute appreciably to the significance of the conservation area. There are also examples where some of these properties have been re-roofed with more recent concrete tiles.

6. The smooth plain clay tiles across the entire main roof area would be replaced with the same type of concrete tile as is found on the rear extension. This would considerably alter the visual appearance of the property because of the more modern form of the tile, in particular with its size compared to the smaller existing tiles and as it would have somewhat less of a smooth texture with more of a ridged appearance, even if the colour would be similar. It would detract from its contribution to the significance by utilising a type of roof material that is not a traditional characteristic of the conservation area.
7. Furthermore, the detrimental effect would be marked with its corner location because it would be prominent. It would be clearly visible from the Mill Road and Trinity Road frontages, and from longer distance views afforded along Trinity Road into the conservation area, as well as from Beacon Avenue to the north. Vegetation along Mill Road would lessen the broader views in this direction, but as it would be approached, the contrast with the more traditional form of the property and the conservation area in general would result in it appearing out of character.
8. Where my attention has been drawn to other examples of similar roof materials to the proposal in the conservation area, they do not contribute favourably to the significance. They are also not generally located in such a prominent position as the appeal property. Nor has the prevailing character been changed to the extent that it would justify the proposal, with the more traditional roof materials that remain.
9. I have also been made aware that some of the uncharacteristic roof materials are on properties that are on a local list of historic assets of special interest, which the appeal property is not. However a stronger level of protection is afforded by the conservation area designation which, unlike the local list, constitutes a designated heritage asset. The Mill Road Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statements (1997) that I have been referred to also denote the use of matching materials in alterations. This is of importance in maintaining the significance of the conservation area and which the proposal would not achieve for the reasons that I have set out.
10. The proposed re-roofing of the front bay window with reclaimed smooth plain clay tiles would be of modest benefit compared to the greater harm caused to the more prominent expanse of the main roof area by way of the introduction of the concrete tiles. Whilst the rear extension already utilises the same roof tile, it is significantly less prominent than the main roof area.
11. I also find no wider justification for the proposal. I note from the application submission that the roof is in need of attention and the costs of a more sympathetic type of material. However, strong protection is afforded through the planning system to the conservation area as a designated heritage asset.
12. I conclude that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. As such, it would not comply with Policy 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Council, Local Plan 2013 to 2032 (2018) which seeks to protect, preserve and, where appropriate, enhance the character, appearance, significance and historic value of designated heritage assets and their settings; and, states that proposals are to preserve and enhance the special character and architectural appearance of conservation areas, amongst other considerations.

13. It would also not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework where it is concerned with conserving and enhancing the historic environment, including the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and, states that in considering potential impacts on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given **to the asset's conservation.**

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters that have been raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

*Darren Hendley*

INSPECTOR