

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2016

**by Emma Tinsley-Evans BSoc.Sc MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 29 July 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/16/3151910**  
**45 Cedar Road, Stamford PE9 2JJ**

- 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 and Mrs B Howard against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
  - The application Ref S15/3247, dated 19 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2016.
  - The development proposed is erection of an extension.
- 

### Preliminary Matters

1. The Council confirms that the appellant submitted revised elevations which were received by email on 18 March 2016. The Council determined the application on the basis of these revised elevations and I have also determined the appeal on this basis.

### Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of an extension at 45 Cedar Road, Stamford PE9 2JJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S15/3247, dated 19 November 2015, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; E/023/15/A; E/023/15/B; E/023/15/C; E/023/15/D (revised elevations as received by the Local Planning Authority by email on 18 March 2016).
  - 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 building.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the street scene along Cedar Road.

### Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is located on the western side of Cedar Road, a residential street within a planned housing estate. This part of Cedar Road is
-

- characterised by a mix of fairly large, 2 storey detached properties interspersed with bungalows. The properties are set back from the road in sizable plots with wide frontages.
5. The houses and bungalows in the immediate vicinity comprise a variety of styles and whilst they front the highway, there is not a strict uniformity to the building line. The properties are set at varying angles to the road and there is generous spacing between them.
  6. The appeal dwelling and the neighbouring properties are screened behind high, mature hedging that runs along much of the length of this part of the road. It provides a sense of enclosure to the properties and gives a consistent soft edge to the street scene.
  7. The host property is a sizable 2 storey detached dwelling. It is one of a number of similar house types along the western side of the road which have a large, single storey, pitched roof double garage attached to the front of the property, projecting at a right angle to the house. There is nothing remarkable about its appearance, design or position in the street scene that gives the appeal dwelling a prominence on Cedar Road.
  8. The proposed extension above the garage would result in a front projection at first floor level. However, the eaves and ridge line of the extension would run parallel to the street, matching the design and pitch of the main roof of the house. Moreover, the roof would slope away from the street and the ridge would also be set lower than the ridge line of the host dwelling. This would reduce its prominence and would give the extension a subordinate appearance. Given the size of No 45, its wide frontage and generous plot, the appeal proposal would be a compatible addition to the property that would not appear out of proportion.
  9. There would be no increase in the footprint of the existing dwelling and the extension would not bring the front building line any closer to Cedar Road. The characteristic gap between the dwellings would be maintained and being set back from the road behind mature planting, the proposed extension would be well screened, allowing its appearance to be softened. Moreover, given the variety of house styles and types in the immediate locality, the extension would not be a discordant or incongruous feature that would be visually intrusive in the street scene.
  10. Consequently, the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the street scene along Cedar Road. The proposal accords with Policy EN1 of the Council's Core Strategy<sup>1</sup> which seeks, amongst other things, to protect and enhance the character of the district and ensure that development is appropriate in terms of local distinctiveness and sense of place.

### **Other Matters**

11. The appeal proposal would not result in built development being brought any closer to the adjacent bungalow at 47 Cedar Road. However, there would be an increase in height compared to the current situation. Notwithstanding this, I do not consider that the extension would be in a location that is readily perceptible to the occupants of No 47 such that it would be visually intrusive.

---

<sup>1</sup> Local Development Framework for South Kesteven Core Strategy Adopted 5 July 2010.

### **Conditions**

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. A condition relating to the use of external materials is also necessary to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Emma Tinsley-Evans*

INSPECTOR