
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2017

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/17/3180891

Ye Olde Cottage, Aveland Way, Aslackby NG34 0HG

- 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 Ms Rachel Stevenson against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref S17/0349, dated 20 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a replacement porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a replacement porch extension at Ye Olde Cottage, Aveland Way, Aslackby NG34 0HG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S17/0349, dated 20 February 2017, 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: Drawing Numbers 1031/1A and 1031/2A.
 - 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 Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and whether the development would preserve or enhance the Aslackby Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The site comprises a mid-terraced, two-storey property, which sits in a prominent location, particularly as you approach from the east. The property is one of three cottages which have a varied and attractive appearance overall. The adjoining dwelling to the west has a single storey, brick extension projecting to the side. The site falls within the western part of the Aslackby Conservation Area. The surrounding area consists of properties of a variety of designs and scales and it is this mixed appearance that contributes to the overall attractiveness of the Conservation Area.

4. The existing porch is in poor condition and, in combination with its existing materials, makes little contribution to the Conservation Area or the appearance of the host dwelling. It also detracts from the character and appearance of the existing group of cottages. The proposed porch would be larger than the existing and extend further forward towards the highway. However, it would be constructed in better materials, namely brick and tile to match the existing dwelling, and would be of a simple design. Although the proposed porch would be more prominent, it would remain partially screened by the existing conifer to the front of the site. Furthermore, although the scale of the proposed porch is larger than the existing, the use of a lean-to roof would ensure that the scale and height would not be excessive in relation to the modest cottage. I note also that the proposed scheme was reduced in scale during the application process.
5. Although the proposed materials would be more noticeable to begin with, over time they would weather and the development would become less visually prominent. The proposal would use uPVC for its windows and, whilst timber is preferable in a Conservation Area, the use of uPVC is at ground floor only due to the single storey nature of the proposal, and there are other examples of uPVC in the area.
6. For the above reasons, although the Council consider there to be a less than substantial harm, I conclude that there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and the proposed development would result in an enhancement to the Conservation Area through the removal of a poor quality extension, and its replacement with a better quality development with materials that would complement the host dwelling. As such, the proposal would comply with Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2010) which seeks to ensure that development is appropriate to the historic character and patterns of the landscape and the quality and character of the built fabric.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have included a condition listing the approved plans for the purposes of clarity. A condition to ensure the materials of construction match the existing is necessary in the interests of the visual character of the Conservation Area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR