
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2020

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/20/3246298

Chestnuts Barn, 62 High Street, Carlby, Stamford PE9 4LX

- 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 & Mrs Ian Poole against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref S19/1669, dated 11 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey rear extension to replace existing single-storey extension and alterations, including proposed vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. On the appeal form it is indicated that the description of development was changed from that originally stated on the application form. I have therefore used the amended description in the above heading.
3. Since the determination of the original application the Council have adopted the South Kesteven District Council Local Plan 2011 – 2036 (January 2020) (Local Plan). Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy is therefore superseded by corresponding Policy DE1 of the Local Plan and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on the edge of the settlement of Carlby and currently comprises a single storey building with single storey rear extension. It is located adjacent to the highway. It is flanked to the side and rear by open countryside and to the east are other dwellings and the main village.
6. The proposed development would introduce a two-storey extension to the rear of property, replacing the existing single storey rear extension. The host property is a modest single-storey building. The introduction of the two-storey element, which would project back into the site, would be highly visible within the surroundings and would appear dominant in relation to the existing

property as a result of its overall scale and height in comparison with the single storey building, particularly when viewed from the west.

7. Adjacent to the appeal site is a large two storey property which extends back into its curtilage, and there are varied scales and designs of properties in the vicinity, including many which are two storeys in height. The adjacent dwelling is currently visible above the appeal property, forming an immediate backdrop to the appeal site and therefore in terms of its overall scale, the proposal would be seen in the context of this property. However, the main property in this case is a large two-storey dwelling and therefore the overall scale and height of this is well-balanced and comprehensive in its overall appearance in contrast to the appeal proposal.
8. I note that the extension has been designed to appear as a series of farm buildings that have evolved over time. The setting in of the initial part of the extension would serve to mitigate the overall bulk to a degree, nevertheless as a result of the highly visible location, the extension would be prominent within the surroundings and would appear incongruous with the host property and surroundings when approaching the village from the west.
9. The proposed development would include alterations to the existing boundary wall to provide a new access. Along this part of High Street, the front boundary treatments are punctuated by access points. The rebuilding of the wall would serve to retain its existing character and visual integrity and as a result of the overall height of the wall and the scale of the proposed extension I do not find that the proposed new access would significantly highlight the presence of the extension. Consequently, I find that the proposed works to the wall would not be unduly harmful.
10. The Appellants consider that the Council's assessment of the proposal lacks analysis of the context of the site. Whilst the Council's report and statement do not go into detail in terms of the context of the immediate and surrounding area, I consider that their reasons for reaching their conclusions are clear in identifying their areas of concern.
11. The Appellants point out that the view along Main Road towards the appeal site is not identified as an important view in the Carlby Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan 2018 – 2036 (2018) (Neighbourhood Plan) and accordingly they consider this renders this view as not important. I also accept that changing a view in itself is not wholly restricted and the proposal would not be seen within the context of the Church. Notwithstanding this, Policy DE1 of the Local Plan requires new development to make a positive contribution to the local distinctiveness, vernacular and character of the area and not have an adverse impact on the street scene or character of the surrounding area, amongst other things.
12. Furthermore, the Appellants highlight that the appeal site does not form part of the identified green spaces within the Neighbourhood Plan. Nevertheless, policy V.2 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that development which would have a negative impact, which impedes or changes the views and green spaces on the entrance to the west of the village will not be supported. The wording of this refers to the views *as well as* green spaces, therefore whilst the appeal site is not within an identified green space, it nevertheless must be considered within the character and context of the western part of the village.

13. I acknowledge the need for the proposed development to provide additional family accommodation, however, for the above reasons the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would fail to comply with Policy DE1 of the Local Plan and V.2 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR