



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2020

by A Blicq BSc (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M2515/D/20/3262740

137 Doddington Road, Lincoln LN6 7HE

- 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 R Lynch against the decision of Lincoln City Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0373/HOU, dated 16 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is double garage to existing family house with link.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character or appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within a long residential stretch of Doddington Road, lined mainly with neat pairs of modest semi-detached dwellings. Where there are detached dwellings these are of a similar scale and follow the underlying building line.
4. Number 137 Doddington Road (No 137) is something of an anomaly in the building pattern. It is a larger detached dwelling set well back from the road, with a central hipped projection and a hipped roof. It stands on a rather narrow plot with minimal lateral separation to side boundaries, and well behind the underlying building line. It is very prominent in views from the west as the adjoining land has been developed as bungalows with a large expanse of hard standing adjacent to the road. However, notwithstanding the rather narrow plot, the dwelling has a presence in the street scene, by virtue of its form, symmetry and height. This is reinforced by its long frontage.
5. The development would comprise a large hipped single storey structure containing a double garage, a gym of similar size and a link to No 137's front elevation. The development's ridge would extend to a height midway up No 137's first floor windows and its footprint would extend across more than half of the central projecting gable. The footprint would have an area similar to that of the host dwelling. Moreover, from the road the garage would intrude into and largely block the gap in the building pattern that exists between No 137's front elevation and the rear elevations of the line of semi-detached dwellings to the east.

6. I conclude that the garage's bulk, mass and height would be disproportionately large in this position, and would largely obscure and diminish No 137's frontage. It would appear oversized and cramped within the site, particularly as the garage doors would face the plot's side boundary.
7. The fact that the garage's extent would terminate at the front building line of the adjoining dwellings does not alter my reasoning that its overall size in relation to No 137 is out of keeping.
8. The appellant has highlighted other dwellings in the area which have garages forward of the host dwelling. However, although I could not identify the location of Yew Tree Lodge, the other examples were not comparable to what is before me. In those cases, the garages are variously single garages, detached from the host dwelling or were contained within minor front extensions clearly designed as integral parts of the original dwelling. They were not major extensions attached to a street facing frontage.
9. I appreciate that No 137 has an extensive frontage depth, but I see no reason why this should necessarily be considered as a development site. It is the appellant's choice to retain it as an expanse of gravel. In any case, my concern is the size and scale of what is proposed directly in front of the host dwelling. There is nothing before me to indicate that there are no other design options to site a garage in this frontage.
10. I have reviewed the visualisation but this reinforces my reasoning. In any case, in the side view the garage appears to be less extensive than shown on the layout plan. I appreciate that planting could provide screening on the road boundary, but this does not alter my reasoning that the development would be over-sized in relation to the host dwelling and its position.
11. The development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and as such would be contrary to Policy LP26 of the Local Plan which requires all development, including extensions to achieve high quality design, and well as the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

12. In the light of the above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Blacq

INSPECTOR