



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2021

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/20/3263095 45 Mill Drove, Bourne PE10 9BY

- 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 P Lambert against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref S20/1143, dated 8 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2020.
 - The development is proposed 2 storey porch extension and detached single garage and carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling located on a long, straight road. Although the surrounding houses exhibit architectural differences, they are all set back from the road in a consistent manner, thereby establishing a strong building line with substantial space between the dwellings and the highway. Front boundary enclosures are generally low in height and are often supplemented by mature and well-maintained landscaping. The combination of the space between the buildings and highway, and the low boundary enclosures and landscaping, establish a pleasant, spacious suburban environment, with which the appeal site is entirely consistent. Accordingly, in its current form, the appeal site makes a positive contribution to the area.
4. The Council have raised no objection to the proposed 2 storey porch extension. I find this to be a somewhat discordant addition to the property, but I accept the Council's analysis on this point, and as a consequence, I have no particular reason to disagree with their conclusions. However, their concern manifests itself with the proposed garage and car port.
5. This structure would be set forward of the existing house, close to the front boundary of the site. It would contain both a garage and a car port and as a consequence, it would have a generous footprint. In addition, the building would have a pitched roof with a ridge and eaves height that would be substantially taller than the existing low boundary enclosure. Accordingly, it

would be a prominent addition to the street, which due to its height, scale and location, would be dominant and imposing. This would be in stark and harmful contrast to the spaciousness currently found to the front of the site which is a prevailing and important characteristic of the area.

6. The proposal would be seen in the context of the more generous landscaping found to the west of the appeal site. However, this landscaping would not screen the building, nor would it significantly soften its visual impact within the street scene. Instead, the scale and location of the proposal would continue to be such that it would still represent a dominant and imposing addition. Accordingly, the landscaping would not lessen the harm that I have identified above. I also note that there are a limited number of examples of similar development along the road. However, these are substantially removed from the appeal site and certainly do not affect the consistent perception of space found to the front of the overwhelming majority of properties in the locality. As a consequence, their presence does not alter my findings identified above.
7. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore fail to comply with Policy DE1 of the South Kesteven District Council Local Plan 2011 – 2036 (2020) which seeks high quality design that makes a positive contribution to local distinctiveness and character.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons identified above, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR