



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 18 May 2021

by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R2520/W/21/3268520

Land adjacent 9 Ancaster Drive, Sleaford NG34 7LY

- 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 Roger Barton against the decision of North Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0739/FUL, dated 16 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a 2 storey 2 bedroom house.
-

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 parcel of land to the side of 9 Ancaster Drive which has been separated from its garden by a fence. The land is grassed and enclosed by a low timber fence. The site is on a corner opposite the junction with Wesley Close, within a predominantly residential area.
4. The site is easily visible from the south, partly due to the extent of the setback of the row of bungalows that are located around the bend. The whole of the site is also prominent from the junction with Wesley Close. No 9 is located at the end of a row of detached two storey houses and bungalows which, although consisting of different designs and styles, are positioned similar distances from the edge of the road to each other.
5. Each dwelling is positioned roughly in line with one another following the curvature of the road, giving a pleasing and coherent pattern to the streetscene. This is a clear and harmonious element of local character which contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposed dwelling would incorporate some features of the neighbouring dwellings including a step in the front elevation and a flat roofed porch which would be positioned level with that of No 9. However, the main element of the front elevation would be set noticeably forward of that of No 9 and consequently closer to the road.
7. In my view, this forward projection would be emphasised by the increasing curvature of the road at this point approaching the bend. Notwithstanding certain boundary features and planting, generally corner plots afford good

visibility around bends which contributes towards a sense of spaciousness. As a result of the proximity of the front elevation to the road edge, the dwelling would appear more imposing than surrounding dwellings and would appear as an incongruous addition to the streetscene.

8. This would be particularly evident looking towards the site from around the junction of Ancaster Drive with Hervey Road from which point the dwelling, set forward and failing to account for the curvature of the road, would appear distinctly at odds with the pleasing and coherent character referred to above. In my view the incongruity of the scheme would be exacerbated by the dwelling proposed being set in a plot which appeared markedly smaller than the prevailing layout. In this respect, the proposal would appear as an awkward attempt to fit a dwelling on a constrained site, resulting in a discordant form of development. I note the previous Inspector reasoned similarly.
9. Whilst I acknowledge that there have been some amendments to the design of the proposal since the previous appeal decision at this site, they do not result in an acceptable scheme. For the above reasons, I am of the view that the proposal would not represent good design in this context. The scheme would not improve the character or quality of the area in line with the expectations of paragraphs 124 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework').
10. I agree with the Inspector at the previous appeal that the proposal would boost the supply and choice of housing in the area. However, that contribution would be modest and carries limited weight in support of the appeal. Economic benefits would also arise from the construction and occupation of a new house. Nonetheless taken together these would be relatively minor benefits that would not outweigh the harm arising to character and appearance referred to above.
11. Consequently I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area in conflict with policies LP1, LP2 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (adopted 2017) and paragraphs 124 and 130 of the Framework which seek to provide high standards of design and preserve character and appearance.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having taken account of all other matters raised, the development conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and with the approach in the Framework. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR