



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 01 June 2022

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25TH July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/22/3296298

32 Reedings Road, Barrowby, Grantham NG32 1AT

- 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 Paul Alderton against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref S21/2528, dated 23 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is 'Removal of garage and entrance porch. Two storey wrap-around extensions to both sides. Single storey rear extension. Re-roofing. New parking area, new tree'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development was amended following submission of the application; I have utilised the amended description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached two- storey dwelling situated within Reedings Road, a predominantly residential street. Reedings Road comprises of detached and semi-detached houses and bungalows. The vernacular house design is of a narrow front elevation and deep flanks, with a shallow single pitched roof which creates a front and rear gable end. This simple design is somewhat utilitarian and does not have particular architectural merit, however, it is repeated along the road, which combined with the regular pattern arising from the estate arrangement creates a sense of uniformity and proportion.
5. Many of the houses in the road and surrounding roads have been extended in a variety of ways, and they feature a broad range of extension designs; some appear to be of a higher quality in design and materials than others. As such, there is an established degree of variance. However, that variance is limited to subservient extension which is set-in or set-down from the main elevations, is in line with the existing eaves height and, or, has flat roof or shallow roof forms to respect the main built form of the host dwelling. The extensions also do not

compete with the simple original form of the houses, which is the vernacular style. As such, the strong uniformed estate character remains.

6. The appeal scheme seeks to extend the dwelling with wrap around two-storey side extensions and a single storey rear extension, as well as a front porch. The appeal site has a generous plot and it therefore has capacity for extension without creating cramped overdevelopment. However, the proposed extensions would overwhelm the original dwelling in scale and would not appear as subservient additions.
7. Indeed, whilst the extensions have been cohesively designed to achieve a larger overall dwelling making use of vernacular materials; the re-designed dwelling would appear out of proportion with the typical building mass of the area, and out of scale within the streetscene. The appeal scheme would erode the simple architectural form of the house by introducing two additional gables, as well as a gabled porch with bold fenestration. Whilst the house is of limited architectural merit and there is no need to show the lineal timeline progression of the building for any heritage reason, its simple form and repetition is nonetheless important to the sense of place and local character.
8. Whilst it is acknowledged that extensions to houses form an established part of the streetscene and wider local character, for the reasons outlined above, the existing examples of extensions have a more appropriate scale, mass and design than that of the appeal scheme. The appeal scheme seeks to create a 'facelifted' dwelling with a distinctive appearance, whereas in contrast, existing and recently permitted extensions in the vicinity recognise the architectural proportions of the original dwelling; even in the case of both sided two-storey extensions.
9. For these reasons, the appeal scheme conflicts with policy DE1 of the South Kesteven Local Plan, adopted in 2020, and the Framework. These seek, amongst other things, development of a high-quality design which makes a positive contribution to local distinctiveness.

Other considerations

10. The appeal scheme would create the small private benefit of increasing the living space in the family-sized dwelling, and the scheme also proposes high-quality landscaping, including an additional tree which would be visible within the public realm. However, such benefits are limited and do not outweigh the harm caused by the scheme. Moreover, they could arise from a scheme which does not conflict with the Development Plan. As such, these considerations do not justify determining the appeal other than in accordance with the Development Plan.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons stated above, I find that the appeal proposal is contrary to the relevant policies of the Development Plan. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR