



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2022

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4TH October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/D/22/3300218

26 Harlequin Drive, Spalding, Lincolnshire, PE11 3GL

- 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 Luke Boekestyn against the decision of South Holland District Council.
 - The application Ref H16-0306-22, dated 23 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is a front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the existing dwelling and on the streetscene

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a recently built detached dwelling, which is situated within a modern residential estate. It is positioned on a private drive on the edge of the estate, facing an area of open space and beyond that, a main road (Wygate Park) that serves the estate and the wider area.
4. House types in the area vary in terms of their appearance and scale and the majority have open sided, covered entrance porches that frame the front doors. Although these porches vary in design terms, solid porches are not common within the estate.
5. The proposal is to construct an enclosed porch that would project some 1.7m from the front of the dwelling and would be 2.4m wide. The walls were originally proposed to be faced with grey brickwork, but the appellant has since proposed the use of natural timber cladding. The porch would have its door on the side in order to provide easier access between the dwelling and the parking area. I agree that this would be of some benefit to the appellant.
6. Policies 2 and 3 of the adopted South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2019 (LP) require (amongst other things) proposals to contribute to sustainable development by having regard to the character of the area and the quality of the design. Policy 3 states that design which is inappropriate to the local area "will not be accepted."

7. Although the proposed porch is a relatively minor development, its overall design and visual impact would be at odds with the predominant character and form of porches on both Harlequin Drive and the estate generally. It would contrast sharply with the original design of the dwelling and it would appear incongruous and visually harmful. It would also be a prominent feature, being clearly visible from both Wygate Park and the area of open space opposite the front of the property. Furthermore, I consider that the use of either grey brickwork or timber cladding would be at odds with the character of both the dwelling and the locality.
8. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the appellant's desire to embody modern architecture and I viewed an existing rear extension at the property, which also contrasts in terms of its design and materials with the original dwelling. I also note the contents of paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states (amongst other things) that planning decisions should not prevent or discourage innovation or change. However, unlike the rear extension, the proposed porch would be publicly visible and I am not persuaded that the terms of paragraph 130 justify the appeal proposal.
9. It has also been pointed out to me that a smaller porch of similar design could be constructed using permitted development rights. That's as maybe, but the appeal proposal would have greater bulk and its impact on the dwelling and the streetscene would be greater.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the appearance of both the existing dwelling and the streetscene. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies 2 and 3 of the LP, as referred to above. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR