



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2023

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/W/23/3314621

194 Dysart Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire NG31 7LQ

- 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 P Moore against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref S22/177, dated 7 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is a new dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an area of land next to a modern semi-detached dwelling which is located on the corner of Yarmouth Avenue and Dysart Road. Dysart Road and Yarmouth Avenue nearby are characterised by mainly two storey dwellings set back from the road similar distances with relatively even spaces between buildings. Overall, the area in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site has a formal but relatively spacious residential character and appearance.
4. I have noted the space between the buildings at the junctions between Dysart Road and Ambergate and Dysart Road and The Avenue is less than that at the junction between Dysart Road and Yarmouth Avenue. I have considered the illustration which shows the side elevation of the proposed dwelling would not project significantly closer to the road than the front elevations of other dwellings on Yarmouth Avenue. I also note the proposed building line would be similar to that of the properties on both sides of Yarmouth Avenue.
5. I have considered the photographs which show a variety of dwelling types and styles all within some 200 metres of the appeal site. I accept the proposal would be of a density which is similar to other dwellings in the area and the scheme would deliver a dwelling on a site less than one hectare in size. I have also considered the new dwelling recently constructed at No 138 Dysart Road (No 138).
6. However, No 138 is some distance away from the appeal site and attached to a dwelling with a different character and context to No 194 Dysart Road (No

194), it is not therefore comparable. Even though the appeal site is a corner plot and larger than others nearby, it would be sub-divided into two small narrow plots. The proposed dwelling would fill part of the space between the side elevation of the appeal property and Yarmouth Avenue. Together with the proposed parking for the proposed dwelling and No 194 only a narrow strip of private outside space to the side and a small shallow area to the rear would be provided.

7. Thus, the proposed dwelling, due to the limited space around it, would have a cramped appearance. When the proposal is considered in its immediate context, with its prominent corner positioning, it would appear in noticeable conflict with the spacious character of the area such that it would be an incongruous feature of the street scene. Whilst I acknowledge the proposed retained and enhanced boundary vegetation, this would not be sufficient to screen the proposal.
8. For these reasons the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy DE1 of the South Kesteven District Local Plan 2011-2036 (2020) which amongst other things seeks to secure good design. For the same reasons, the scheme would also conflict with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. In reaching these conclusions, I acknowledge the comments with regard to the Council's handling of the planning application. However, I confirm that I have determined the appeal with regard to its planning merits.
10. I also acknowledge the need for new homes nationally and locally. I accept the appeal proposal would deliver a home suitable for family occupation in a location where services, facilities and employment can be easily accessed by a range of sustainable transport choices. I note there would be economic benefits associated with construction, local expenditure and revenue for the Council. However, whilst I accept these are benefits, all of these matters or any other raised are insufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the development plan and the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR