



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2023

by I A Dyer BSc (Eng) FCIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/W/22/3313843

28 Exeter Gardens, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2RN

- 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 J West & Miss O Landin against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref S22/1592, dated 8 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is replacement dwelling, including demolition of existing dwelling and revised vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr West and Miss Landin against South Kesteven District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site (the site) fronts onto Exeter Gardens, a street in an established residential area. The street has a narrow carriageway flanked by verges with footways behind. Dwellings are set back behind front gardens along roughly consistent building lines. The front gardens often accommodate car parking, yet a significant level of planting remains, giving the area a degree of verdancy.
5. Dwellings are predominantly detached, but of varying scale and design. Whilst traditional design is predominant, some dwellings have been extended, or plots developed with dwellings, which feature a more contemporary appearance. Overall, the area has a pleasant, spacious suburban feel with a high degree of verdancy.
6. The site lies between a modest bungalow (No 26) of traditional appearance and a substantial two-storey dwelling (No 30) with some contemporary detailing.
7. The proposed dwelling would be of a significantly increased scale, mass and built form when compared to the building that currently occupies the site,

8. The proposal would incorporate a crown roof with several projections to the front and rear, including dormer windows. The gable walls would be relatively featureless and would present a considerable expanse of brickwork. Whilst this would be screened, to a degree, in views along Exeter Gardens by No 30, the bulk of the wall and heavy surmounting roof form would be clearly visible behind the much more modest form of No 26.
9. This would present an incongruous and unacceptable contrast between the proposed dwelling and No 26 that would be out-of-keeping with the street scene. The overall scale and design of the proposal does not, therefore produce a harmonious street scene and would be harmful to the pleasant, spacious suburban feel of the area which I have identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
10. During the course of the application, the appellants amended their design, seeking to address the concerns of the Council. However, they did not successfully do so and the Council subsequently refused the application.
11. The appellants identify that the proposal is similar in scale to some nearby properties, its roof and eaves heights reflect similar ones on nearby properties and that several nearby properties possess dormer windows. They further argue that there is no consistent rhythm to the built form of the street and, therefore, the proposal would not disrupt such.
12. My attention has been brought to recent development in the area which took a more contemporary approach to design and which incorporate similar design features to those of the proposal.
13. There are dormer windows elsewhere in the area and so the incorporation of such would not be an incongruous feature. Similarly, there is a variety in building design and scale. However, the proposed dormers would, as part of the overall roof design, increase the building's disproportion in scale with its neighbour at No 26. Likewise, it is the cumulative effect of the different individual features in the sites particular location, such as the dormer windows, and the difference in eaves and roof heights, that would result in the over-dominant effect and which makes the impact of the proposal disharmonious with its neighbours.
14. Whilst the use of materials may affect the external appearance of the proposal, and materials selected would not be out of place in the area, they could not, of themselves, address the fundamental issue of the disproportionate scale of the proposal when seen in context of its neighbour at No 26.
15. Nearby recent development has taken a more contemporary approach to design and incorporated buildings of significant scale. In principle, such an approach would not necessarily result in an unacceptable design for a replacement dwelling on the site. I note that the Council has expressed a similar view. However, I have considered the proposal before me on its own merits.
16. I therefore conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. It would, therefore, be contrary to Policies SE3 and DE1 of the South Kesteven District Council Local Plan (2020) and Policy 2 of the Stamford Neighbourhood Plan (2022) which together, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development achieves

high quality design, makes a positive contribution to character of the area, and not have an adverse impact on the street scene.

17. These policies are in close accord with the aims of part 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, with which the development would also be in conflict.

Conclusion

18. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan and the Framework and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal has failed.

I A Dyer

INSPECTOR