



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 July 2023

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/23/3318668

17 Dallygate, Great Ponton, Lincolnshire NG33 5DP

- 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 & Mrs R and C Pitt against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref: S22/2422, dated 12 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'extension to dwelling'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a small detached bungalow with pitched roof with flat roofed garage to the side. The dwelling is set back from Dallygate, with off-street parking to the front. The property lies within a short row of bungalows of similar scale at an edge of village location. Views of the dwelling from Dallygate to the west are generally screened by existing vegetation, while from the east the dwelling is viewed against the backdrop of a school, and dwellings on Mill Lane which are located on higher land. The modest scale of the dwelling and the surrounding context makes for an unassuming property within its plot.
4. The proposed extension comprises the redevelopment of the existing garage involving two storeys and a single storey extension beyond this.
5. The height of the two-storey extension would significantly exceed the ridge height of the existing dwelling, with a roof design incorporating a hipped and straight gable to rear. This design serves to exacerbate the incongruous nature of this part of the scheme when compared to the scale of the existing dwelling and the adjacent row of bungalows. It would be a discordant element in the streetscene.
6. Furthermore, the single storey extension, would be constructed up to the site boundary, would have a height that exceeds the eaves height of the existing dwelling and would project towards the frontage. These features serve to mark this part of the scheme as an incongruous feature in the streetscene.

7. While generally well screened from the west, the extension would be particularly prominent when approaching the site along Dallygate from the east. The extensions would be out of character with the scale and modest design of this group of bungalows.
8. It has been advanced that a viable fallback position exists through the creation of an additional floor above the existing bungalow¹. The Council has confirmed that prior approval would not be required² and, as such, a realistic fallback position exists. The additional storey would be across the whole width of the dwelling and would have a regular and consistent form and appearance. The prior approval scheme would harmonise with the existing dwelling and surrounding area more successfully than the appeal proposals would. Therefore, I find that the fallback position would have a less harmful effect on the character of the dwelling and surrounding area.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area in conflict with Policy DE1 of the South Kesteven District Council Local Plan 2011-2036 (2020), 6G of the Design Guidelines for Rutland and South Kesteven Supplementary Planning Document (2021), and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). Together, amongst other things, these require that development should be of an appropriate scale, massing and height given its local context.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that pre-application community consultation was carried out by the appellant and the feedback from that exercise was generally favourable, including support from the Parish Council. However, such support would not outweigh the harm that I have identified and, in any event, I have considered the appeal on its merits.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR

¹ Under Class AA of the GPDO 2015

² S21/2164, decision issued 04/01/22