
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2023

by S. Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/23/3329594

Cobthorne, 35 Village Streets, Millthorpe, Lincolnshire NG34 0LD

- 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 and Mrs Richardson against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref: S23/0749, dated 18 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and rear extension with a proposed link, conversion of outbuildings and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

The Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated at the eastern extremity of Millthorpe village which is a small linear settlement of houses of different designs, some located close to the road while others are set back from it in substantial plots.
4. The appeal property itself was originally a simple, two-storey, gable ended, pitch roofed rural dwelling located on the roadside. It has been extended to the rear by a two-storey addition at right angles to it and of comparable size and height, plus a single storey, flat roofed extension running alongside it on its western side. The property includes a range of separate outbuildings to the rear and running parallel to the original dwelling.
5. The proposed development includes the demolition of the single storey, flat roofed extension and its replacement by a two-storey addition to the existing two storey extension and which would be sited alongside it. It would have the same height as the existing rear addition and would replicate the latter's double pitched roof, creating two such roofs in parallel. Both the existing and proposed extension would have a greater length than the existing extension. Other alterations would be included to link the currently separate range of outbuildings and where some would be used for habitation purposes.
6. The existing extension, by its size and bulk and by its siting at ninety degrees to the original building, departs from the simple linear form of the original

dwelling. However, it is positioned to the rear of the building and the single storey part is largely, though not entirely, hidden behind an existing hedge against the highway.

7. Despite the existence of the rear extension, the simple form of the original dwelling is still evident when experienced by passers-by and this adds positively and distinctively to its character and appearance despite the additions to the rear.
8. The proposed two-storey side extension, by its height and bulk and siting would be more imposing when seen from the highway than the existing two-storey extension, located behind the original dwelling, together with the single addition which the proposed development would replace. The latter, apart from its roof, is hidden behind a tall hedge fronting the road, though I have taken account of the fact that the hedge with its existing height might not always be there. However, even if the hedge were not there, or if its height was reduced, the proposed development would form a dominant and unacceptably bulky addition which would have an adverse visual impact upon the simplicity of the original building, to the detriment of its character and appearance.
9. The proposed extension would be constructed in stone which would reflect the main materials in the original building. It would hide much of the red brick of the existing extension, though red brick is also a material used in the original dwelling and in respect of existing buildings to the rear of the property.
10. The LPA raises no specific objection with regard to the proposal to link the outbuildings to the main house and I find no reason to disagree.
11. However, overall, the proposed two-storey extension would be overly large, dominant, and prominent in relation to the original simple dwelling. It would fail to assimilate well with the simplicity of the original part of the stone property and would not appear sympathetic or subordinate in scale. Thus, it would constitute poor design and would have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area.
12. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to policy DE1 of the South Kesteven Local Plan 2020 which promotes good quality design that makes a positive contribution to local distinctiveness, and which reflects the vernacular of the area, and to chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 which requires the same.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR