



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2024

by G Dring BA (Hons) MA MRTPI MAUDE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/24/3344591

Lilac House Casthorpe Road, Barrowby, Lincolnshire NG32 1DP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Stuart McGregor against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref is S23/2278.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and construction of new two storey extension including garaging, gym, bedrooms and home office.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage and construction of new two storey extension including garaging, gym, bedrooms and home office and erection of boundary wall and gates at Lilac House Casthorpe Road, Barrowby, Lincolnshire NG32 1DP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S23/2278, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers: 203.P01 Revision A, 203.P02 A, 203.P03 and 203.P04.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) No works shall take place on the boundary wall until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the wall hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above in the banner heading, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details along with the Council's description of the proposal on its decision notice, that the development also comprises a boundary wall and gates. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I. As a result, I have amended the description of the development in the decision section above to include the boundary wall and gates, in the interests of clarity.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Notwithstanding the description of the existing property set out in the evaluation section of the Council's officer report, it is clear from the submitted drawings and my site visit that Lilac House is a two storey detached dwelling, not a bungalow. To the front of the dwelling is a detached single storey garage with an office accommodated in the roofspace.
5. Casthorpe Road is characterised by a mix of large detached properties situated in deep plots with relatively wide frontages, with dwellings set back from the road. The properties vary considerably in their individual design characteristics and form. It appears that some of the properties have been altered and extended in the past. There are several properties within close proximity of the appeal site that have projecting wings of differing heights, to the front elevations.
6. There are a wide range of front boundary treatments along Casthorpe Road, of varying heights, including brick walls, close boarded fencing, post and rail fencing, hedgerows and planting. The spacious plots and individuality of design of both dwellings and front boundary treatments contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
7. By reason of the projection proposed, the front extension would have a transformative effect upon the appearance of the property when viewed from the road. Nevertheless, the proposed extension would be set back from the road, in keeping with other separation distances within the area. The extension would be lower than the existing dwelling with the first floor accommodation provided for in the roofspace meaning it would appear subservient. Given the overall size of the plot, the proposed extension would not result in a dwelling that would appear overdeveloped or cramped within the plot.
8. Given the variation in the built form prevalent within the area and that front projections are an established feature in the vicinity, the proposed extension would not appear at odds with the character and appearance of the area.
9. The proposed brick wall along the front boundary at 1.2m in height would reflect the height and materials of other front boundary treatments along Casthorpe Road. Given the height of the proposed wall, it would still allow views into the appeal site meaning it would not result in a dominant or oppressive appearance.
10. I therefore find that the proposal would accord with Policy DE1 of the South Kesteven District Council Local Plan 2011-2036 January 2020 which seeks, amongst other things, that proposals make a positive contribution to the local distinctiveness, vernacular and character of the area. For the same reasons the proposal would accord with section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to achieving well designed and beautiful places.

Other Matters

11. An interested party has raised concerns about the proposal. Whilst the previous owner of the appeal property may not have required additional living or garage space, that does not preclude the appellant from applying for the additional space they wish to provide.
12. I was able to view the relationship between the appeal site and the neighbouring properties from the road. The hedge along the western boundary does provide significant screening and whilst the roof of the proposal may be visible above it, it would pitch away from the boundary limiting its overall effect in visual terms. The Council has not raised any concerns in its reason for refusal about the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. For the above reasons, I can find no reason to disagree.

Conditions

13. The Council suggested three conditions within its questionnaire which I have considered with regard to the tests set out in the Framework and the information in the Planning Practice Guidance. I attach a standard time condition. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans is necessary to define the development which is granted consent in the interests of clarity.
14. A materials condition is required in relation to the extension to ensure an appropriate finish in accordance with the details submitted, to match the existing dwelling. Limited details are provided with the application about the materials proposed for the boundary wall, I have therefore added a condition requiring details of the materials to be submitted to and approved by the Council prior to works commencing on this element of the scheme.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

G Dring

INSPECTOR