



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2024

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/D/24/3342572

1 Brook Terrace, High Street, Wroot, Lincolnshire, DN9 2BY

- 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 Sam Jones against the decision of North Lincolnshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PA/2023/1923.
 - The development proposed is described as 'two storey extension to existing dwelling'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene and the area.
3. Wroot is a linear village with dwellings of varying ages and styles along both sides of High Street. The appeal dwelling is a two bedroomed house at the eastern end of a row comprising four pairs of semi-detached houses that were built to a homogenous design of wide front elevations with main pitched roofs and central projecting sections with catslide roofs. Whilst the dwellings have a modest style, the simplicity and consistency of their design contributes positively to the character and appearance of the street scene and the area. Although the dwelling at the opposite, western end of the row has been extended to the side with a single storey extension, that extension has a pitched roof to match the main roof and its single storey form and matching roof have resulted in a subsidiary addition that does not detract from the consistent form and symmetry of that pair of dwellings or the row. None of the dwellings has been extended with a two storey front extension as proposed here.
4. The proposal would provide a third bedroom at first floor level together with additional ground floor accommodation. It would project forward of the dwelling by some 3.8m, extending across less than half of its width. It would have a gabled roof whose ridge would sit well below that of the main ridge. Whilst the size and scale of the proposal would be sufficiently subservient to the size and scale of the dwelling, its two storey form and siting on the front elevation would disrupt the form and symmetry of the pair and the row. The gabled roof form would appear at odds with the pitched and catslide roof forms of the dwellings.

5. The neighbouring property to the east, Vine House, is a traditional, detached dwelling that is set significantly forward of the appeal dwelling. It has a deep side elevation and a light coloured render finish that gives it some prominence in the street scene. The proposed extension would be set back some distance from the front elevation of Vine House which would obscure views in the approach along High Street from the east. It would, however, be clearly seen from the access and in the approach from the west along High Street. The appellant considers that it would 'bookend' the row of semis 'in a pleasing manner' and 'bridge the jarring distance' between the two. I agree that the siting of Vine House would help reduce its impact in the street scene to some degree. However, given the separation by the appellant's driveway and the difference in building lines, it would be seen as part of the row of semis rather than closely related to Vine House and would still have an unbalancing effect on both the pair of semi-detached houses and the row.
6. I have noted the appellant's claim that the proposal would improve the energy efficiency of the dwelling and would meet the need for additional space for the occupants. However, I have no reason to believe that those objectives could not be met by extending the property in some other way that would have a less harmful impact on the street scene.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development, by reason of its siting and gabled roof form, would significantly harm the character and appearance of the street scene and the area. As such it would conflict with development plan policies CS5 of the Core Strategy (2011) and policies DS1, DS5 of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2003) which together seek to ensure that development creates high quality streetscapes, reflects or enhances the character and appearance of the immediate area and is sympathetic to the dwelling and neighbouring dwellings. It would also conflict with the Framework which has similar objectives.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal is not in accordance with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector