



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2024

**by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 18 October 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/24/3351692**

**19 Rosedale Drive, Grantham, Lincolnshire NG31 8PY**

- 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 Ian Parkin against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
  - The application Ref is S24/0086.
  - The development proposed is porch to front elevation and first floor extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for porch to front elevation and first floor extension at 19 Rosedale Drive, Grantham, Lincolnshire NG31 8PY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S24/0086, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
  - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan and 23.080PL01-2, with the exception of the external rendering indicated on plan 23.080PL01-2.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the use of external render on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. Notwithstanding the wording of the Council's reason for refusing the appeal planning application, it is clear from the appeal evidence that there is no objection to the design of the porch and extension. There are no reasons to disagree. However, it is proposed to render the proposed porch and extension, as well as the exterior of the appeal property (No 19). This is the matter which is in dispute and is therefore the focus of this Decision.
4. No 19 stands in a relatively recent housing estate in which the properties appear to have been developed at around the same time. Their external walls comprise predominantly brickwork with a variety of detailing. These materials

are replicated, with variations, throughout the estate. The consistent palette of materials used provides a sense of homogeneity and identifiable local character.

5. There is no conclusive evidence with this appeal that indicates whether No 19 or the other houses referred to could be rendered under permitted development rights. But in any event, within the context of an estate where brickwork is the predominant external material, the use of render as proposed would lead to No 19 having a highly prominent and somewhat stark appearance. It would be visually jarring and out of keeping with the character of the buildings in its visual context.
6. I have considered the examples submitted by the appellant indicating where render has been used in the locality. However, the identified render and cladding have been used sparingly as design details on predominantly brick dwellings. They are therefore significantly different from the totally rendered exterior indicated in the appeal proposal. The other examples are some distance from the appeal site and are not within the immediate visual context of No 19. Their designs are also significantly different to those of the properties in the appeal housing estate. Accordingly, these examples can be attributed very little weight in this decision. Furthermore, the proposed materials would not be innovative or amount to a positive change to the local area as the appellant suggests.
7. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposed materials would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling or its surroundings. In this regard the proposal is contrary to Policy DE1 of the South Kesteven Local Plan 2011-2036, the Design Guidelines SPD, and the design guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. However, as the design of the proposed extensions would be acceptable and exterior materials can be controlled by condition, in this regard the appeal would comply with those same policies and guidance and should therefore be allowed.
8. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed subject to a condition requiring the external materials to match those used in the host property in order to safeguard visual amenities. I have included a condition identifying the approved drawings in the interests of proper planning. For completeness and the avoidance of doubt, the wording of this condition excludes the use of the materials shown on drawing 23.080PL01-2 as it indicates external rendering.

*Elaine Benson*

INSPECTOR