



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/25/3371108

1 Dale Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 8EF

- 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 Lewis Watson against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref is S25/0602.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Proposal for a single-storey extension at the side and rear of the property, including internal modifications'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a small detached bungalow located in an area of dwellings that appear to have been built in the 1960's. The area contains a mix of houses, both detached and semi-detached, and detached bungalows. Whilst some have been altered or extended including the house opposite, they were built to a consistent style typical of that period with front elevations set back from the road.
4. 1 Dale Road occupies a corner plot at the junction of Dale Road and Sandcliffe Road. Its main, front elevation faces onto Dale Road with a side elevation facing onto Sandcliffe Road and set behind a hedge. A single width drive is sited at the end of the rear garden with open access from Sandcliffe Road to a single detached garage.
5. The proposed development comprises a large wraparound single storey extension to the side elevation onto Sandcliffe Road and to the rear elevation which can be seen from Sandcliffe Road across the drive. The ridge height of the main pitched roof would be continued to extend the bungalow to the side with a lower gabled roof over the proposed front and rear projections and a 'cathedral' window in the rear gabled elevation. A flat roof extension would fill in the gap between that and an existing flat roof extension on the rear elevation. The proposed gabled front elevation would reflect the smaller existing front gable in terms of pitch resulting in a twin gabled front elevation. The design of the elevations therefore achieves a sense of cohesion that reflects the single storey form and roof design of bungalows in the area, albeit with a contemporary appearance.

6. The Council's concerns relate to the size and siting of the proposal. Whilst dwellings generally follow the curve of the road in a staggered building line, the side elevation of the existing bungalow already projects forward of the front elevation of the neighbouring bungalow at 20 Sandcliffe Road adjacent to the rear of the site. Although the building line would be brought closer to Sandcliffe Road, this is a side elevation that would be partially screened by the retention of the existing hedge and it would not be significantly further forward of the building line of the bungalow on the opposite corner at 18 Sandcliffe Road. I therefore disagree with the Council in regards to the bringing forward of the building line at the side and find that this would be acceptable.
7. However, I do have concerns regarding the overdevelopment of the plot at the rear. The rear elevation of the extension would be less than 5m from the boundary with 20 Sandcliffe Road at the closest point to the road. As the application does not include any changes to parking or boundary arrangements (other than a dotted line on the plans indicating the removal of the garage), this would mean that the rear elevation that contains the kitchen and lounge windows would be separated from that boundary by only the drive and would be clearly visible from Sandcliffe Road, with only a small area of rear garden remaining, measuring approximately 10m by 8m. The proposal would therefore have a cramped appearance in the street scene at this point. As such, despite its single storey height, the siting and length of the rear projection would be unacceptable and would be overly dominant in the street scene.
8. Although the proposed development would provide additional space for the occupants of the dwelling, I have no supporting evidence to indicate that there is a particular shortage of this type of accommodation in the area and that would be a private benefit that does not outweigh the wider public harm I have identified.
9. Any economic benefit arising from construction or increased Council Tax would be small and carries only very limited weight that is insufficient in this case to outweigh the harm that would be caused.
10. I find, therefore, that the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to development plan policy DE1 of the South Kesteven Local Plan which seeks to ensure that proposals are of a high quality design that does not have an adverse impact on the street scene.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR