



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2023

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/23/3315773 150 Eastgate, Deeping St James, PE6 8RD

- 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 Chris Ray against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref S22/2074, dated 20 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is two-storey and single-storey front extension and enlargement of existing dormers to front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey and single-storey front extension and enlargement of existing dormers to front and rear at 150 Eastgate, Deeping St James, PE6 8RD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S22/2074, dated 20 October 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan – 001 rev A; existing and proposed block plan – 002 rev B; existing ground floor plan – 003; existing first floor plan – 004; existing roof plan – 005; existing elevations sheet 1 – 006; existing elevations sheet 2 – 007; proposed ground floor plan – 008 rev J; proposed first floor plan – 009 rev J; proposed roof plan – 010 rev J; proposed elevations sheet 1–011 rev J; proposed elevations sheet 2 – 012 rev J; visual 1 – front; and visual 2 rear.
 - 3) Except for the timber cladding, 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the streetscene

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling. At the front it appears as a 'chalet' bungalow with first-floor dormer windows. At the rear there is a mixture of

dormers and a more traditional two-storey element. Eastgate comprises a linear row of dwellings that vary considerably in terms of their age, scale and appearance. Apart from their detached form, there is no particular building characteristic on this part of the road. Likewise, the appeal property has no distinctive features that would preclude changes to its appearance.

4. The appeal proposal would substantially alter the scale and appearance of the dwelling by extending at the property at both the front and rear. The alterations at the front include a projecting single-storey garage and first floor gabled extensions. The gables would be timber clad. At the rear, the alterations comprise a gabled and flat roofed extensions on the first floor. A balcony is also proposed overlooking the rear garden. The appeal proposal follows two earlier applications, one was refused by the Council (reference S21/2454) and the other was withdrawn (S22/1300). The appellant points out that the current appeal proposal involves a reduction in the scale of the projecting front facing garage.
5. The Council contends that the proposal would be out of keeping with the existing dwelling because of its scale, the projecting garage and the use of timber cladding. It argues that the proposal would conflict with Policy DE1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan and with Policy DNP9 of the Deepings Neighbourhood Plan. These policies seek (amongst other things) to promote good quality design and for development to reflect the positive features that contribute to the character of the area. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Design Guidelines also advises that extensions should respect the scale and character of the existing dwelling.
6. Although the proposal would increase the scale and overall mass of the property, I am not persuaded that it would be unacceptably harmful. As stated above the existing property is of no particular architectural merit and the streetscene along this section of Eastgate varies in terms of the scale, age and design of properties. Projections at the front of dwellings are evident, including at numbers 148 and 160 Eastgate. These projections are comparable to the appeal proposal and do not appear harmful to the streetscene.
7. Furthermore, I consider the design of the individual components of the proposal to be acceptable in terms of their proportions and overall detail. Whilst cladding is not a common material found on properties along Eastgate, there is a wide variety of external facing materials on other dwellings. This includes different colours of render and different colours and types of brickwork. Because of this variety in materials and design, I do not find the introduction of timber cladding to be unacceptable.
8. I note that the Council considers that the proposal would not impact on the setting of Osier Farm at number 141B Eastgate (which is a Grade II listed building), because of the separation distance between the properties. I have no reason to disagree with that assessment. I also concur with the Council that the proposal would not have an unacceptably harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring dwellings.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. In addition to the standard condition requiring the development to commence within 3 years, I have also imposed a condition specifying the approved plans.

A further condition is imposed which requires the external facing materials (except for the timber cladding) to match as closely as possible those used on the existing dwelling. This is necessary to ensure a satisfactory external appearance.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the proposal would not be unacceptably harmful to the character or appearance of either the existing dwelling or the streetscene. Therefore, it is concluded that the appeal be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR