
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2016

by S J Lee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22ND November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/A2470/W/16/3156473
6 Stamford Road, Ketton, Rutland PE9 3ST

- 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 Tim Wade against the decision of Rutland Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/0567/FUL was refused by notice dated 21 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension above single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms part of a row of four terraced houses. These are well set back from the road behind long drives and gardens. The two end terrace buildings have projecting front gables, with the two dwellings in between presenting their roof slopes to the road. Both have two symmetrical gablets above the first floor windows which interrupt the line of the eaves.
 4. There is an existing single storey porch extension on the front of the house. This extends to just under the sill height of the first floor windows and projects slightly beyond the building line of the end dwellings. As well as acting as a porch, this also includes a WC. I also noted that there were single storey porches on two other dwellings in the row which differ in size and style to that of the appeal site. While the uniformity of the terrace has already been altered as a result of these alterations, the basic character of the terrace remains largely intact. The ground floor extensions are small scale and do not alter the balance of the housing and are clearly subservient to their host dwelling.
 5. Although the extension would not project out any further than the existing ground floor structure, the increase in height and the inclusion of the dormer window would make it far more prominent and unduly dominant feature on the front elevation. This would have a fundamental and detrimental impact on the balance of the host dwelling and the symmetrical nature of the terrace at first floor level.
 6. The pitch of the roof, the blocky design and siting of the dormer below the eaves of the main roof would appear incongruous and unsympathetic to the
-

main house. This would be exacerbated by the width of the extension, which would appear uncomfortably squeezed between the first floor windows. This cramped appearance would further accentuate the overly prominent and dominant nature of the development. Overall, I find that the design has had little regard to the character or appearance of the original house or that of the terrace.

7. There is one block of terraces on either side of that of the appeal site which are of the same original design. While the dwellings are set back from the road, they are located within an area of largely open countryside. This open setting ensures that the dwellings remain prominent features. Again, while some of the dwellings in these rows have altered the appearance of their front elevations, I saw no other two storey extensions. The development would not, therefore, reflect the overriding character of the street scene. The inappropriate change in character resulting from the development would also, therefore, materially harm the appearance of this small group of dwellings.
8. In conclusion, I find that the development would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would conflict with policy CS19 of Adopted Core Strategy (2011), policies SP6 and SP15 of the Adopted Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (2014) and the Extensions to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document (2015) which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that extensions are in-keeping with the character of the original dwelling and are not visually intrusive.

Other matters

9. The appellant has drawn my attention to another development in the area which he considers illustrate an inconsistent approach in the Council's application of the relevant policies. I had the opportunity to view the site mentioned and it was clear that it was not a comparable scheme to that before me. Moreover, I have not been provided with the full details of this application and thus cannot conclude that there has been any inconsistency in the Council's approach. In any case, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
10. While the use of matching materials is noted, the development would not constitute an improvement over the existing situation. Furthermore, the current incomplete appearance of the ground floor structure is not a sufficient justification for permitting an inappropriate form of development. While there would be no material harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, this also does not alter my overall conclusion.
11. In coming to this conclusion, I have had regard to the personal circumstances of the appellant. However, these are not sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S J Lee

INSPECTOR