The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 March 2017

by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A2470/D/17/3169565
85 Main Street, Greetham, Rutland LE15 7NJ

- 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 and Mrs Richard and Alison Brett against the decision of Rutland County Council.
- The application Ref 2016/1043/FUL, dated 14 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2016.
- The development proposed is the addition of front porch.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Greetham Conservation Area (GCA).

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a detached and extended two storey stone cottage. Its slightly elevated position, open aspect and road frontage siting make it prominent in the street scene. These factors, coupled with its traditional design, proportions and use of materials mean it also makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the GCA.

4. Stone built two storey cottages facing and opening directly onto the road are a key feature of the GCA, Main Street in particular. In general, porches are not a defining element of the street scene, such features being limited to lightweight canopies over doors on newer properties.

5. The proposed porch, by virtue of its fully enclosed design and scale, would be an obvious addition. It would detract from the simple flush frontage of the building as it presents to the street. It would also be at odds with the small and simple openings that characterise its front elevation. Whilst limited in its overall floor area, the impression of the height and scale of the porch would be exacerbated by the elevated positioning of the dwelling.

6. The proposed development would therefore give rise to harm to the character and appearance of the GCA. This harm would be less than substantial. With

regard to paragraph 134 of the Framework[1], this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development.

7. I have very limited evidence before me that increased privacy and safety for children and pets would be of benefit to the public. With regard to National Government's drive towards reducing energy consumption however, I can see that the porch would be beneficial to retaining heat within the building through minimising air loss through the existing door. Nevertheless, on its own this benefit is limited and as such not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.

8. For the above reasons, the proposed development would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the GCA. As such, it would conflict with Policies CS19 and CS22 of the Core Strategy[2] and Policies SP15 and SP20 of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD[3]. These Policies, along with sections 7 and 12 of the Framework, seek to ensure that new development is of a high quality and contextually appropriate design and appearance and that the historic environment is protected, preserved or enhanced through new development.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge the design, siting and scale of the porch to the front of the Wheatsheaf Public House (PH) which is in close proximity to the appeal building. The proposed development would appear to emulate this. However, the complex that makes up the PH is a different scale and orientation to the appeal building, as well as the front elevation being enclosed by a substantial garden. I do not therefore consider that the two sites, despite how close they are, are sufficiently similar to justify the proposed development.

10. I also note that there has been some support locally for the porch and the Parish Council in particular did not object subject to an appropriate new door. Notwithstanding this, it does not automatically follow that an assessment of the proposed development in the context of the character and appearance of the GCA should be any less robust. The lack of objection is not enough to make the porch acceptable in planning terms.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR

[1] The National Planning Policy Framework 2012
[2] Rutland Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011
[3] Rutland Local Plan Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document 2014