
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A2470/D/19/3231740

9 St Andrew's Close, Whissendine, Oakham LE15 7HD

- 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 Wayne Windsor against the decision of Rutland County Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/0315/FUL, dated 21 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the development in the heading above is taken from the application form however, I have omitted the reference to the previous refusal of permission as this is not an act of development.
3. Although I noted at my site visit that there is decking to the front of the property. The drawings I have before me indicate a different decking arrangement. I have considered the scheme shown on the submitted drawings.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached house sited on an elevated corner plot at the junction of St Andrew's Close and Main Street. The property has previously been extended on the gable adjacent to 26 Main Street. St Andrew's Close is a small cul-de-sac of detached houses set in relatively spacious plots. Main Street is a village street with a mix of house types. Opposite the appeal property buildings are generally nearer to the road frontage, closer together and at a level with the street. Development on the same side of Main Street as the appeal property is generally raised above the level of Main Street and within more spacious plots.
6. The side gable of the appeal property faces St Andrew's Close with steps up from road level to the main entrance door in the side elevation. The extension would project out from the side gable wall occupying roughly half the space between the gable and the footpath. It would use similar materials and

detailing to the existing dwelling. The two-storey element would follow the roof form with a ridge lower than that of the existing roof. Additional landscaping would be incorporated into the design. Despite this, the height and projection of the extension from the existing gable wall, and its elevated position, would be a prominent and dominant feature from the footpath where there are no other buildings of that scale in such close proximity. The overall effect would be a visually intrusive extension that would detract from the spacious entrance to the cul-de-sac. Further, the extensions elevated siting would detract from the pleasant open views towards the cul-de-sac from Main Street.

7. For these reasons I find that the side extension would detract from the open and spacious surroundings of the appeal site and would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy CS19 of the Rutland Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document adopted July 2011, Policy SP15 of the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document adopted October 2014 and Supplementary Planning Document – Extensions to Dwellings March 2015 which collectively seek to ensure that development positively contributes to the unique character of villages and meets a high standard of design. Further, the extension would conflict with section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character.
8. The height, design and siting of the proposed new boundary wall would be sufficiently set back from the plot boundaries so that it would not be a significant feature of the street and I find the details of the wall acceptable. Further, the location and design of the decking to the front of the house would not be visually significant and would relate acceptably to the well screened front boundary along the Main Street frontage. I also find the decking to be acceptable.
9. I note the references to the Supplementary Planning Document - Garden Extensions March 2015 (SPDGE). In the introduction the SPDGE states that the guidance is for householders who wish to extend their gardens on to other land. As the application is for the erection of an extension, I consider this document has limited relevance to the appeal proposal.

Other Matters

10. I note the appellant's view that there may be other development that would not need planning permission that could be erected forward of the gable wall of the appeal property. However, I have not been provided with any specific details of an alternative scheme to compare with the appeal development and there is no evidence before me of any realistic prospect that an alternative scheme would be implemented.

Conclusion

11. I have concluded that the boundary wall and the decking would be acceptable. However, my findings on these matters do not outweigh the harm that the side extension would cause to the character and appearance of the area.
12. I find that overall the proposed development would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. Material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in

accordance with the development plan. Having considered all matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR