



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Richard Clegg BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A2470/D/19/3242659

1 Beech Drive, Ryhall, PE9 4EW

- 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 & Mrs Neve against the decision of Rutland County Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/1004/FUL, dated 9 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is an extension & alterations to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and of the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. 1 Beech Drive is a detached, two storey dwelling located in a prominent position, on a corner plot, at a slightly elevated level in relation to its adjoining neighbouring dwelling. The appeal dwelling has a pitched roof, a gable element facing the road and an attached single storey flat roofed garage/office to the front. Neighbouring properties are similar in terms of scale and design, although there are some variations as some of them have been extended and/or have changed materials.
 5. The proposal seeks to extend the first floor to the side and front, with the front extension projecting above part of the existing garage. It also includes a single storey porch to the front, a hipped roof for the remaining single storey garage, internal alterations, re-roofing the property and the insertion of rooflights in the front roof slope. The external alterations also include render and timber cladding.
 6. The first-floor side extension would follow the existing ridge line and would project along the full depth of the main part of the dwelling. The first-floor front extension would add a second gable feature to the front, which would project
-

along the full width of the garage, thus it would be wider than the existing front gable element, and would follow the eaves height of the main dwelling. Its ridge height would be similar to that of the main dwelling, thus higher than that of the existing front gable element. Whilst the first-floor front extension would not project along the full depth of the garage, it would still have a significant forward projection.

7. The proposal, particularly due to the depth, height and overall mass of the first-floor elements, would result in a bulky addition to the front and south side of the house, which would appear out of proportion with the existing dwelling. Thus, the development would be an incongruous addition to the appeal property.
8. The increased massing would make the dwelling considerably more substantial and thereby more dominant when viewed within the street scene. I note that the appeal dwelling is set-back from the road and that the extensions would also be at a distance from the highway. Notwithstanding this, given the prominent position of the appeal site within the streetscene, the incongruous appearance of the development would be clearly visible. The extension would not harmonise with the scale and proportions of the host dwelling, or complement or improve the character and appearance of the street scene.
9. Accordingly, I conclude that through a combination of its scale, form and siting, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and of the street scene. Therefore, the development would be contrary to the objectives of Policy CS19 of the Rutland Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policy SP15 of the Site Allocations & Policies Development Plan Document, which together require, amongst other things, that development is appropriate and sympathetic to its setting in terms of scale, height, appearance and integrates well within the surrounding local area.

Other matters

10. Whilst the appellants stated that neighbouring properties have had similar alterations, no details of these have been provided. I note that neighbouring dwellings vary in terms of materials and form, and that some of them have had alterations to their garage roofs. However, 1 Beech Drive is in a prominent position and, in any event, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.
11. The proposal has not been found unacceptable in terms of its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Nonetheless, this is a neutral matter rather than one that carries weight in favour of the scheme.
12. I note that no objections have been made by third parties. However, a lack of objections from neighbours is not a determinative factor.
13. I acknowledge that the appellants were willing to amend the proposal. However, this was a matter for the Council and no adjustments to the design are before me in this appeal.

Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Richard Clegg

INSPECTOR