



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2020

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A2470/D/20/3247287

The Old Pump House, Manton Road, Edith Weston LE15 8HB

- 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 Trevor & Margaret Jones against the decision of Rutland Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/1224/FUL, dated 4 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is 1st floor and side extensions addition to dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal forms give the agent's name 'Mr Kevin Jones' as the name of the appellant. The agent has subsequently confirmed that they have submitted the appeal on behalf of their parents. I have therefore taken the names of the appellants from the planning application forms and the Council's decision notice.
3. The plans submitted as part of the planning application show the existing building on the site to be single storey. On my site visit, I noted an extension had been erected at first floor level of a similar profile to part of the first-floor element of the proposal before me but with different window fenestration. The Council's report confirms that this is currently used by the appellant's for recreational activities including bird watching. However, I can't be certain from the evidence before me whether the structure relates in part to the appeal proposal. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis that the development proposed is not retrospective and the proposals are to extend the single storey building shown on the submitted drawings.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located away from the nearest settlement of Edith Weston. It is bound by metal mesh fencing with vegetation to the outer perimeter including a high hedge to the front boundary. The prevailing character is rural with neighbouring land generally consisting of fields. A golf course and the Rutland Water Nature Reserve are also situated within close proximity to the

- site. The existing single storey, flat roofed building is clad in wooden tiles and has solar panels installed to the roof.
6. Policy SP6 (Housing in the Countryside) of the Rutland Local Plan Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (2014) (DPD) states amongst other things that proposals to extend dwellings in the countryside will be permitted where development is within the existing curtilage, only results in a modest increase in the volume of the original dwelling, is in keeping with the character, footprint, size and design of the original dwelling and is not visually intrusive in the landscape.
 7. Paragraph 5.31 of the DPD confirms amongst other things that to be sufficiently modest in scale to not threaten the character and appearance of the area, a dwelling extension would not be expected, either individually or cumulatively, to exceed 50% of the volume of the existing building (measured externally). Extensions larger than this would need to clearly demonstrate the development would accord with the Council's policies on design and amenity.
 8. The evidence before me indicates that the existing building has a volume of 90.63 cubic metres (m³) and that the volume of the extended dwelling would be 181.62 m³. This would equate to a 100.39% increase in volume. On this basis the extension would significantly exceed the maximum allowance for extensions under Policy SP6. The proposal would conflict with the development plan unless it could be demonstrated that the development could be accommodated without having a detrimental impact on design and amenity.
 9. The dwelling is currently of modest scale and is set in from the side boundaries of the site. The boundary planting in place ensures its single storey height has a relatively discreet presence within the landscape. The extended dwelling would span the width of the plot and would be of an increased height for the majority of this width. First floor windows would be provided to the front and rear elevations. Even though facing materials are proposed to match the existing building, the increased scale of the dwelling and its domestic features would be more visible over the boundary treatments particularly for passers-by on Manton Road. Consequently, the larger dwelling that would result from the proposals would appear incongruous within the predominantly rural surroundings.
 10. The appellant has drawn my attention to a previously refused planning application for extensions to the building. In that particular instance the Council referred to an increase in floor area of more than 50% and the appellant contends they have subsequently reduced the increase in floor area to less than 50%. However, I must have regard to the development plan which specifically refers to volume as being the measurement by which extensions should be considered. Furthermore, regardless of the measurement taken, I have also found that the design of the proposal would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area and for this reason alone the development would conflict with the development plan.
 11. Some limited information has been provided in respect of other developments that have been allowed in the wider area. Given these relate in one case to the replacement of three houses with a single dwelling and ancillary development and in the other examples to bird watching hides, it is likely there were different material considerations in assessing the potential effects on the character and appearance of the area. The examples provided do not therefore

persuade me that the increased domestic presence that would result from the appeal proposal would protect the character and appearance of the area in this particular instance.

12. To conclude the development would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, in that regard, the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS19 (Promoting Good Design) and Policy CS24 (Rutland Water) of the Rutland Core Strategy (2011), Policies SP15 (Design and Amenity) and SP6 (Housing in the Countryside) of the DPD and Policies EW3 (The Environment) and EW4 (Countryside and Open Space) of the Edith Weston Neighbourhood Plan 2012 – 2026 (2014).

M Russell

INSPECTOR