



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 21 September 2021

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A2470/D/21/3277430

122 Welland Way, Oakham, Rutland LE15 6SZ

- 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 Paul Cooper against the decision of Rutland County Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/0147/FUL, dated 5 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey extension at 122 Welland Way, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6SZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/0147/FUL, dated 5 February 2021, subject to the following conditions
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; Existing Ground and First Floor Plans (drawing number: 21/1144/01); Proposed Floor Plans (drawing number: 21/1144/02a); Proposed Elevations (drawing number: 21/1144/04).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the submission of the appellant's appeal the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published and came into force on 20 July 2021. In light of this I have sought the views of the main parties in writing and comments received have been taken into consideration.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The area surrounding the appeal site is characterised predominantly by two storey semi-detached properties on a 1970's residential estate. The built form in the area is mixed with properties on different size plots including the appeal site which is described as having a site boundary on an angle relative to the

house. There are also variations in the styles of the properties with some having later additions, including the appeal property and nearby dwellings. It is this mix of built form and styles which contributes positively to the character of the area.

5. The proposed extension would have a ridgeline set down from the ridgeline of the main roof and the roof of the previous extension. The proposal would also be set back from the front building line of the property. In this regard, the proposal would appear as a subservient addition and not an incongruous feature within the street scene.
6. The proposal would abut the boundary of the site however given the angle of the boundary and position of the proposal, it would only be the corner of the extension that abuts the boundary. There would be space between the extension and the boundary to ensure that the proposal would not appear squeezed onto the site.
7. Due to the design, position and proximity of the proposal to the boundary, the extension would not be overdevelopment of the site and would blend in with the existing styles and built form of the surrounding area.
8. Accordingly, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would accord with Policy CS19 of the Rutland Core Strategy 2011, Policy SP15 of the Rutland Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document 2014, the Rutland Supplementary Planning Document Extensions to Dwellings 2015 and the Framework which seeks all new development to contribute positively to local distinctiveness and expect to meet requirements for good design.

Conditions

9. Conditions relating to timeliness and the identification of plans are necessary in the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty. In the interests of character and appearance, a condition is imposed in relation to materials.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR