



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A2470/D/21/3285073

Sawpit Cottage, 7 Kings Lane, Barrowden, Oakham, Rutland LE15 8EF

- 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 Mrs Wendy Sullivan against the decision of Rutland County Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/0153/FUL, dated 5 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue relevant to this appeal is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site contains a bungalow that assimilates into the traditional character of the surrounding area owing to it being constructed from stone. The surrounding dwellings feature some extensions and alterations however, the prevailing trend is that these have also been constructed from traditional stonework.
4. The proposed development would comprise a porch constructed from wood. This would contrast with the prevailing character of the appellant's dwelling and the surrounding area given the absence of this material within nearby buildings. Buildings within the surrounding area are typically constructed from similar types of stonework. This means that the character of the surrounding area features a limited variation in terms of different building colours. Therefore, the presence of a wooden elevation would be incongruous.
5. The incongruous form of development would be highlighted by the relative lack of wood in other structures in the surrounding area. The presence of wood is generally limited to a small level of boundary treatments. In result, the erection of a porch with a wooden elevation would appear incongruous.
6. In addition, owing to the topography of the surrounding area and the pattern of development in the surrounding area, the side elevation of the proposed porch would be readily apparent from several different viewpoints.
7. This would be exacerbated by the relatively low boundary treatments that are present at the appeal site. When combined with an open section on the appeal

- site's boundary due to the presence of a driveway, the proposed development would be clearly visible.
8. For these reasons and given the contrast between the wood elevation and the stonework present on the rest of the appellant's dwelling, the proposed development would also be strident.
 9. The appellant has suggested that wood is a traditional building material. Whilst I am conscious that whilst, in general, there are a number of buildings of notable age that have been constructed from this material, these are very limited within the environs of the appeal site. Therefore, the proposed development would not harmonise with its surroundings and would, in result, be incongruous.
 10. The contrasting materials generate concern given that the boundaries of the appeal sites are relatively small in nature and have a limited height. This means that the proposed porch and its contrasting materials would be readily perceptible from vantage points outside of the appeal site.
 11. My attention has been drawn to examples of wood elsewhere. I do not have the full information regarding the planning circumstances of these, which lessens the weight that I can attribute to them. Nonetheless, I note that, in general, these are located some distance away from the appeal site or within areas with a greater variety of built materials. Therefore, they do not have the same effects as the appeal proposal would have. In result, the presence of wood elsewhere does not overcome my previous observations.
 12. The proposed development would result in improvements to the appellant's living conditions owing to matters including the increased circulation space, as well as improvements to thermal efficiency. Whilst these are matters of note, they do not overcome my previously identified concerns.
 13. In considering this appeal, I have been directed towards the Neighbourhood Plan, which seeks to ensure that additions and alterations to building are constructed from materials that are complementary to those used elsewhere within the village. As the Neighbourhood Plan has been the subject of a successful referendum and has been adopted, it carries full weight in my assessments.
 14. Therefore, the breach of the Neighbourhood Plan, from which harm would emanate, is a notable concern. This remains the case even though the Council has not cited any potential breaches of other development plan documents or policies.
 15. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policy BW6 of the Barrowden and Wakerley Neighbourhood Plan (2019). Amongst other matters, this seeks to ensure that new elevations visible from the public realm are constructed from local-style rubble stone.

Other Matters

16. The appeal site is located within the Barrowden Conservation Area (the CA). However, given that I am dismissing the appeal, the proposed amendments

would not result in changes to the way in which the CA is experienced. Therefore, I do not need to give this matter further consideration.

17. I acknowledge concerns raised by the appellant regarding the manner in which the planning application was considered by the council. however, in considering this appeal, I have limited my assessments to the planning matters before me.
18. My attention has been drawn to letters of support in favour of the proposed development. However, these are only some of all the matters that must be considered and therefore do not overcome my previous conclusions.

Conclusion

19. The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The scheme would therefore conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the preceding reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR