



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2023

by R Gee BA (Hons) Dip TP PGCert UD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A2470/D/23/3322423

18 Cresswell Drive, Cottesmore, Rutland LE15 7DY

- 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 Rachael Jaques against the decision of Rutland County Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/0163/FUL, dated 14 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension (with the first-floor element to be flush with the house).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. For clarity, I have taken the description from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form, as it more accurately describes the proposal. In doing so I have removed words that are not acts of development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within a well-established residential area comprising a mix of detached and semi-detached houses of a similar scale. The host property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling and is largely symmetrical to the adjoining property when viewed from the street. The symmetry of the pair makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the properties and the wider street scene.
5. The guidance contained within the Rutland Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Extensions to Dwellings suggests that the ridge height of a side extension should be set below the existing ridge height to ensure the extension is subordinate to the original house.
6. The proposed development would be flush with the front elevation of the existing dwelling and the eaves and ridge would be a continuation of the existing roof profile. Consequently, the proposal would fail to be subservient to the original dwelling.
7. I acknowledge the gap that would be retained between the proposed extension and the side boundary, nevertheless, in visual terms the gap between neighbouring dwellings would be significantly reduced and its loss would

contribute towards a terracing effect due to the close proximity of the neighbouring property. Given the prominent location of the dwelling within the cul-de-sac this would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the streetscene.

8. I note the proposed extension would create symmetry to the host dwelling and would provide the occupants with additional accommodation, however, these are neutral factors in the determination of this appeal.
9. My attention has been drawn to other houses in the locality that have been extended. However, as observed at my site visit the circumstances differ in that the dwellings either occupy corner plots or their relationship to neighbouring properties and the space between built form differs. Accordingly, these other examples are not directly comparable with the appeal proposal. In any event, I have considered the appeal scheme on its own merits.
10. The Council is satisfied with the proposed single-storey element of the extension, and I see no reason to disagree.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. This is contrary to Policy CS19 of the Rutland Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 (CS), Policy SP15 of the Rutland Local Plan Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document 2014 (DPD) and Policy COT H5 of the Cottesmore Neighbourhood Plan (NP). Collectively, these policies require design that responds positively to local distinctiveness and the character of the area; and that extensions respect the scale and character of the host building. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires high quality development that is sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

12. The rear boundary of the appeal site adjoins the Cottesmore Conservation Area (CA). The appeal site is viewed in the context of the more recent suburban housing and has a neutral impact on the significance of the CA. The Council did not include a reason for refusal based on the impact upon the setting of the CA. Based on the plans before me, and as observed at my site visit, I do not consider the proposal would have an adverse impact upon the setting of the CA. However, compliance with the development plan in this respect is a neutral matter.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, having regard to all the policies brought to my attention, the conflict with Policy CS19 of the CS, Policy SP15 of the DPD and Policy COTH5 of the NP leads me to conclude that there is conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations which would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

R. Gee

INSPECTOR