



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2024

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A2470/D/23/3334892

19 Main Road, Barleythorpe, Oakham, RUTLAND, LE15 7EE

- 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 Hayley Travers against the decision of Rutland County Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/0789/FUL, dated 25 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is an increase in roof height to provide second floor accommodation, and front and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an increase in roof height to provide second floor accommodation, and front and rear extensions at 19 Main Road, Barleythorpe, Oakham, RUTLAND, LE15 7EE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2023/0789/FUL, dated 25 July 2023, and the plans submitted with it, 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: 079 203 Rev C; 079 204 Rev C.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed roof alterations on the character and appearance of the area around Bridge Street.

Reasons

3. No 19 is a detached house situated on the eastern side of Main Road, at the southern end of Barleythorpe and to the north-west of Oakham. It is set well back from the road and occupies much of the width of its narrow, but deep, plot. It has a complex arrangement of roofs, with two gable elements to the front and a central roof running north-south with a cat-slide front slope containing a dormer window. The proposed alterations would include the raising of the central roof slope and the resultant removal of one of the gable elements and the front dormer window. The alterations would enable the provision of additional living space at first- and second-floor level.
4. Policy CS19 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CS) indicates that new development should be appropriate and sympathetic to its setting in terms of scale, height, appearance, materials, and its relationship to adjoining buildings. Policy SP15 of the Council's Site Allocations and Policies

- Development Plan Document (SAP) indicates that development must complement the character of the local area; must be appropriate to the local context of the site and to the surrounding streetscape character in terms of scale, form, massing and height; and be appropriate to its context.
5. The Oakham and Barleythorpe Neighbourhood Plan (NP) indicates that all new development should demonstrate good quality design and respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It should effectively address such matters as scale, form, detailed design and materials; and streetscape.
 6. The Council's Extensions to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Development (SPD) indicates that extensions will be expected to respect the street scene, in terms of its scale, design and building materials.
 7. The Council contends that, by virtue of the design, and scale of the increase in the roof height of the original dwelling, the proposed development would result in an incongruous addition and result in overdevelopment of the original dwelling, and have an adverse impact on the streetscene.
 8. The appellant contends that the dwelling stands on a large, deep site and that the proposed extension would not result in overdevelopment. In addition, the increase in height would result in the house being only some 0.3 metres higher than the neighbouring row of houses to the east. Finally, the design of the alterations would bring the appearance of the house more into line with that of nearby dwellings.
 9. Nos 19 and 21 Main Road are set well back from the road. No 17, to the south, is part of a short terrace of older houses that are set much closer to the road and have an off-road parking area to the front. The terrace of houses, along with No 21, are characterised by pitched roofs running parallel to the road. By way of contrast, the appeal property has a complex and uncharacteristic arrangement of roof elements. The proposed alterations would involve the house having a more characteristic main roof running parallel to the road, with a single, narrow front gable to the southern side of the front elevation. In my opinion, this would result in No 19 appearing somewhat more in keeping with the general style of the houses to either side.
 10. The proposals would involve the roof level being raised to around 0.3 metres above the level of the roof ridges of the houses to either side. Given that No 19 is set well back from the row of houses to the south, this very limited increase in height would not result in the appeal property appearing in the street scene as higher or out of context with the scale of those houses. Similarly, it would not appear significantly out of scale with No 21 to the north.
 11. The Council has referred to an appeal decision on an earlier scheme proposed for No 19 which would have involved the roof being raised by around 1 metre more than this amended scheme. This appeal was dismissed, with the inspector concluding that "although Nos.19 and 21 Main Road are set much further back from the road than the older cottages, the dwellings within this row are all very similar in terms of height and have very limited space between them. Consequently, the increased roof height and mass would appear visually prominent and incongruous, in this row of modest dwellings".
 12. With regard to the current scheme, its significantly lower main roof ridge level would ensure that the dwellings along this part of the road would remain

similar in height, while the simplified roof arrangement proposed for the appeal property would ensure that it would not appear prominent or incongruous in the context of its surroundings. Moreover, the scheme would not increase the width of the house, which would remain set within a very deep plot, such that it would not represent overdevelopment of the dwelling within its site.

13. In the light of the above, I find that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the area along this part of Main Road. It would not conflict with Policy CS19 of the CS, Policy SP15 of the SAP, Policy 2 of the NP, or guidance in the SPD. Accordingly, I allow the appeal.

Other Matter

14. Although the decision notice indicates that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the amenities of a neighbouring property, the officer's report notes that 'the development would not result in any adverse impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring property'. I concur with that view, and I have not, therefore, addressed the issue in my deliberations above.

Conditions

15. The Council has suggested conditions relating to protected species. However, I note that the County Council Ecology Team have indicated that, in view of the fact that no evidence of bats was recorded in the submitted Preliminary Roost Assessment & Emergence Survey, no recommendations would be made. Given this, and the limited scale and nature of the proposal, I do not consider that any conditions are necessary in this case
16. I have, however, attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR