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| Max Robson14 Kings RoadNorth LuffenhamRutlandLE15 8JH | Ismael KiyaniRegusCentral BoulevardBlythe Valley ParkSolihullB90 8AG |

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

**REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION**

Applicant Name and Address Agent Name and Address

Date of Validation Application Number:

30 June 2025 2025/0749/FUL

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PROPOSAL: | Proposed front porch, two storey side extension, additional onsite parking and widening of the existing vehicle access |
| LOCATION: | 14 Kings Road North Luffenham Rutland LE15 8JH  |

**REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION** for the following reasons:

1. The proposed two storey side extension would result in the over development of the application property and would not be sympathetic to the form and design of the host residential block as an architectural unit. This, when combined with its size and design, would make the extension appear as an incongruous, obtrusive feature, that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling, and to that of the local area. In addition, the first floor side extension, by reason of its form, close to the common boundary with the neighbouring property (No. 16 Kings Road), would result in an adverse impact to the living conditions and residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of this property.

The proposal would therefore be contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework,

Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011), Policies SP5 and SP15 of the

Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (2014), Design Guidelines for Rutland (SPD), Extension to Dwellings (SPD) and Policy NL7 of the Adopted North Luffenham Neighbourhood Plan.

1. The application is not supported by sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed rooflights in the rear roofplane would not result in an adverse impact of the residential amenities of neighbouring properties, and is therefore contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS19 the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011), Policies SP5 and SP15 of the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (2014), Design Guidelines for Rutland (SPD),

Extension to Dwellings (SPD), and Policy NL7 of the Adopted North Luffenham Neighbourhood Plan.

INFORMATIVES:

Proactive Statement – This decision has been reached taking into account paragraph 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Decision Date: 27 August 2025



Proper Officer of the Council

**REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION (HOUSEHOLDER)**

**IMPORTANT NOTES**

1. Please quote your application reference number (2025/0749/FUL) in all relevant correspondence.

# Appeals to the Secretary of State

* If you are aggrieved by the decision of your Local Planning Authority to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
* As this is a decision to refuse planning permission for a householder application, if you want to appeal against your Local Planning Authority’s decision then you must do so within **12 weeks** of the date of this notice.
* Appeals must be made using a form which you can get from: The Planning Inspectorate at Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Bristol, BS1 6PN Tel: 0303 444 5000 [https://www.gov.uk/appeal-householder-planning-decision.](https://www.gov.uk/appeal-householder-planning-decision) The Planning Inspectorate have an online appeal service which you can use to make your appeal. You can find the service through the Appeals area of the Planning Portal <https://www.planningportal.co.uk/planning/appeals>
* The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal, but he will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal.
* The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to him that the Local Planning Authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions they imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of any development order and to any directions given under a development order.