



## REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

### Applicant Name and Address

WL Developments (Great Casterton) Limited  
The Mine Site  
Mill Lane  
South Witham  
Grantham  
NG33 5JN

### Agent Name and Address

Mrs Kylie Skipworth-Cooke  
John Roberts Architects Limited  
1 James Street  
Lincoln  
LN2 1QD

---

Date of Validation  
11 February 2021

Application Number:  
2021/0140/FUL

---

PROPOSAL: Minor material amendment to application 2019/0287/FUL - addition of a 2m high electric sliding vehicular gate off Water Lane and the addition of a electric pedestrian gate adjacent to plot 5, Boundary wall to plot 1 to be rebuilt & extension of wall to plot 5 with a height of 1.45m.  
LOCATION: 21 Old Great North Road Great Casterton Rutland PE9 4AP

---

### REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed gates across the road and footpaths have a prison like appearance, and promote an unsociable and isolated development that does not integrate into the village community. They do not complement the character of the local area or promote permeability and accessibility by making places connect with each other, and would neither preserve nor enhance the Conservation Area. As such they are contrary to Sections 12 and Section 16 of the NPPF (2019), Policies CS19 and CS22 of the Rutland Core Strategy (2011) and Policies SP15 and SP20 of the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (2014).
- 2 The unauthorised removal of the boundary wall along Water Lane has destroyed an attractive and historic feature within the street scene. Conversely the new wall that has replaced it, as well as the section of wall to the rear of plot 1, appears as overbearing and incongruous features within the street scene. The works have caused substantial harm to a non-designated heritage asset (historic, stone, boundary wall of traditional construction) to the detriment of the character and appearance of Great Casterton Conservation Area and the setting of an adjacent Listed building (Bridge Farmhouse). As such the development is contrary to Sections 12 and Section 16 of the NPPF (2019), Policies CS19 and CS22 of the Rutland Core Strategy (2011) and Policies SP15 and SP20 of the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (2014).

### INFORMATIVES:

Proactive Statement – This decision has been reached taking into account paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Decision Date: 7 April 2021

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "J. Johnson". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "J".

Proper Officer of the Council

## REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

### IMPORTANT NOTES

1. Please quote your application reference number (shown overleaf) in all relevant correspondence.
2. **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 Communities and Local Government under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
  - If you want to appeal, then you must do so using a form which you can obtain from Initial Appeals Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Bristol, BS1 6PN. Tel No: 0303 444 50 00. 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.gov.uk/appeal-planning-decision>
  - Appeals must be made within **six months** from the date of this decision notice.
  - 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 having regard to Sections 70 and 72(i) of the Act, to the provisions of the development order and to any directions given under the order, the Local Planning Authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions it imposed.