
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2016

by B Bowker Mplan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 1 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W3710/D/16/3159803

6 Earls Road, Nuneaton, Warwickshire CV11 5HT

- 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 Mr John Homer against the decision of Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 034165, dated 19 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is re-roofing of 6 Earls Road due to leaking roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Abbey Conservation Area (ACA).

Reasons

3. No 6 Earls Road is a semi-detached pitched roof dwelling located in the ACA. No 6 is part of a row of similar properties all of which have retained their original plain clay tiled roofs, a feature which positively contributes to the uniformed appearance of Earls Road.
 4. The ACA Appraisal and Management Proposal document identifies the attractive and relatively well preserved local examples of middle class housing as a special characteristic of the area. The document highlights the high degree of unity in scale, materials and form as a key feature of housing in the ACA. The document also highlights that a notable number of properties in the ACA have retained their original plain tile roofs, which is a key characteristic of the area. In this respect, as part of the wider row of properties, No 6 is an important feature in the ACA as a whole.
 5. During my site visit I saw that No 6's modern tiled roof is visible from public vantage points along Earls Road. The roof tiles do not have the same subtle appearance or colour as the plain roof tiles evident in the wider row of properties. As a result, the proposal gives No 6 a contrasting appearance when viewed alongside surrounding properties. Consequently, the proposal harms the uniformity of the wider street and its positive contribution to the ACA as a whole.
-

6. I also saw some examples of modern roof tiles at properties further along Earls Road. However, these examples are infrequent across Earls Road with properties predominantly having plain clay tiled roofs.
7. Whilst the visual impact of the proposal is localised in extent, it has resulted in harm to a characteristic feature of the ACA. In addition, no public benefit is associated in support of the proposal. In the context of paragraphs 131-134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I consider the extent of harm to the significance of the ACA to be less than substantial. However, section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is clear in that harm should be given considerable importance and weight.
8. Therefore, taking the above reasoning into account, I conclude that the proposal has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the ACA as a whole. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to saved Policy ENV14 of the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Local Plan and paragraphs 131-137 of the Framework. Combined, these policies require development to respect and conserve the character and appearance of heritage assets such as the ACA.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having taken all matters raised into account, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

B Bowker

INSPECTOR