

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2017

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2nd February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E3715/D/16/3162706

Popehill Cottage, Draycote Road, Draycote CV23 9RB

- 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 Dave Walker against the decision of Rugby Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R16/1061, dated 13 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of extensions and alterations to an existing dwelling, demolition of existing sectional concrete garage and erection of a new detached garage and log store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The scheme subject of the appeal does not include the proposed double garage or log store which were deleted from the application determined by the Council.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property currently has the character of a garage building with accommodation within the roofspace and is situated within the large front garden of Popehill House. However, a Certificate of Lawful Development has been issued for the use of the property as a single dwelling house (Ref R16/0612). The proposed development includes a 2-storey extension which would increase the lawful residential accommodation.
 5. The property possesses a utilitarian appearance reflecting its character. The property is of a simple design with a gable wall facing forwards the road and the other side elevation has an external staircase to access the first floor accommodation. The gable roof includes a dormer within the front roofslope below which are garage style doors.
 6. In the absence of any significant vegetation within the front garden, because of its proximity to Draycote Road the property is sited in a prominent and highly
-

- visible location when viewed from the adjacent roads. Travelling away from the property the views do start to diminish because of other buildings and boundary vegetation but from the west the roof remains visible above a hedge.
7. Although the Council has indicated that an extension with a volume of around 30% of the property might be acceptable, no specific policy or other published guidance has been identified to support this threshold as being the upper limit for additions to buildings. Therefore, the appeal scheme has been assessed on its own merits having regard to the circumstances of the property and its context.
 8. As claimed by the appellant, the enlarged property would sit comfortably within the spacious extent of the curtilage defined on the submitted drawings. However, the scale of the proposed extension would represent a significant increase in the size of the property. The width of the proposed extension would be similar to the width of the property. When the scale of the proposed extension is taken together with the extent of its projection from the rear elevation then the appeal scheme would visually dominate the property. Further, there would be some erosion of the existing open gap between the property and the boundary with the neighbouring property causing a localised loss of spaciousness albeit this matter alone would not be enough to justify this appeal failing.
 9. The harm which has been identified would be accentuated by the design of the proposed extension because it would not adequately reflect the simple utilitarian character and appearance of the existing property, including by reason of an eaves rather than gable elevation facing towards the road. This orientation adds to the bulk of the appeal scheme. There is also the lack of any clear subservience of the proposed extension to the host property, including by reason of height. Cumulatively, these scale and design matters amount to significant harm being caused to the property which would be noticeable from the adjacent roads because of its prominent siting and openness of the frontage.
 10. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with Policy CS16 of the Rugby Borough Core Strategy. Amongst other matters this policy requires development to demonstrate high quality, inclusive and sustainable design and for proposals to be of a scale and design which would not cause material harm to the quality, character and amenity of the area. This policy is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) core principle of securing high quality design. Accordingly, and considering all other matters including the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is concluded that this appeal should fail.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR