

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2017

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/16/3165401

38 Beaufort Avenue, Cubbington, Leamington Spa, CV32 7TB

- 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 Mrs Julia Parra against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application Ref W/16/1755, dated 27 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a hip to gable roof extension, first floor side extension and erection of rear dormer roof extension.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The appeal proposal was originally described on the planning application form as a first floor extension over garage, with loft conversion. However, both the Council's decision notice and the appeal form contain the description as given in the banner heading above. I consider this gives a more complete description of the development.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof. It is situated in a residential estate, containing houses that were originally constructed with both hipped and gabled roofs. The original roofs are a distinctive characteristic of the area. I also noted that a number of properties have been altered and extended at the sides, some of which include hip to gable additions. The Council states that some of these have been constructed as permitted development and, therefore, planning permission from the Council was not required.
 5. The proposal contains three elements. These are a hip to gable roof extension; a first floor side extension with a gabled roof; and a flat-roofed rear dormer
-

extension. The extensions would provide additional bedroom and en-suite accommodation.

6. The Council contends that the proposal would be an incongruous and awkward addition to the property. Reference is made by the Council to Policy DP1 of the adopted Warwick District Local Plan, which states (amongst other things) that development will only be permitted if it makes a positive contribution to the environment. In addition, the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance – Residential Design Guide 2008 (SPG) gives advice on design matters. I note that the SPG specifically advises against hip to gable roof extensions on semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs.
7. In my opinion, the Council's policy and guidance is consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which requires planning to always seek to secure high quality design; and for development to add to the overall quality of the area in which it is located (paragraphs 17 and 58).
8. In reaching my decision, I have given careful consideration to the appellant's contention that the hip to gable extension could be carried out as permitted development and, if that were the case, the Council would not object to the remainder of the development. Whilst that may be the case, I have no substantive evidence to suggest that this is a likely course of action and, in any event, I am required to consider the appeal proposal on its merits.
9. At my site visit, I viewed similar extensions in the locality that have been brought to my attention, including the extensions at number 48 Beaufort Avenue and at number 5 Braemar Road. However, I consider that these other extensions fail to make a positive contribution to the appearance of the area. I also noted that other nearby properties contain first floor side extensions with hipped roofs, which I consider to be more in keeping with the original dwellings.
10. In my opinion, the proposed hip to gable extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings (of which the appeal property is a part). It would unbalance the symmetry of the building because of its bulk and prominence which, in turn, would be detrimental to the visual qualities of the existing streetscene. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the Development Plan and with the Framework, as referred to above.

Other Matters

11. Objections to the proposal were submitted to the Council by the occupiers of neighbouring properties, expressing concern that the proposal would result in a loss of privacy and outlook. I note that the Council has not found against the proposal for these reasons and, given the separation distance and angles between the buildings, I have no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusions on these matters.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR