
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2017

by Robert Fallon B.Sc. (Hons) PGDipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/17/3173925

6 Park Road, Leamington Spa CV32 6LG

- 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 and Mrs Pryce against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application Ref W/16/2253, dated 10 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension with ground level alterations, first floor side extension over garage, new pitched roof canopy to front elevation. External walls rendered and roof tiles replaced.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. Park Road has a tree-lined verdant character with large detached dwellings set on spacious plots, heavily dominated by soft landscaping.
4. Although the Council's design guide¹ advises that extensions should be subservient to the host dwelling, because there are a number of properties in Park Road with front gable projections, I would not consider the principle of a front extension to be wholly unacceptable, subject to the specific design and site circumstances. However, the front projection the subject of this appeal would be substantially wider than the existing two storey side extension and as a consequence extend into the gap to the east of this and partly onto the main front elevation of the dwelling. This would create an awkward and contrived scale and form of development at odds with the existing simple form of the dwelling and its roof. As a consequence, it would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. The scheme would be clearly visible when approaching from both directions on Park Road, which would intensify this harmful impact.
5. Although some dwellings in the road have partly rendered front elevations, this is secondary to the primary material palette of brick. The proposed rendering of

¹ Warwick District Council Residential Design Guide (April 2008)

the entire dwelling would appear very much at odds with the prevailing character of the area, erode the cohesiveness between the appeal property and its neighbours and be an unduly dominant feature in the streetscene. The public views of the building and its relationship with the neighbouring dwellings would be clearly visible when approaching from both directions on Park Road, which would intensify this harmful impact. Although the appellant states that the dwelling is not in a Conservation Area and that it would be possible to paint the building under permitted development rights, this does not alter my view that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to a development at 12 Park Road recently granted Planning Permission under Council reference W/17/0637. Although I reviewed this property at my site inspection, I am not aware of the particular circumstances where planning permission was granted for this and in any event, I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits. The existence of this other development does not justify the harm I have identified.
7. I conclude that the development would be contrary to Policy DP1 of the Local Plan² and the Council's design guide which collectively seek to ensure that new development is of a high design standard that respects the character and appearance of the area.
8. I note that the Council raises no concerns regarding the single storey rear extension and the extended canopy, but that does not alter my view that the development as a whole would be harmful, for the reasons I have given.

Conclusion

9. I have found that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. In view of this and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Fallon

INSPECTOR

² Warwick District Local Plan 1996-2011 (September 2007)