



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2019 by S Watson BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E3715/D/19/3231262

54 Crick Road, Hillmorton, Rugby CV21 4DY

- 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 Jackie Taylor against the decision of Rugby Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R19/0160, dated 7 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2019.
 - The development proposed was described as second storey extension to existing bungalow and two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. Since the time of the Council's decision, the Rugby Borough Council Local Plan 2011-2031 (LP) has been adopted. As such policy CS16 referred to in the decision notice has been superseded and draft policy SDC1, also referred in the decision notice has now been adopted. Both parties were given the opportunity to comment on any impact this would have on the appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is on the south side of Crick Road which slopes down towards the east. The south side of the road is predominantly characterised by bungalows and chalet bungalows. The site contains a detached bungalow, the roof of which is perpendicular to the road with gables at the front and rear. The proposal includes the provision of extensions, primarily at first-floor level, to accommodate five bedrooms, and the creation of a new roof running parallel to the road with side facing gables and front facing half dormers.
6. The proposal would result in a significant increase in the eaves and ridge height of the property and, with its large side gables, would appear as a prominent

addition. While I note that the proposed first floor would be partly within the roof it would significantly increase the massing of No 54 at first-floor level. This would be in contrast to the neighbouring properties at Nos 52 and 56 which have little bulk above ground floor level. Although No 52 has a first floor, this is entirely within the roof, which is perpendicular to the road, and appears modest in scale. As such, the resultant dwelling would appear incongruous in its context.

7. The appellant has suggested that the appeal proposal would have a lesser impact on No 56 than the effect the extensions at No 52 have on No 54, due to the lane which separates Nos 54 and 56. However, I find that the design of the first floor at No 52, particularly in respect of the orientation of its roof, is not comparable to the appeal proposal.
8. I note that there are two-storey buildings to the west, but these are separated from the appeal site by No 52 and so, primarily, the proposal would not be read in connection with them. Also although other examples of first floor extensions on Crick Road have been brought to my attention, I do not have sufficient information before me of those cases to ascertain whether the circumstances of each are directly comparable to the current proposal. Notwithstanding this, all proposals need to be considered on their own merit.
9. As the proposed alterations would effectively result in a new style of dwelling, I consider that the proposal would not be out of proportion with the existing dwelling or harm its appearance. Nevertheless, this matter would not be sufficient to mitigate the harm that I have identified, and the extension would not sit comfortably within the street scene.
10. In all, I consider the scale and design of the proposal would harm the street scene. The proposal would therefore be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy SDC1 of the LP and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which, amongst other things, collectively seek to ensure the creation of high-quality buildings and places.

Other Matters

11. I note that only one comment was received from neighbouring occupiers and that a Councillor was supportive of the scheme. I have had regard to these matters, but they do not outweigh the harm identified above.
12. It has been raised that the Council were initially supportive of the proposal but that they then did not act in a positive and proactive manner during the planning application process. I am also aware of the disagreement between the Council and appellant over a number of measurements, and that amended plans were submitted during the planning application process. However, such disagreements have not affected my consideration of the plans before me or the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Watson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR