

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2020 by John Gunn DipTP Dip DBE MRTPI

Decision by Elizabeth Jones BSc (Hons) MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E3715/D/20/3247434

9 Hayes Close, Brownsover, Rugby, Warwickshire CV21 1JG

- 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 James Angus against the decision of Rugby Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R19/1400, dated 30 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey to front.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises the erection of a first floor level front extension, erection of single storey front extension and various external alterations. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is situated on a modern housing estate characterised by 2 storey detached houses. The cul-de-sac in which the appeal site lies rises gradually from Bow Fell and contains a limited range of simple house designs, with well-defined building lines and small gaps between the properties. This provides a simple and pleasing rhythm to the Close. Individual dwellings are set a modest distance back from the road with provision for off street parking

facilities and open front gardens. This contributes towards the open character of the area.

6. At my site visit I noted that all the properties in the Close have gabled roofs and some have been extended at ground floor level with lean-to roofs. None of the properties within the Close have a two-storey extension on the front elevation. Although reduced in width and depth, the first floor level front extension would introduce a hipped roof that would appear out of place with the host property and its immediate neighbours. Moreover, it would project a significant distance forward of the main wall of the property, exceeding the modest projection that is recommended in the Rugby Borough Council Local Development Framework, Sustainable Design and Construction – Supplementary Planning Document (Appendix B - Residential Design Guide) (SPD). As a result, it would unbalance the proportion of the host property and upset the rhythm of the Close. Consequently, the development would appear incongruous and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
7. I visited the nearby streets, including Bow Fell and Elter Close, and saw that whilst some properties had been extended, the overall character of the built environment was well preserved. I noted the 2-storey front extension at 3 Elter Close and, whilst acknowledging that it has some similarities to the appeal proposal, it appeared as an isolated example in the locality. Moreover, its design and context are different and therefore it is not directly comparable with the appeal proposal which I have determined upon its own merits.
8. In the light of the above, I find that the proposed development would have a harmful visual effect upon the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, the development would be contrary to Policy SDC1 of the Rugby Local Plan 2011-2031, the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework, which require developments to be of a scale and design that responds positively to the character of the area in which they are situated.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Gunn

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Elizabeth Jones

INSPECTOR