



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020

by J M Tweddle BSc(Hons) MSc(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/20/3253576

8 Cassandra Grove, Warwick Gates, Warwick, Warwickshire CV34 6XD

- 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 Kurt Smoult against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application Ref W/19/2138, dated 12 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is construction of a single-storey front garage extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The area is characterised by two storey detached residential properties as part of a relatively modern housing estate. While there is some variation in their design, the properties are all finished externally with red brick and traditional pitched roofs. The dwellings are laid out in a staggered arrangement with spacious open front gardens which include off-street parking. The majority of dwellings have single, integral garages which project slightly forward of their principal elevation. Indeed, the design and scale of the appeal property's existing single garage, is replicated at several properties along the street providing a degree of uniformity in design.
4. The proposal would extend the existing garage forward by approximately 3.3 metres and sideways up to the boundary with No 10. It would have an overall width of about 4.8 metres and constructed in matching materials with a hipped roof.
5. Due to its increased width, coupled with its forward projection, the extension would result in an overly assertive addition to the property that would significantly draw the eye and thereby dominate its front elevation. There are no other properties in the immediate vicinity that have a similar front and side extension to that which is being proposed. Accordingly, it would be a discordant feature that would be at odds with the appearance of other dwellings along Cassandra Grove and the wider area, where garages are mostly of a single width. The use of a similar sized garage door and circular window would do little to reduce its harmful effects.
6. Moreover, in extending the property forward as proposed, the development would reduce the space to the front of the property, diminishing the open and

spacious character of the street. Its discordant forward projection would be particularly noticeable when approaching from the south, introducing a large featureless south facing side elevation. Consequently, this would not be a sympathetic nor subservient addition that would respect the original character and appearance of the host dwelling or that of the wider area.

7. In reaching this view, I have had regard to the previous appeal decision¹ for a similar proposed development at the appeal property. In that case the Inspector noted that the area is characterised by dwellings with garages of a single width and therefore, by diverging from this established character, he found the proposal to be harmful. The current proposal has not reduced the overall width of the proposed garage extension, subsequently, for the reasons set out above, I find the proposed development to be harmful. In doing so, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own individual merits and reached my own conclusion based on the evidence before me.
8. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy BE1 of the Warwick District Local Plan (adopted 2017) and the associated provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which together require new development to contribute positively to the character and quality of its environment through good layout and design. Consequently, it would also conflict with the guidance set out in the Council's Residential Design Guide 2018 which seeks to ensure that any new extension is generally subservient to the existing dwelling.

Other Matters

9. The proposal would provide additional space for the appellant to garage and work on his classic car, especially during periods of inclement weather. In addition, the appellant suggests that the extension would provide only an additional 25% to the existing footprint of the property and points out that other garages on the street have been converted to other uses. I also acknowledge the lack of objection from any neighbouring residents or statutory consultees. However, these matters, neither singularly nor combined, outweigh the harm I have found and do not therefore lead me away from my overall conclusion.
10. I note the appellant's comments over the Council's handling of the planning application, but this matter is outside of my jurisdiction and should be addressed directly with the Council.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons I have set out, and taking into account all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Jeff Tweddle

INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal Ref. APP/T3725/D/19/3224628