The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 23 August 2021

by Mark Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPl MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/21/3274884
29 George Road, Warwick CV34 5LX

- 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 J Rorynski against the decision of Warwick District Council.
- The application Ref W/20/1871, dated 13 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 February 2021.
- The development proposed is described as 'Part single storey and two storey side extension and front porch extension'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the part single storey and two storey side extension.

2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the front porch extension and planning permission is granted for a front porch extension at 29 George Road, Warwick CV34 5LX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref W/20/1871, dated 13 November 2020, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Number 200 Revision A.

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the front porch extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

3. The applicant's name given on the application form was incorrect as their surname was entered twice in error. I have therefore taken the appellant's name from the appeal form.

4. On 20 July 2021, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. Since the revised Framework does not materially alter the national policy approach in respect of the issues raised in this appeal and as such their cases would not be prejudiced, I have not consulted the main parties on the revised Framework. I have referred to the 2021 iteration of the Framework in my findings.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling situated on the western side of George Road and occupies a large corner plot at the junction with Nelson Avenue. The property is set back from the road and includes a driveway to the front and garden areas to the side and rear. The side of the garden is bounded by a low brick wall with an established hedge which continues around to the front of the property. There is a gentle slope along George Road such that the appeal property sits at a higher level than Nelson Avenue to the side.

7. The surrounding area is of established residential character with a mix of mainly semi-detached and detached dwellings. Properties in the immediate vicinity are generally situated within generously sized plots with low level boundary treatments to the front and planting which contributes to a spacious and verdant character.

8. The proposed development would comprise a part single storey and part two storey extension to the south side of the property together with a porch extension to the front. The proposed side extension would project towards the site boundary with Nelson Avenue and extend along the majority of the side of the property. The two storey element would be set well back from the principal façade of the property and set down from the main ridge.

9. Although the proposed side extension has been designed to be a subordinate addition to the property, due to its substantial scale and massing, and positioning on the end of the property, the proposal would have a significant presence in the street scene, particularly when viewed from the junction of George Road and Nelson Avenue. Consequently, the openness to the corner plot would be significantly reduced, contrary to the advice contained in the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The harm to the spaciousness of the corner plot and its contribution to the wider street scene would be exacerbated by the level difference between the proposed extension and Nelson Avenue and by the way that it would project beyond the front building line of the neighbouring properties on the north side of Nelson Avenue to the rear of the site.

10. The appellant has referred to examples of similar extensions in the local area. However, I do not have the precise details or the planning history of these cases before me. Accordingly, I cannot draw any direct comparison between these developments and the appeal proposal and so cannot be sure they represent a direct parallel to the proposal. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits taking account of the policies of the current development plan. The appellant also refers to a recently constructed garage to the side of 27 George Road opposite the appeal site. However, as a single storey flat roof structure the neighbour's garage does not result in as significant an effect on openness as the proposed two storey and single storey side extension would.

11. The appeal proposal includes construction of a front porch. This aspect of the scheme would represent a modest addition which would be in-keeping with the

host property and the surrounding area. Indeed, this addition would enhance the appearance of the property by clearly defining its front elevation. The reason for refusal does not specifically refer to the proposed front porch and the Council have not indicated any objections to this part of the development. The porch is physically and functionally severable from the remainder of the scheme and I therefore consider that a split decision would be appropriate in this case.

12. I therefore conclude that the proposed part single storey and two storey side extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Accordingly, this aspect of the proposals would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Warwick District Local Plan (2017) and the advice contained in the Council's Residential Design SPD. In summary, and amongst other things, these require development to positively contribute to the character and quality of the environment through good layout and design. The proposal would also conflict with paragraph 130 of the Framework, which, amongst other things, requires development to be sympathetic to local character. The proposal accords with these policies and guidance insofar as it relates to the front porch extension.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the proposed front porch. However, in relation to the proposed part single storey and two storey side extension the appeal should be dismissed.

Conditions

14. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. In relation to the front porch extension, I have attached the standard time limit condition and a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Mark Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR