



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2021

by K Stephens BSc (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 December 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/E3715/D/21/3281938

14 Glebe Crescent, New Bilton, Rugby CV21 2HG

- 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 Adam Kopczynski against the decision of Rugby Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R21/0409, dated 11 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side and rear extension at 14 Glebe Crescent, New Bilton, Rugby CV21 2HG in accordance with the terms of the application Ref R21/0409, dated 11 April 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) Notwithstanding details in the application, the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved drawings:
 - Proposed_V3_-_3D_view_1_v1.pdf
 - Proposed_V3_-_3D_view_2_v1.pdf
 - Proposed_V3_-_Back_v1.pdf
 - Proposed_V3_-_Front_v1.pdf
 - Proposed_V3_-_Side_v1.pdf
 - Proposed_V3_-_Ground_floor_v1.pdf

Background

2. During the determination of the application the proposal was amended. The angled part of the extension was removed, the width of the extension across the front reduced and the pitch of the roof lowered. It is this amended proposal that the Council refused and which forms the appeal before me.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached, hipped roof, brick and tile dwelling on a corner location on a bend on Glebe Crescent, which is an oval-shaped cul-de-sac. An existing single detached garage structure has since been demolished. Glebe Crescent is characterised by similar semi-detached properties arranged around both sides of the cul-de-sac. Nonetheless, being located on the inner bend of Glebe Crescent the appeal property, and the adjoining semi, occupy wider plots than most. As a result, the appeal property is set some distance away from, and at an angle to, neighbouring properties, giving it a more spacious setting. Consequently it does not read as part of a continuous row of similar type properties, unlike most of the rest of Glebe Crescent.
5. The proposal would involve the erection of a single storey side extension that would wrap around the rear of the property. The extension would measure approximately 4.5 metres across the front and have a depth of about 11.24 metres from front to back, which would include extending some 2.99 metres out from the rear elevation. It would have a shallow mono-pitch roof. The extension would provide a garage together with enlarged living and kitchen areas for the dwelling. The front door, currently on the side elevation of the dwelling, would be relocated to the front.
6. The width of the dwelling is annotated on the submitted plans as being 4.97 metres and the proposed extension would be 4.5 metres wide. Nonetheless, it is less than the width of the property. Policy SDC1 of the Rugby Borough Council Local Plan (the 'Local Plan') does not stipulate that extensions must be a particular size in relation to the host dwelling, nor does the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design and Construction' (the 'Design SPD'). However, Policy SDC1 requires new development to be of a scale, density and design that responds the character of the areas in which they are situated. The Design SPD advises that extensions must not dominate the existing building and appear subservient to it, and that extensions that are too large in relation to the dwelling or out of keeping with the street scene can have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area. Side and rear extensions on corner plots are required to take into account the visual impact on the side road and not be unduly prominent.
7. The amended design is simple in form and detail, presenting a garage door and new front door to the street. This would help ensure the extension was subservient to the host dwelling in design and function. The existing wide plot and frontage to the street would allow the extension to be adequately accommodated on site. Surrounding the appeal site as it rounds the corner is tall timber fencing. The fencing, together with the incline of this part of Glebe Crescent, means the massing of the single storey extension would be largely screened from view and would not be unduly prominent to the side road. Furthermore, the orientation of the appeal property to the neighbouring 16 Glebe Crescent ensures the extension would not significantly alter the street scene.
8. According to the application form the extension would be rendered. Whilst I saw some properties in the area had some render, brickwork is the predominant facing material. The use of matching brick for the extension would

further ensure there would be no material harm to the character and appearance of the area. The Council has suggested a condition to this effect that I can impose.

9. These factors in combination mean the proposed extension would not appear overly large in relation to the host dwelling. Furthermore, due to the property's location in this particular part of the Glebe Crescent cul-de-sac I find the extension would not significantly disrupt or be incongruous to the character and appearance of the street scene, the host dwelling or the pair of semis as to harm them. Accordingly, the proposed development would not be in conflict with Policy SDC1 of the Local Plan or the general design guidance in the Design SPD, whose aims are outlined above.
10. The appellant refers me to a number of properties in Glebe Crescent that have been extended. I saw that some extensions were wider than the dwelling they were attached to, and a number were more conspicuous, prominent or contrived than the appeal extension. The Council has not provided any detailed commentary on these extensions.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should succeed and planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions that are necessary in the interests of certainty and safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

K. Stephens
INSPECTOR