



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 March 2022

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/21/3284887

48 Princes Drive, Edmondscote, Leamington Spa CV32 6AF

- 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 Devaney against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application Ref W/21/0822, dated 29 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is garage conversion, front extension and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background

2. I have been made aware of the planning history relating to the site which includes permission for the conversion of the garage and a front extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises an extended semi-detached dwelling located along one side of Princes Drive. This stretch of road consists of semi-detached dwellings of a similar vernacular including bay column features, oriel windows and hipped roofs. A number of properties have been extended through side and porch extensions resulting in a degree of variety.
5. Despite design variation along the road the proposed development by virtue of its overall form, projection and height would be unduly prominent appearing as an incongruous feature that would unduly dominate the front of the property and significantly disrupting the appearance of the street scene.
6. There are examples of where contemporary design can sit comfortably side-by-side more traditional architecture. However, the overall appearance of the development, namely the rooflight, curved design, slimline vertical glazing and the choice of materials would not complement the dwelling, but jar against its appearance. The appellant has indicated that the windows are similar to those previously approved. However, as the details are not before me, I have not taken this into account in coming to my decision.

7. The appellant has suggested that the rooflight would provide additional light into the hallway. Whilst this is a personal benefit of the scheme, it is insufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified in relation to the main issue.
8. Whilst the appellant has suggested the proposed development would use less materials and be more sustainable compared to the extant permission, in this particular regard, it would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
9. My attention has been drawn to the presence of other porch and forward extensions along the road. However, I have not been made aware of the individual circumstances that led to them being constructed. In any case, every appeal must be considered on its own merits, as I have done. The presence of other extensions in the area does not justify a scheme that I have found to be harmful.
10. I appreciate that the appellant is proposing an alternative design to improve the relationship with the oriel window, but the amendments would result in a proposal that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and area.
11. In conclusion the proposed development would adversely affect the character and appearance of the host property and the area contrary to Policy BE1 of the Warwick Local Plan (2017) and Policies RLS2 and RLS4 of the Royal Leamington Spa Neighbourhood Development Plan which, amongst other things, require developments to achieve good design, positively contribute to the character and quality of its environment through good layout and design, adopt appropriate materials and details and demonstrate how they have taken in to account and responded to the predominant character in the street.
12. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which amongst other things, sets out that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above the appeal does not succeed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR