



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2022

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/22/3292481

2 The Grange, Myton Lane, Warwick CV34 6QQ

- 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 Varinder Singh against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application Ref W/21/1982, dated 25 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the header above is taken from the application form. The appeal form and the Council's decision notice state the proposed development is the erection of proposed front box dormer and two front rooflights as well as the erection of proposed rear box dormer. This description is consistent with the details shown on the appeal drawings and so more accurately describes the proposal. As such, my assessment is based on the amended description.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property lies in a residential cul-de-sac amongst dwellings of a similar age. While the houses in The Grange are not identical, they are all 2 storeys high and have a traditional appearance with pitched roofs.
5. Despite the screening effect of trees near to the house, the front dormer and rooflights would be seen from The Grange and the closest stretch of Myton Lane, particularly during times of leaf-fall. The rear dormer would be seen from the arm of The Grange that leads to the back of the appeal property as well as from adjacent residences to the rear. Consequently, the proposed development would have a noticeable effect on the street scene.
6. The front dormer would fill most of the roof slope between 2 existing projections to the front of the appeal property. Also, it would extend from just above eaves level to just below the ridgeline and so it would be a sizeable enlargement to the roof. Moreover, it would have tall windows that would fail to

closely align with any of the fenestration at ground or first floor levels. Even if matching or similar materials are used in its construction, the dormer would be an incongruous addition that would result in an unattractive, top-heavy appearance to the house. As such, it would be unsympathetic to the style and architecture of the host property.

7. Also, the proposed rear dormer would be a sizeable, box-like enlargement that would largely obscure the rear roof slope. Furthermore, its fenestration would not correspond with the windows below. The rear dormer would introduce a strong horizontal emphasis, at odds with the vertical style of the existing property and in conflict with the provisions on page 45 of the Council's Residential Design Guide 2018. The proposed use of modern materials would not address the inappropriate design of the rear addition.
8. The appellant states that a number of properties close to the site have had similar dormer extensions recently approved, although no details of these planning permissions have been provided. The houses to each side of the appeal property have small, pitched roof dormers at first floor level in their front elevations. However, the proposed dormers would be much bulkier and box-like and so they would not closely reflect other architectural features in the locality. Also, the front dormers at 17 Myton Crescent are much smaller than those proposed and in any event they are set away and not seen in the same context as the appeal site. As such, I am unconvinced that previously permitted development provides justification to allow the appeal proposal.
9. For these reasons, I conclude the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. As such, it would not accord with policy BE1 of the Warwick District Local Plan 2017, which, amongst other things, looks to ensure development respects local architectural distinctiveness.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, the proposal would not accord with the development plan policies when read as a whole. No case has been presented that justifies making a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR