



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2022

by Helen Smith BSc (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E3715/W/21/3289361

8 Done Cerce Close, Dunchurch CV22 6NZ

- 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 and Mrs Loydall against the decision of Rugby Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R21/0881, dated 16 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as erection of a new 3 bedroom, two storey dwelling to the end of the terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on a prominent corner to the side of 8 Done Cerce Close (No 8). No 8 is the end dwelling of a row of terraced houses of similar architectural design. The surrounding terraced properties are set back from the road within established building lines. Although plot sizes vary, the end corner plots tend to have relatively more space around them than the other dwellings.
4. The appeal site contains a row of mature conifer trees fronting the street. The conifer trees convey a sense of space, soften the urban grain and contribute to the open character of the area. In the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, there is a grass covered mound and trees which separates the street from the main road and lawned frontages to the nearby Tanser Court development. These areas, as well as the position of houses away from the road, create a sense of openness to the area.
5. The proposed dwelling would be located significantly closer to the street than the side elevation of No 8 and the front of the neighbouring dwelling at 7 Done Cerce Close. As such, it would project beyond the established building line and it would uncharacteristically protrude towards the road. In addition, the proposal's side elevation would have a bland appearance. Therefore, the dwelling would appear as a highly visible and incongruous feature within the street scene.
6. Furthermore, the presence and massing of the proposed dwelling would significantly erode the sense of openness of this prominent corner plot. This

would be further compounded by the removal of the row of conifer trees and its replacement with hard boundary treatment, such as timber fencing as indicated on the drawings. The development would have no effect on the landscaped and grassed areas in the surrounding area. Even so, the positive contribution the appeal site makes to the character and appearance of the street scene in its current form would be lost.

7. The house would include sympathetic detailing and matching materials that could be reasonably secured through the imposition of planning conditions. However, these acceptable aspects would not outweigh the harm identified above.
8. Whilst there are examples of front extensions and garage conversions nearby, I am not fully aware of all the circumstances relating to these developments. In any event, these are not similar to the current proposal, and I have determined this appeal on its own merits and its site-specific characteristics.
9. Therefore, I conclude the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would fail to accord with Policy SDC1 of the Rugby Borough Council Local Plan (adopted 2019). Amongst other things, this seeks to ensure new developments are of a scale, density and design that responds to the character of the area and adds to the overall qualities in which they are situated.

Other Matters

10. No objections have been received from the Parish Council or the neighbours. Also, no concerns are raised in respect of the effect on neighbouring properties or road safety. However, these are neutral factors rather than benefits to which I attach positive weight.
11. The proposal would make a small contribution to the delivery of housing for the area on a site that is close to bus routes and within walking distance of local services and facilities. The proposal is also likely to be more energy efficient than some of the existing housing stock. However, these modest benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.
12. The appeal site is not located within a designated Conservation Area or near to any heritage assets. However, the requirement to provide high quality and sympathetic development relates to all areas.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight that indicate a decision other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen Smith

INSPECTOR