



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 August 2022 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

**Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 14 December 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/22/3297512**

**2 Lilac Grove, Warwick, Warwickshire CV34 5SU**

- 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 Ms Hayley Wharrier against the decision of Warwick District Council.
  - The application Ref W/21/2077, dated 15 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2022.
  - The development proposed is remodelling of dwelling, including single storey side extension, increase roof level and entrance feature, plus erection of new garage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Preliminary Matter

3. Whilst the appellant states that they do not seek permission for a garage, the description of development on the appeal form includes reference to one. Given that this is what has been applied for and was before the Council when it made its decision, I have also assessed the proposal with the garage.

### Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No. 2 is a single storey dwelling and the proposal would seek to increase the height of the house, albeit the extended property would still be shorter than many of the houses on Lilac Grove. Furthermore, given the variation in the height of the surrounding houses and the limited overall increase in the height of the property, the slightly taller dwelling would not appear out of character within the street scene. Moreover, the pitch of the extended roof would be consistent with the surrounding roofs and thus would harmonise with the other buildings.
6. The proposed roof lights would be built into the slope of the roof and given that only three are proposed they would not overdevelop either plane. The windows

proposed on the first floor of the house and the ground floor of the converted garage would reuse the existing rear bow windows and these would be similar to the bow window on the ground floor of the front elevation of the dwelling. The consistent appearance of the windows across the front elevation would create a balanced appearance. The proposed pitched roof over the entrance feature would be set below the ridge of the house and it would be limited in scale compared to the roof itself. The proposed first floor window above the new front door alongside the two rooflights would also be limited in scale and would not overdevelop that first-floor elevation.

7. The proposal would extend the converted garage further into the rear garden with a flat roof and roof lantern. While the garage is partly screened by the house and the neighbouring property, the extended flat roof would still be visible past the proposed sloped facade above the garage. Garages with flat roofs are common in the area, however the converted garage would be viewed as an extension to the dwelling and the design of the roof would integrate poorly with the form of the host dwelling. The proposed 'EPDM' rubber roof, sloped facade and roof lantern would create a more attractive finish to the roof than the existing roof, however this would not overcome the above concerns.
8. The proposed garage would be located forward of the dwelling at the end of the driveway. Whilst there is a shared parking area in front of this, this section of the road is free from built form. The garage would be a single storey building; however, its depth and low height would give it something of a squat appearance compared to the dwelling. Given the siting of the proposed garage forward of the house, above the shared parking area for Lilac Grove, this bulky addition would be in a prominent location and would enclose this end of the road. The squat appearance of the garage sited forward of the dwelling would have a jarring and uncomfortable relationship with both the dwelling and the street scene.
9. Therefore, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Warwick District Local Plan (2017). This policy expects new development to positively contribute to the character and quality of its environment through good layout and design. The proposal would also conflict with the advice set out in the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2018) which states that side extensions should relate to the design of the original building with matching roof shape and pitch. The proposal would also not accord with the general design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

### **Other Matters**

10. One of the proposed sky lights would face towards the dwellings on Blacklow Road which themselves have large and deep gardens. Given the separation distance between the proposed sky light and these dwellings as well as its angle within the sloped roof, the occupiers would have limited opportunities to overlook neighbouring properties. Whilst there would be some overlooking from the dwelling, this would not be unusual within a residential location such as this.
11. No. 2 appears to be built at a lower slab level than the dwellings along Blacklow Road. As a result, the full height of the extended dwelling would not appear as tall from those properties compared to how it is shown on the

proposed plan. Given the siting of No. 2 in relation to No.'s 6 to 12 Blacklow Road, it does not occupy the full width of any of the gardens. Furthermore, the dwellings along Blacklow Road have large gardens and the separation distance between No.2 and these properties, alongside the limited increase in the overall height of the house, would ensure that the extended dwelling would not harmfully enclose the outlook from the gardens or within the houses. Accordingly, the extended dwelling would not appear significantly more overbearing than the current house.

12. Whilst the garage would be a bulky addition to the street scene and as viewed from the dwelling opposite it would be clearly visible. It would thus affect the existing outlook. However, it would be a single storey building and given the distance between it and the dwelling opposite, I am satisfied that the outlook from that dwelling would not be significantly enclosed by the proposal. Therefore, the proposal would not cause significant harm to the living conditions of the occupants of the dwellings along Blacklow Road.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

13. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and the material considerations would not, in this instance, be worthy of sufficient weight to indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*G Sibley*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*John Morrison*

INSPECTOR