



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2023

by Ben Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/22/3307121

22 Kingswood Close, Lapworth, SOLIHULL, Warwickshire B94 6JQ

- 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 Nigel Cresswell against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application Ref W/22/0538, dated 25 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey front extension in line with existing garage facade to create a new first floor bedroom and ground floor porch, with new rooflights to the rear and side elevations associated with internal remodelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposed scheme was subject to revision during its consideration by the Council. The amended plan (Drawing 5768/02 revision F) seems to have not been subject to public consultation. However, as the amendments are relatively minor no party would be prejudiced by my taking the revised version into account.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Kingswood Close is a cul-de-sac consisting of traditional dwellings. These are predominantly semi-detached properties, with hipped roofs, brick elevations and two-storey bay windows. Although the dwellings have a generally homogenous design, they include modifications that have introduced a variety of extensions and alterations. The appeal dwelling is a detached property near the end of the street. It includes a two-storey bay, with a small dormer over the side garage. Although the garage projects beyond the main elevation it is a diminutive element with the decorative bay window being the most prominent feature of the frontage. Therefore, the dwelling's design complements the character of local housing making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed scheme consists of a two-storey side extension and alterations to the front elevation. The Council's Residential Design Guide 2018 provides detailed design guidance for side extensions for detached dwellings. The

guidance requires such proposals to relate to the design of the original building to enhance its design unity. This requires design features to complement main elements of the existing dwelling including with respect to the pitch of roofs and window style. It also seeks extensions to be recessed, from ridge levels and façade junctions, to create a subordinate addition to the existing dwelling.

6. The proposed scheme consists of a two-storey side extension that would project forward of the main elevation with an extended roof, large dormer window, porch and garage. Although projecting slightly less than the existing bay window, the proposal would be a wide and overt addition to the dwelling. Despite the proposed hipped roof design replicating the existing dwelling, the projecting eaves lines would extend forward of the existing roof in an awkward manner.
7. Moreover, the scheme would obscure most of the front elevation of the existing dwelling. The proposal would erode the existing hierarchy of forms and diminish the prominence of the bay window. The proposed scheme by projecting forward of the main elevation, would be overt and confuse its appearance. Furthermore, the dormer window would visually compete with the bay window due to its disproportionate width and dominance. For these reasons, the proposal would not be subordinate and would dominate the front elevation harming the appearance of the dwelling and the wider streetscene.
8. No's 25 and 27 Kingswood Close have two storey side extensions that project forward of the main elevation. However, these maintain the first-floor windows and eaves line over their front doors, limiting their overall impact on the appearance of the original houses.
9. No 26 Kingswood Close has a large side extension that includes a wide dormer window and extends forward of the front elevation, similar to the proposed extension. However, this does not appear to be a recent addition. This demonstrably unbalances the design of both the dwelling and the pair of semi-detached properties to the disbenefit of the streetscene. This type of extension does not reflect the subordinate style of extensions now sought by the Council's relatively recently adopted guidance and offers limited weight in favour of the proposal.
10. Accordingly, the proposed extension would conflict with policy BE1 of the Warwick District Local Plan, the Council's Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework. These seek, among other matters, for development to positively contribute to the character and quality of the environment and to enhance the urban character of streets.
11. In reading correspondence between the Council and Appellant I recognise that discussions with the case officer were relatively supportive. It is unfortunate that the Council appeared to change its opinion relatively late in the process, potentially raising false expectations that the scheme could be supported. However, such discussions should only be treated as informal and should not be taken as a guarantee of a positive outcome.
12. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR