



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2023

by C Billings BA (Hons), DipTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E3715/D/23/3321203

3 Norman Ashman Coppice, Binley Woods, Warwickshire, CV3 2BP

- 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 Nikhil Gupta against the decision of Rugby Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R23/0157, dated 2 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey front and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey end terraced house set within a row of three properties. It has an integral garage that projects forward of the main elevation, which is a feature of the original appeal property and its immediate neighbours.
4. This part of Norman Ashman Coppice has a strong unified character, in terms of the front single storey projections and any later additions added to the grouping of terraced properties. All front single storey projections or later extensions are of similar depth and have lean-to pitched roofs.
5. There are examples of single storey front extensions, infilling the area between the garage projection and neighbouring property, but no examples of extending forward of the garages in this part of Norman Ashman Coppice.
6. The appeal property has a hard surfaced open driveway in front and therefore the front elevation is visible within the street scene.
7. Whilst the appeal property may be large enough to accommodate the proposed extensions, the extension to the garage would project forward by approximately 2 metres, increasing the prominence of this element, compared to any other forward single storey projections to properties in this part of Norman Ashman Coppice.

8. In the wider local area, along Monks Road there is more variation in the character and design of the frontages of properties. Therefore, there is a much reduced sense of uniformity than that found within the environs of the appeal property in Norman Ashman Coppice. A number of properties in Monks Road have had extensions to their garages and front elevations of varying size and design, that project forward of the main elevation. This includes Nos 15, 21, 27, 29 and 31 Monks Road, which I observed during my site visit.
9. There are notable differences between the character of the street scene around the appeal property and that found further along in Monks Road, in terms of design and scale of front projections. The character and design of properties and front projections in the immediate surrounding area of the appeal property, have clear unity of form, design, and scale and accordingly, are not of mixed character. This is unlike that found further along in Monks Road, which includes a mix of pitched and flat roof designed extensions of varying depth and width.
10. The proposed extension to the garage would have a pitched roof front gable design, which would not compliment the design of other projections and extensions found in this part of Norman Ashman Coppice. The roof design together with the length of projection to the garage would result in an incongruous, overly prominent feature within the street scene, not in keeping with the character of the immediate surrounding area.
11. Policy SDC1 of the Rugby Borough Council Local Plan (Local Plan), June 2019, sets out that new development will only be supported where the proposals are of a scale, density and design that responds to the character of the areas in which they are situated. The Climate Change & Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document, February 2023 (SPD) notes that, extensions that would dominate the existing building or be overprominent in the streetscene will not be permitted.
12. The SPD further advises that, only modest extensions, which do not extend significantly forward of the building line and reflect the character of the existing property or area will be allowed. The proposed garage extension would conflict with the SPD guidance.
13. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It therefore does not comply with policy SDC1 of the Local Plan and guidance contained in the SPD. The proposed development also does not accord with section 12 of the Framework, which relates to achieving well-designed places.

Other Matters

14. As noted by the appellant, post Covid there is a greater need for dedicated space to work from home. The proposal would provide an office space to meet such requirements. However, this personal requirement does not outweigh the identified harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

15. In conclusion, the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area I have found, is not outweighed by any other considerations, including the Framework, which indicates that decisions should be made in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
16. I thereby dismiss the appeal.

C Billings

INSPECTOR