The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2023

by S Rawle BA (Hons) Dip TP Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/23/3321894
6 Holmes Road, Whitnash, Warwickshire CV31 2RF

- 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 Evita Svampane against the decision of Warwick District Council.
- The application Ref W/23/0245, dated 16 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2023.
- The development proposed is a double storey forward extension to enlarge the existing kitchen and form a study at ground floor level and at first floor provide a further bedroom.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house located in a residential area where properties are of a similar period but with a mix of house types, including bungalows, detached and semi-detached dwellings. The properties are set back on their plots with parking areas to the front which creates a sense of spaciousness. Like other properties in the same road the appeal property has a flat roof single garage projecting from the central part of the front elevation which matches the neighbouring house which creates a strong sense of uniformity. Some of the properties have been extended to the front at ground floor level, but at first floor dwellings have a largely uniform appearance which provides a simple, uncluttered appearance to the streetscene. This combined with the sense of spaciousness contributes positively to local character.

4. The proposed extension to the front would replace the existing single storey garage. Because of the gable fronted roof design, the extent of the forward projection and its width, the proposed front extension would appear as a prominent and incongruous feature against the simple form of the existing buildings and would harmfully unbalance the existing pair of semi-detached houses.

5. Notwithstanding that appeal property and its neighbour are set back from other properties along the same road, the proposal would be highly prominent being set forward and seen against the existing single storey garage at the neighbouring property and would appear as an incongruous feature in the

streetscene. It would neither harmonise with the appeal property, nor would it integrate into the streetscene. Consequently, the proposed development would look harmfully out of place.

6. I have taken account of the fact that some properties in the same road have a gable end as do other properties in the wider area. However, for the properties particularly highlighted by the appellant within the same road, they are detached and the first floor gable forms part of the main front elevation. Similarly, I observed that the gable end design of other houses within the wider area do not appear to have been created by a forward extension as proposed here. Consequently, the existence of these other houses with a gable to the front are not comparable with the appeal scheme and the impact it has on its surroundings and do not justify harmful development at the appeal property.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the area in conflict with Policy BE1 of the Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029 adopted in September 2017 and Policy W4 of the Whitnash Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2029 which among other things seek to ensure that development harmonises and respects the existing character of the area and enhances and reinforces local distinctiveness. The proposal would also be at odds with the Residential Design Guide May 2018 which seeks to ensure that development positively responds to the existing pattern of development. Further, the proposal would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

8. I note that some neighbours are supportive of the proposal. I also acknowledge that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the living conditions of local residents. However, these are neutral factors that do not weigh in favour of the proposal and do not justify harmful development at the appeal site.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the proposal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S Rawle

INSPECTOR