

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2023

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/23/3326700

25 Blacklow Road, Warwick CV34 5SZ

- 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 Gary Uppal against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application Ref W/23/0400, dated 20 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is double storey front extension and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling located in a residential road of detached dwellings. The surrounding area is residential in character.
 4. Policy BE1 of the Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029 (2017) states that new development will be permitted where it positively contributes to the character and quality of its environment through good layout and design.
 5. Blacklow Road includes detached properties of largely varied and individual design and appearance. There are, however, pairs or small groups of dwellings, which display a greater degree of uniformity of appearance. One such group is the appeal property and the neighbouring two properties, Nos 27 and 29. The three dwellings are of similar scale with consistent design features, including a prominent front gable and a recessed two storey element to one side with a single storey garage and porch projecting forward from this. The group of dwellings make a positive contribution to the street scene and are prominent within it due to their open frontages and position on a curve in the road, with an area of green space in front.
 6. The proposed two-storey extension would add a second forward-facing gable by infilling the recessed part of the dwelling's frontage. While the new element would be set back from the existing gable it would nonetheless add
-

considerable bulk and mass to the front of the property due to its width and height. As such, it would materially alter the character and appearance of the appeal property and would be a dominant feature that would not appear subservient to the original dwelling, upsetting its proportions and original character.

7. For the same reasons, it would also harmfully effect the current uniform design and appearance of the group of three dwellings. In particular, the current articulation, with half the front elevation recessed from the projecting gable of each of the dwellings, provides a rhythm and regularity to the appearance of the group, which would harmfully be disrupted by the proposal. Due to the prominence of the dwellings within the street scene, the harmful contrast between the original design and appearance of Nos 27 and 29 and that of the extended appeal property would be readily apparent.
8. I have had regard to the other examples of dwellings within the surrounding area drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, these largely appear to reflect the original individual design of the particular dwelling. Moreover, for these original examples and those where extensions have occurred, they do not display the same degree of uniformity with their immediate neighbours as the appeal property does with Nos 27 and 29.
9. Therefore, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to Policy BE1 of the Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029, described above. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which advocates good design.
10. I have had regard to the representation made by an interested party concerning the effect of the proposal on living conditions and parking. However, this does not raise any matters in addition to the main issue that would result in a different overall conclusion in this case.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR