



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2023

**by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 07.11.2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/23/3328472**

**89 Buckley Road, Lillington, Leamington Spa, Warwickshire, CV32 7QL**

- 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 Aleksandra Pastewska against the decision of Warwick District Council.
  - The application Ref W/23/0597, dated 21 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2023.
  - The development proposed is described as '*Erection of single storey rear and side extension, as per planning application W/22/1277, with the amendments indicated via NMC application W/22/1277, with a change of external finish from facing brick to white render*'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. Planning permission was granted in November 2022 under Ref W/22/1277 for development described as '*Erection of single storey rear and side extension*'. Approval for a non-material amendment was given in May 2023 for an '*Amended rear extension design, including altering the proposed rear window to bifold, introduction of 2no. skylights to the proposed rear pitch to provide a more suitably spaced internal dining area and provide more natural light, additional window to ground floor bathroom and removal of first floor bathroom window*'.
3. The approved plans showed the rear and side extension to be finished with facing brickwork that would match the materials of the original dwelling. This was reinforced by the requirement of condition 3 on the planning permission for all external facing materials to be of the same type, texture and colour as those of the existing building.
4. At the time of my visit the rear and side extension was complete except for the external finish with the original property brick faced.
5. The Council's officer's report relevant to this appeal clearly notes that planning permission was sought for the erection of a side and rear extension but with the application of white render to the entire property, including for the extension, as was explicitly shown on the drawings which accompanied the planning application. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis, as will I.

## **Main Issue**

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

## **Reasons**

7. The appeal property is a two-storey, end-of-terrace within a wholly residential area comprising principally detached, semi-detached and terraced homes dating from a similar period of construction. Despite some variations to the buildings in terms of form and size, there are many repeat and consistent property types creating a striking uniformity and visual cohesion to the street scene along this part of Buckley Road, assisted significantly by the common use of red facing brickwork and brown interlocking roof tiles. The appeal property contributes positively to this cohesion through its conforming appearance.
8. The use of white render for the existing dwelling and extension would not only be noticeably out of keeping with the appearance of the immediate group of neighbouring dwellings within the terrace of which it forms part, but would also appear in stark contrast to the wider established character of the street scene, where a consistent use of red-facing brickwork is prevalent.
9. I have noted properties elsewhere along Buckley Road where individual properties display mixed materials, many obviously changed from their original appearance. However, these sit removed from the context of No 89 beyond the junction with Wellington Road to the east and along part of Buckley Road where there is a distinguishable shift in architectural style and character to the street scene. The lack of visual cohesion to the dwellings at this point is tangible and contrasts markedly with the harmony around the appeal site. I therefore do not share the appellant's view that a wholesale change to the appearance of No 89 would blend seamlessly into the streetscape at this point.
10. By failing to adopt appropriate materials or show respect for the local distinctiveness of the area, the proposal would conflict with the aims and objectives of the *Warwick District Council Residential Design Guide May 2018* and would be contrary to criterion c) and g) of Policy BE1 of the Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029. For the same reasons there would be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places. I have only been provided with a copy of the Independent Examiner's report into the Council's Royal Leamington Spa Neighbourhood Development Plan, and not any adopted plan, so have been unable to identify any conflict with Neighbourhood Plan Policy RLS4, which is also quoted in the Council's decision.

## **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

*John D Allan*

INSPECTOR