

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2024

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/24/3342064

26 Wellesbourne Road, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8EL

- 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 & Mrs A Aujla against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application Ref is W/23/1221.
 - The development proposed is described as double storey side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. Although the appeal form signifies that the decision to refuse permission was made by Birmingham City Council, the local planning authority concerned was Warwick District Council.
3. The appeal property is sited within the boundaries of the Barford Conservation Area (BCA).
4. Reference is made in the Council's officer report on the refused application to an earlier permission¹ for a similar development proposal. I have not been given sight of the approved plans, but the officer report explains that the current proposal differs from the previously approved scheme in that the proposed side extension at first floor level is to be extended to the side boundary of the curtilage. The previous planning permission is extant and represents the appellants' fall-back and is therefore a material consideration attracting significant weight.

Main issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the BCA.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling which appears to me to be of mid 20th century origin. There is also a detached garage extending to the common boundary shared with the property to the north. The property is one of several detached dwellings served by a service road set apart from the main Wellesborough Road. Whilst trees and other planting is apparent along the main road frontage, the appeal property can be seen through gaps.

¹ Ref W/22/0483

7. The design of the previously consented scheme reflects guidance provided in the Council's SPD² in that the first-floor side extension is set in from a shared side boundary. All other two storey elements of the other properties served by the cul-de-sac share a common characteristic in that they are sited away from their side boundaries. Therefore, in combination, the houses and the intervening gaps exude a perception of spaciousness in the layout which is characteristic of this part of the BCA. Whilst the SPD's guidance is primarily directed to prevent terracing, it also assists in my view in preventing the loss of spaciousness and the perception of cramped development.
8. The consented scheme displays substantial extensions particularly at the rear. The approved side extension as it effects the front elevation was found to be proportionate to the host property, whilst the extension proposed now would in my view create an over-elongated visually disproportionate front elevation. It would also appear cramped in its context since, unlike the other properties alongside it would extend to its boundaries. I appreciate that the next dwelling to the north is set well apart from its southern side boundary, but this is not a convincing reason to depart from the SPD's guidance.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal, if built, would cause visual harm. Accordingly, neither the character or appearance of the BCA would be preserved or enhanced. A clear conflict therefore arises with those provisions of policy HE1 of the Warwick District Local Plan and policy B6 of the Barford Neighbourhood Plan in that the proposal would not harmonize with or enhance the existing settlement and would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the BCA.
10. Whilst the harm to the significance of the heritage asset I have found is less than substantial, I can think of no public benefit that would arise from the scheme.

Other matters

11. I have considered the representations made by local residents and Parish Council who object and those made by other more remote residents supporting the scheme. I have already dealt with the main planning-related points made.
12. I share the Council's view, for similar reasons, that the proposal would not harm the setting of the listed Barford House³, which is set in its own grounds on the other side of the main road.
13. I have taken account of all other matters raised, but no other matter is of such strength or significance as to outweigh those considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

² Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document

³ Grade II

