



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2025

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E3715/D/25/3358418

The Old Rectory, Lutterworth Road, Churchover, Warwickshire, CV23 0EH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Joe Hallam against the decision of Rugby Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is R24/0649.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension with small two storey element to create master bedroom, plus a loft conversion including the raising of the roof line.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Joe Hallam against Rugby Borough Council and this is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. Amendments to the planning application the subject of this appeal were made prior to the Council's decision. The appellant states that the amendments made reflected communication with the Council and that some of the amendments suggested by the Council were, in the appellant's view, unwarranted.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property is located in the countryside. It comprises a large extended two storey detached dwelling set back from the road behind a grass verge and trees and garden. The appeal dwelling is set towards the centre of the property's garden, which predominantly comprises open areas of lawn.
6. The appeal property sits outside and appears visually separate from, the small village of Churchover. There are large agricultural fields to the north, south and east of the appeal property and the property is separated from a dwelling to the west by a wide area of garden land.

7. The area surrounding the appeal property is green, open and spacious.
8. Whilst set back from the road behind trees, the appeal dwelling appears prominently in its surroundings due in part to topography, but also due to the dwelling's extended size and its central position within an open area of garden which itself, sits within the open countryside.
9. It is proposed to extend the height of the main gable roof. A taller front gable would replace the existing gable and a large two-storey gable would be added to the rear of the dwelling. It is also proposed to extend the dwelling above the single-storey extension to the side, to the height of the proposed main roof. This side extension would include an additional two storey gable feature.
10. The proposed two storey rear gable would project considerably to the rear. A proposed single-storey rear extension would stretch across the rest of the rear elevation and this would project a little further than the proposed rear gable. A front porch and rear dormers are also proposed.
11. As well as raise its height, the proposed development would greatly increase the footprint of the appeal dwelling. The visual impacts of these substantial changes would be exacerbated by a very large increase in the overall scale and volume of the dwelling.
12. The totality of the increased development proposed is such that it would not comprise a subservient addition. Rather, the proposal would dominate the appearance of the host dwelling to the point of overwhelming it.
13. The harmful effect arising from the above would be exacerbated by the appearance of the two-storey side extension, the ridge of which would not be set down from the main ridge. Further, as proposed, the two front gables would extend to different heights and this, together with their different widths and varied fenestration, would result in an unbalanced, unsymmetrical appearance. This would appear awkward and would serve to draw further attention to the proposal as an unduly dominant development.
14. Undue attention would also be drawn to the large number of windows proposed. As well as numerous, these would be of various shapes and sizes, resulting in windows that would appear out of character with the appearance of the host dwelling.
15. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Policy SDC1 of the Rugby Local Plan 2011-2031 (2019); and to the Council's Climate Change and Sustainable Development Supplementary Planning Document (2023), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

16. The appellant states that the proposed development will provide improved office and work from home space, amongst other things. This is a factor that stands in favour of the proposal but it does not outweigh the significant harm identified.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR