



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2025

by **P Barton BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E3715/W/24/3356024

Flat, 41 Park Road, Rugby, CV21 2QU

- 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 Shazad Mohammad against the decision of Rugby Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is R24/0277.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion and first floor side extension
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development given on the application form was "*Loft conversion and first floor side extension for flat 41 Park Road*". As the address is not an act of development, I have deleted it from the description of the proposal used in the banner header above.
3. The plans submitted and determined by the Council show an extension to the existing first floor flat with a bedroom within the roof space. It also indicates the creation of an additional self-contained flat at first floor level and within the roof space.
4. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 12 December 2024 with a further minor revision on 7 February 2025. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site faces Park Road and Wood Street, both of which consist of predominantly 2 storey terrace properties, many of which have single or double height bays. A limited number of properties on Park Road also have front-facing gable features with windows serving accommodation in the roof space. These architectural features are proportioned to the narrow plots giving a strong vertical emphasis and harmony to these terraced streets. Properties on Park Road generally have more architectural detailing and there are mature street trees.

7. The appeal premises is characteristic of other corner plots in the locality, with elevations facing both roads and often with high boundary treatments or single storey structures siting forward of the building line to one of these roads.
8. The proposed first floor side extension would reflect the building line of the adjacent single storey building but not that of the 2 storey properties along Park Road. Consequently, it would sit forward of the established building line at first floor level in a prominent corner location. The creation of gable ends to the existing building and the extension facing Park Road would also unbalance the symmetry of the hip end roof design of the appeal premises and the property to the opposite side of Park Road at the junction with Wood Street. Moreover, the proposed gable ends facing Park Road would be significantly wider and would not reflect the proportions of the narrow plots that characterise properties on this street. All these factors would disrupt the prevailing uniformed character and appearance of the locality.
9. Other loft conversions have been referred to in the area in support of the appeal. However, unlike the appeal proposal the ones I saw have not included an upper floor extension that projects past the established building line along the road. As a result, they are materially different to the appeal proposal and so reference to them has not altered my assessment of the proposed scheme.
10. For the above reasons, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This would conflict with Policy SDC1 of the Rugby Local Plan 2011-2031, which supports proposals of a high design quality that respond to the character of the area in which they are situated. The proposal would also conflict with the Framework, which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

11. I also note the appellant's concern over the Council's handling of the application. However, this is not a matter that I can consider under a Section 78 planning appeal and does not alter my findings, in which I have had regard solely to the planning merits of the proposal.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations put forward in support of the proposed scheme do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

P Barton

INSPECTOR