



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E3715/D/25/3365273

The Old Post Office, Flecknoe Village Road, Flecknoe, Warwickshire, CV23 8AT

- 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 Ms Duffy against the decision of Rugby Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is R24/1163.
 - The development proposed is alterations to the fenestration of the easterly stone section of the house, enlarging the windows and upgrading these to be triple glazed units.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

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

Procedural Matter

3. The proposal benefits from a recent planning permission¹ for refurbishment. The proposal the subject of this appeal relates to a different form of fenestration to that permitted.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling. It has what appears as a main two storey stone section, with a stone-built front elevation which includes five windows and an entrance door facing out onto the street. Attached to this is a lower brick and slate building. There is a small single storey brick building attached to the end of this lower brick and slate building and the appeal dwelling has been extended to the rear.
6. The front elevation of the appeal dwelling is situated very close to Flecknoe Village Road, being separated from it by a very narrow area of paving and garden.

¹ Reference: R23/1088.

7. Whilst the area is predominantly residential in character, the village pub is located adjacent to the appeal site and this part of Flecknoe Village is notable for the presence of attractive period buildings with traditional vernacular features.
8. Whilst I observed that buildings in the area have been altered and/or extended, these changes generally appear in character with host dwellings and the surrounding area. Consequently, whilst they have changed over time, buildings including and around the appeal property have retained many of their traditional vernacular qualities and present a charming, distinctively historic character to this part of Flecknoe Village Road.
9. The appeal dwelling's existing front-facing windows make a positive contribution to these positive characteristics. Like other windows in the terrace other than dormers, they are relatively small and sit below the eaves. They appear in keeping with the appeal dwelling's traditional cottage-like appearance.
10. In contrast, the proposed development would introduce large modern windows that would serve to severely harm the traditional appearance of the appeal dwelling. The proposed windows would appear as discordant features, out of character with the host property's historical qualities and they would draw the eye in a prominent village location.
11. The harm arising would be exacerbated as a result of windows breaching the eaves and so drawing further attention to their incongruous appearance.
12. Given this, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and to Rugby Local Plan (2019) Policy SDC1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

13. The proposal would improve the appeal dwelling's energy efficiency. Whilst a factor in favour of the proposal it is not something which outweighs the identified harm. I also note that the Council has pointed out that triple glazed windows were approved under the previous application referred to above.
14. The appellant refers to support for the proposal. Whilst I recognise that there is some local support for the proposed development, I have found that the proposal would result in significant harm, contrary to local and national planning policy.
15. In support of the proposal, the appellant refers to other developments elsewhere. However, there is nothing before me to demonstrate that all of the circumstances relating to these are so similar to the proposal the subject of this appeal as to provide for direct comparison. In any case, I have found that the proposal would result in significant harm and this is not something that is changed or mitigated by the presence of other developments elsewhere.

Conclusion

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

N McGurk

INSPECTOR