



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 03 June 2025

by V Simpson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/25/3361482

Proposal: Proposed bedrooms over existing kitchen/dining room at 2 Quarry Farm Cottages, Rowington Green, Rowington, Warwickshire CV35 7DD.

Application Ref: W/24/1359.

Decision – dismissed

Reasons

Issue – Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt

1. In so far as they are relevant to this appeal, the development plan policies relating to the Green Belt are generally consistent with the equivalent parts of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
2. Since 1 July 1948, there have been several extensions and alterations to the rear of the cottage. Cumulatively, these have greatly increased the footprint of this building, as well as enlarging its volume and the floorspace within it. The appeal scheme would result in further and sizable volume and floorspace increases. When considered in combination with the previous extensions, the development would substantially increase the floorspace and volume of this cottage. Such enlargement would amount to a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building¹.
3. Consequently, the development would not meet the exception at paragraph 154. c) of the Framework, and it would comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Issue - effect on the openness and purposes of the Green Belt

4. The appeal scheme would result in the enlargement of the cottage, and, albeit not at ground level, it would introduce development in a space where there currently is none. Moreover, the enlarged part of the cottage would be visible from within the gardens of the appeal site and the adjacent dwelling. Consequently, and albeit to a small extent, the development would harmfully reduce the openness of the Green Belt.
5. That being the case, the development would not accord with a Green Belt purpose to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

¹ As it was on 1 July 1948

Issue - effect on the character and appearance of the area

6. The house on the appeal site is one of a pair of modest, semi-detached cottages. Notwithstanding previous extensions and alterations to these cottages, their simple style, form, and scale, can still be clearly understood. Although the extension would be to the rear of and lower than the existing cottage on the appeal site, it would have a contrived roof shape which would jar with the more simply detailed dual-pitched roof forms of the main 2-storey parts of the house.
7. Moreover, the development would extend across most of the rear of the cottage at both first-floor and roof levels, and a large part of it would have a flat roof. The associated increase in the bulk and massing of the cottage would detract from its modest characteristics. However, because the extension would not be readily visible from outside the rear and side garden of the appeal site, and, the rear garden of the adjoining cottage, the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area would be small.
8. Nevertheless, for the reasons given, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. In this respect, it would be contrary to the policies cited in the decision notice.

Other considerations

9. The proposal would provide additional space and an improved layout for the appellant and their family. It would also bring short-term economic benefits during the construction phase. Nevertheless, due to the modest scale of the scheme, the weight that may be attributed to each of these economic and social benefits is small. In addition, there is no compelling evidence to conclude that the development is the only affordable way for the appellant to secure the amount of accommodation that they desire. I therefore attribute very limited weight to this consideration.

Green Belt balance

10. The proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which would lead to a small loss of its openness. In accordance with the Framework, substantial weight is given to the harm that would be caused by this. In this case, the other considerations do not clearly outweigh this harm and any other harm previously identified. Consequently, the very special circumstances required to justify the development do not exist.

Conclusion

11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and nothing outweighs this.

V Simpson

INSPECTOR