



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2025

by Eleni Marshall BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/25/3372070

14 Dugard Place, Barford, Warwickshire, CV35 8DX

- The appeal is made under of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land carried out without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Matt Ball against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application reference is W/25/0883.
 - The application sought planning permission for variation of condition 2 (plan list) of planning permission W/24/1462 (erection of two-storey rear and side extension, single-storey rear extension, new pitched roof to porch and garage, erection of car port to front attaching to garage) to allow amendments to the two-storey side extension without complying with a condition attached to planning permission W/24/1462 dated 17 January 2025.
 - The reason given for the condition is for the avoidance of doubt and to secure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with the Local Plan.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit the proposal development had commenced and had been undertaken, in terms of the roof form of the side extension, in line with the plans which are the subject of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area with regard to roof design.

Reasons

4. The Council's delegated report confirms no objection to maintaining the gable roof design which would be characteristic of Dugard Place, nor to the proposed use of exterior cladding which would not be out of character with the varied materials already present within the street scene. The Council also find that the extension would be appropriately set down from the main ridge and set back from the principal elevation. Based upon my site visit, and the plans before me, I have no reason to conclude differently on such matters. The main issue is, therefore, based upon the design of the proposal which is considered to be at odds with the existing roof design.
5. The appeal site is a detached residential dwelling which stands on the inside corner of a U-shaped street, occupying a large plot as well as being located in a visually prominent position within the general street scene. At the time of my site visit I

found that the street scene is characterised by gabled properties which are subject to two main variations in the form of low pitched off angled forward facing gable properties (such as the appeal site) and more typical side facing gabled properties. I note, from my site visit and the appellant's statement of case, that some properties along Dugard Place have been subject to alteration and extension – this is discussed further below in the context of the examples provided.

6. The appeal that is before me seeks to amend the plan list relating to planning permission W/24/1462 which granted planning permission for the erection of (amongst other elements) a two storey rear and side extension by reorientating the proposed two storey side extension gable to be facing the principal elevation rather than be side facing, and to remove the ridge which within the existing planning permission would integrate the two storey side extension ridge into the main roof.
7. The host dwelling is a low-pitched contemporary dwelling whereby the main roof ridge is offset from the centre of the two-storey core of the host dwelling positioned further to the east to create a gabled roof which features two differing roof pitches and two differing lengths of roof slope. The proposed two storey extension would be on the western side elevation adjoining the end of the longer roof slope. The existing planning permission is for a perpendicular gable side extension and allowed for a shallow pitch that attempted to mimic the design style of the original main roof while also integrating the design into the main roof with the elongated ridge. Based upon the plans before me I find that this, already approved, design would be sympathetic to the original architectural features and design of the host dwelling and would result in positive integration as a result of the extension.
8. The now proposed, varied, design would stand adjacent to the main roof and create a double gabled front elevation with a more traditional central ridge which I find would not integrate positively with the main roof and would read as an incongruous feature given the host dwelling's existing roof. The two examples of planning permission which the appellant has outlined has been where the design of the extension had been permitted on side gabled properties and not properties of the same architectural detailing as the appeal site. I do not find, therefore, that there is inconsistency in decision making in this case but rather that each case should be considered on its own merits and the host dwellings, in those examples, differ in architectural style to the appeal site meaning that the proposed design would not effectively integrate at the appeal site by comparison as it has done on properties of other architectural styles.
9. The main issue, with the integration of the proposed design, is exacerbated by the pitch angle between the two roofs varying by in the region of 14 degrees which can already been seen as a result of the work that has taken place on site resulting in visual incongruity of the different roof designs. I note the comments regarding the roof pitch and the provision of tiles, made by the appellant, however, whilst I acknowledge this, this does not overcome the harm which I have identified with regard to the proposal being entirely at odds with the existing roof design which, in terms of bulk, scale and massing, is unacceptable in terms of being visually incongruous as a design feature.
10. I note that the appellant has stated that they are of the opinion that the Council has made a decision based on personal opinion, however, I find that the Council has given clear reasoning as to the refusal reason stated. I find that the proposal would be inappropriate in the context of the original architecture of the host dwelling, that

it would be unsympathetic to the local character or history and would not integrate well into the existing design, by reason of the introduction of a roof design which would be at odds with the existing roof of the host dwelling and which would result in a visually incongruous design feature. As outlined, I note the presence of similarly designed extensions, in isolation, but these were not approved or constructed in the context of a similarly designed host dwelling and are of limited weight of relevance to the proposal that is before me.

11. The proposed variation to the roof design of the approved extension would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. The proposal would be contrary to the Warwick District Local Plan 2017 Policy BE1 which requires proposals to positively contribute to the character and quality of its environment through good layout and design and expects proposals to harmonise with, or enhance, the existing settlement in terms of physical form, reinforce or enhance the established urban character of streets and reflect, respect and reinforce local architectural and historical distinctiveness.
12. The proposal would also be contrary to Barford Neighbourhood Plan 2014 – 2029 Policy B7 which requires that new development should be of a scale, mass and build form which responds to the characteristics of the site and its surroundings and that care should be taken to ensure that the building(s) height, scale, mass and form, including the roof line, do not interrupt the visual amenities of the street scene with the Barford Village Design Statement requiring that extensions should respect the original concept of the development.
13. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 which seeks to ensure developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area and be sympathetic to local character and history as well as the Warwick District Council Residential Design Guide 2018 which seeks to assist with the assessment of good design taking into account the overarching objectives of that guidance including that extensions to detached dwellings should seek to enhance the overall design unity.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR