



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: 07 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/25/3370691

48 Masters Road, Whitnash, Warwickshire, CV31 2EY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Martin and Madeline Kalabus against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application reference is W/25/0479.
 - The development proposed is raised roof, exterior insulation with a render finish, new window to front and side elevations and the construction of a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have determined the proposal based upon its own merits based upon the plans which the Council made their determination. The plans in question are confirmed, for clarity, in the Council's delegated report as 2411-06 PL-3 Rev C.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the scale and built form of the street scene, the character of the street scene and the proportionality of the principal elevation of the host dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end of terrace dwelling and stands where the street scene is characterised by rows of terraced dwellings in the immediate locality albeit pairs of semi-detached dwellings, further down the hill, towards Brunswick Street. The street scene features a distinctive elevation change with the design of properties reflective of this - the properties located on the hill are characterised by stepped elevations which feature the highest property, a step down in ridge height and floor level to the two mid terraced dwellings, and then a final step down to the lowest property (in this case the appeal being the lowest in the row). This design feature, as part of the blocks of four terraced dwellings, is notable within the street scene immediately around the appeal site and I find it forms a distinctive part of the character and appearance of the street scene along Masters Road.
5. The appellant has provided examples, in the form of contextual images, however, I disagree that Masters Road does not adhere to a ridged or uniform character for the reasons outlined above. The stepped terraces, described above, are a notable characteristic within which the appeal proposal would be viewed and impact upon. While there may be examples, along Masters Road, of differing property styles,

these are in different parts of Masters Road and not part of the street scene within which the appeal site stands. The example of the four-property terraced row, noted by the appellant, is formed by 64 to 70 (even numbers) Masters Road but this is located on the flat end of Masters Road compared to the appeal site which is, as outlined, located on a slope where the stepped terraces are characteristic.

6. The proposal seeks to increase the ridge height of the property to be level with the middle two dwellings of the terraced row which would result in a single step, from the highest property, along the terraced run and result in three properties with equal ridge heights. I find that the proposal, to raise the ridge height would be inappropriate in the context of the existing and established character of the street scene and would represent development which would fail to respect the scale and built form of the street scene. The proposal would be contrary to the established character of the four blocks of four dwelling terraced rows which are uniform in this part of Masters Road.
7. The proposals indicate a slight increase to the height of the first-floor front fenestration to mitigate changes to the proportionality of the principal elevation and whilst there is some variation within the street scene with regard to window designs the proposal would result in a relationship between the window and the eaves which would be uncharacteristic. The existing relationship between the first-floor window and the eaves is a unified design characteristic in the street scene. The proposed window would be taller than those within the street scene and would not meet the eaves of the property which would add to the overall uncharacteristic nature of the proposals as a result of changes to the fenestration combined with the proposed ridge height increase.
8. The appellant has provided examples of raised roofs within the appendices to their statement of case. I do not consider any of the examples provided within appendix H to carry resemblance to the current proposals. All of the examples provided were for amendments to detached residential dwellings, which were described (within the Council's respective assessments) as being in areas more varied in character, and not a dwelling at the end of a terraced row with clear characteristic features as outlined. The Council do not raise objection with the principle of raising the ridge height to dwellings but rather that it should be undertaken in a manner which responds to the characteristics of the site and should not disrupt visual amenity as I have found to be the case with this appeal.
9. The proposed rear dormer structure would not be visible from within the street-scene and, based upon the evidence before me, the Council's refusal reason is partly based upon the character of the host property and non-compliance with the Warwick District Council Residential Design Guide 2018 (RDG). The RDG does contain specific design guidance regarding roof dormers. Indicative drawings are included within figures 21-22 inclusive as well as further written commentary. It states that dormer windows will only be permitted where they can be inserted without damaging the character and appearance of the building and the general area and without unreasonably affecting the amenity of neighbours.
10. The rear dormer structure would present as contrary to this guidance which is a material consideration within an application for planning permission. In addition, long box dormers are not characteristic of the locality. The RDG does not apply a blanket ban on flat roof dormers, however, it does seek to avoid them unless they are character appropriate to a more modern house. The appellant makes

reference to appeal reference APP/T3725/D/23/3315752 (192 Cromwell Lane) in relation to the presence of a fallback position being given significant weight in the planning balance. Each case should be considered on its own merits, and, in that case, it was found that a dormer constructed as permitted development would have appeared awkward and less preferable, in design terms, than the scheme that was ultimately allowed. By contrast the appeal at Cromwell Lane would not have resulted in an increased ridge height as forms part of the current appeal proposal and furthermore the dwellings along Cromwell Lane, as noted by the Council, were not of a notably uniform character and appearance as with Masters Road.

11. The proposed rear dormer would exceed the height of the existing roof and as submitted, it would require planning permission to be undertaken at the same time. It does not, therefore, benefit from a fallback position in the context of the overall scheme as presented. Despite this I acknowledge (as does the Council) that if there was no increase in ridge height, or if the dormer was constructed following consent for the raised ridge height, then a similar design could be implemented without planning permission and that this, in isolation, would be an unreasonable basis to withhold permission. In this case, however, the proposal before me would be combined with an increase in ridge height to the host dwelling which I find to be unacceptable. Even if I had found the dormer to be acceptable, in isolation, as a result of weight attributable to a fallback position beyond the control of the Council (at either stage) this would not overcome the main issue I have identified with regard to the raised ridge height.
12. The appeal proposal also seeks to utilise exterior insulation with a render finish which the Council confirms as unobjectionable, and I have no reason to conclude differently on this given that the street scene does contain a wide variety of external facing materials and that the proposals would not be detrimental to the varied character of the materials found. Class AA¹ (the rights which allow for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of additional storeys) is subject to a prior notification process where consideration can still be had to the external appearance of the dwellinghouse including the design and architectural features of the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse – such an enlargement would, therefore, still be subject to consideration as part of that process. Very limited could realistically be attributed to Class AA in the context of this appeal.
13. The proposal would be contrary to Warwick District Local Plan 2017 Policy BE1 which requires development to positively contribute to the character and quality of its environment and that proposals are expected to demonstrate that they reflect, respect and reinforce local architectural distinctiveness and reinforce or enhance the established urban character of streets. Policy BE1 also requires proposals to respect buildings in terms of scale, height, form and massing. The proposal would be contrary to paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 which seeks to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.
14. The proposal would also be contrary to Whitnash Neighbourhood Plan 2011 – 2029 (NP) Policy W4 which requires all development proposals to be of a scale, mass and built form which responds to the characteristics of the site and its surroundings with care being taken to ensure that building height, scale, and form, including the

¹ Class AA, Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015

roof line, do not disrupt the visual amenities of the street scene. I have no evidence before me to suggest that the application of NP Policy W4 is unreasonable nor disproportionate. Whilst I note that the policy makes reference to particular weight given to proposals within or close proximity to Whitnash Church and the Chapel Green Conservation Area, which the appeal site is not, I find the policy is still applicable to all new development proposals, as noted in the wording at the start of that policy, whether small or large scale.

15. It is acknowledged that the appellant outlines that the improvements are aligned with the Council's Climate Emergency Action Plan demonstrating a commitment to sustainable, future ready design, however, I do not find the sustainability credentials of the proposals are sufficient to overcome the inappropriateness I have identified with regard to the street scene and character of the area as outlined.

Other Matters

16. The appellant raises procedural grounds for appeal; however, this appeal is not accompanied by an application for costs and whilst I note the comments made, the handling of the application, amendments and timescales or matters relating to extensions of time are outside the scope of this appeal. A lack of objection is acknowledged but is a neutral consideration.

Conclusion

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

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR