

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2017

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DiP TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 2nd May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/D/17/3171188

17 Chapel Street, Bishops Itchington CV47 2RB

- 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 and Mrs Wheeler against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application ref: 16/03922/FUL, dated 5 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is front, rear and side single and double storey extensions with loft/roof over and partial demolition of rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for front, rear and side single and double storey extensions with loft/roof over and partial demolition of rear elevation at 17 Chapel Street, Bishops Itchington CV47 2RB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/03922/FUL, dated 5 December 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing nos. 3647/01, 3647/02, 3647/03, 3647/04C and 3647/05C.
 - 3) The extensions hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the first floor en-suite windows in the west elevation have been fitted with obscured glazing, to a minimum level 3 glaze. Once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of the development from the application form, which differs slightly from that given on the appeal form, but nevertheless provides a reasonably succinct and accurate description of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. No. 17 Chapel Street is a detached property, set back from the road, on a fairly prominent plot on the corner with Fisher Road. To the front, it has a single storey projection, which is surrounded by a railing, and whose flat roof is used as a balcony. That projection is largely finished in cream coloured render which contrasts with the exposed masonry on the dwelling's other walls. The Council states that planning permission was not granted for that render, but that as it has been there for over 4 years it considers it to be lawful.
5. Dwellings in the surrounding area are predominantly finished with red brick walls of differing hues, although some, such as the terrace at nos. 14 to 20 (evens) Chapel Street, have mainly yellow brick walls. However, there are also examples of painted brickwork, and cladding. The buildings also display considerable variety in terms of their style and form. Consequently, although the immediate area is not unattractive, its buildings do not generally contribute to a strong sense of local distinctiveness.
6. The Council raises no objection to the form and mass of the proposed extensions. Given the varied proportions of nearby properties I have no reason to disagree. Indeed, as the form of no. 17's flat-roofed projection with its raised, prominent balcony is rather at odds with the sloping roofs more typical of the streetscene, its replacement would be a visual enhancement.
7. Turning to the proposed facing materials, render is not a characteristic of the immediate area. However, given the nearby range of facing materials and their varied colours, I am not persuaded that its use here would cause significant harm. Its finished appearance would not be greatly different from the painted masonry that I noted elsewhere. Although reconstructed stone quoins and window surrounds may not represent a traditional design for the locality, their use would give the building some definition, and I did observe stone quoins and window surrounds at The Old School House opposite.
8. Finishing the whole property in render, in contrast to its immediate neighbours, could draw the eye to this building and therefore make it appear slightly more dominant in the streetscene than a masonry finish. However, for the reasons above, I am satisfied that that material and the reconstructed stone detailing would not cause significant harm. Considered together with the enhancement resulting from the replacement of the projecting flat roof and balcony, the scheme's overall effect would be to preserve the character and appearance of the area.
9. For those reasons the proposal would not conflict with policies CS.9 and CS.20 of the Stratford-On-Avon District Core Strategy 2011 to 2031 which set out, in general terms and amongst other things, that development shall be of a high quality design, which reflects the area's character and distinctiveness. Although the Council has not referred to any particular part of its Planning Advice Note 'Extending Your Home' 2008, the scheme would not conflict with its general

principle that extensions should not harm the appearance of the area. The appeal will therefore be allowed.

10. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have considered those suggested by the Council against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard time limit condition, in the interests of certainty, a condition is necessary requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
11. In its delegated report the Council also suggests a condition requiring that the two first floor west-facing windows in the extension be obscure glazed. Given the proximity of those en-suite windows to no. 15 Chapel Street, and the overlooking that could result from them to no. 15's side facing windows and its outdoor amenity areas, I consider such a condition to be necessary to protect the neighbouring occupants' living conditions.
12. For the above reasons, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR