
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2017

by George Arrowsmith BA, MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 01 September 2017

Appeal Ref APP/J3720/D/17/3177186

Oaklee, Windmill Lane, Ladbroke, Southam, CV47 2BN

- 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 Ric Hampson against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00186/FUL, dated 19 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is the extension and remodelling of an existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the extension and remodelling of an existing dwelling at Windmill Lane, Ladbroke, Southam, CV47 2BN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00186/FUL, dated 19 January 2017, 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: R1, P1.1, P2.1, P3, P4.1, P5.1, P6, P7, P8.1, P10.1 & P12.1.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall not begin until samples and trade descriptions of the external facing and roofing materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the extended and remodelled dwelling would be detrimental to the character of the street scene and the wider local area.

Reasons

3. The proposal is to remodel a nondescript detached bungalow standing in a well-treed plot at the north eastern extremity of Ladbroke village. Most of the village is within the Ladbroke Conservation Area but the detached dwellings on the east side of Windmill Lane, including the appeal property, are excluded. Drawing P27 presented with the application shows that these existing dwellings are predominantly single storey but with a variety of form and design
4. The remodelled dwelling would be substantially larger than the existing bungalow. It would extend further to the rear and further towards the site frontage although it would still be set behind the principal elevation of

Cotswold, its neighbour to the south. It would also be about 1.8m higher than the existing building and would become a 1½ storey structure. There would be a staggered double gable frontage, within which the large first floor windows would be almost triangular, and a double pitched roof. The long north facing side elevation would have one very large dormer window set in a shallow gable and two large dormer windows. The walls would be finished with a mixture of white render and vertical timber cladding. The roof would be predominantly black slate except that part of the south facing side roof would be clad in sheet metal in preparation for the future installation of solar panels.

5. Taking all the above factors into account, the officer's report describes the remodelled building's overall appearance as complicated and discordant within the wider setting. The report adds that the wide front gable would appear excessively bulky, dominant and incongruous, and that the choice of external finishes for the walls, the large side facing dormers and the unorthodox shape of the first-floor windows would appear disparate with the surroundings, jarring with the simple character of the immediate area
6. Despite concluding that the dwelling would appear discordant within the wider setting, the report notes that it would not be excessively high and that the degree of forward extension would not be harmful in principle. In addition, it finds that the dwelling would not appear overly dominant or intrusive in the street scene and that it would cause no harm to the character or appearance of the nearby conservation area.
7. There is superficial inconsistency between elements of the officer's report. In particular, the finding that the dwelling's overall appearance would be discordant within the wider setting sits a little uneasily with the finding that it would not appear overly dominant or intrusive within the street scene. It may however be that the latter finding relates to the size and position of the remodelled dwelling but discounts its design.
8. In my view the remodelled dwelling would appear somewhat extravagant and unconventional. I accept that some of the design features echo those on other village buildings, for example double gable frontages, rendering and timber cladding, but despite these theoretical similarities the way the features would be incorporated in the proposed building would have a very different overall effect. Nevertheless, although unusual, I do not find the design intrinsically unattractive or unacceptable. Taking account of its set-back from the road in this edge of the village location, I am satisfied that it would not harm the street scene or have an adverse effect on the character of the surrounding area. The vegetation screening the site would further reduce the proposal's impact but is not the determining factor in my assessment. I also agree with the officer's conclusion that the proposal preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area (although the officer uses the words 'not harm') because it is screened, set back from the highway and would not be seen in the same visual context as the buildings within the conservation area.
9. The officer's report says that the degree of extension would not appear subservient to the existing building as required by policy CS.20 on the Council's Core Strategy. The appeal proposal is however so different in scale and character from the original that it is more accurately described as a remodelling. As such policy CS.20's requirement for subservience is not

directly relevant, with the consequence that the proposal can justifiably be judged on its own merits. In this context, I am aware that there is no objection to the proposal from the Parish Council or any interested person.

Conditions

10. I have imposed the substance of the conditions suggested by the Council which I consider necessary in the interests of clarity and visual amenity.

George Arrowsmith

INSPECTOR