

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 13 October 2020 by John Gunn DipTP Dip DBE MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/D/20/3256860

11 Bidford Road, Broom, B50 4HP

- 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 Ms Shan Walker against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00785/FUL, dated 13 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is single-storey and two-storey rear extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated on the edge of the village overlooking open countryside. The host property comprises a semi-detached house located within a group of similarly designed buildings, with hipped roofs being a feature of the locality. They are set a modest distance back from the road and utilise a similar palette of materials.
4. The single storey rear extension would be similar in scale to the adjoining property and in this regard, I find that this element of the proposal would reflect nearby development and would respect the character and appearance of the area.
5. The adjoining property has a flat roofed dormer on its rear elevation and although the flat roof dormer proposed would be similar in design to this feature, it would not be an independent feature like that next door. It would be reliant on the proposed extension above the ground floor extension. As a result of its design, this aspect of the proposal would significantly increase the bulk and massing of the host property, which would be particularly noticeable when viewed from Bidford Road, within the vicinity of the appeal site. It would significantly detract from the appearance of the host property, introducing an unsympathetic extension which would not be subservient in scale to the host property. Moreover, the extended property's overall scale would be significantly at odds with the established form of development nearby.

6. Furthermore, I find that the side facing dormer would significantly alter the roofscape of the host property and would introduce a prominent and alien addition into the street scene, which would also unbalance the symmetry of the semi-detached pair of which the host property forms part. As a result, the proposal would not be sympathetic to local character and would erode the strong sense of place that exists within this part of Bidford Road.
7. I visited the nearby streets, including further along Bidford Road and into High Street. I saw that elsewhere in the village that the overall character of the built environment was varied with a range of different house designs, size and age evident. For the most part where two storey extensions had been erected, they appeared as subservient elements to the host property. As a result, whilst acknowledging that other extensions have been built in the locality, their design and context was different. Therefore, the examples submitted by the appellant of other developments in the locality are not directly comparable with the appeal proposal. They do not provide justification for it.
8. The appellant has referred to the potential to carry out elements of the development as 'permitted development' and indicates that this would represent a significant fallback position. I acknowledge that the property is likely to benefit from certain permitted rights and that certain permitted development rights are likely to have a similar effect on the character and appearance of the host property and area, as the proposal before me.
9. However, given the interdependency of the various elements of the proposed development I do not consider that there would be a real prospect of much of the individual elements proceeding in the event that the appeal was to be dismissed. Moreover, the fallback position would be unlikely to provide the appellant with the same amount of accommodation that the proposal would offer. Accordingly, this limits the weight that I attach to this matter in my assessment of this case.
10. I acknowledge the appellant's desire to improve her home and provide a modern home fit for her family to enjoy. From the evidence submitted it appears that the Council would be willing to consider alternative proposals, that would comply with adopted policy, and meet her aspirations. It is unlikely that the scheme before me is the only option to improve the accommodation.
11. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, contrary to Policy CS.9 and CS.20 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011-2031, which requires high quality design that responds to the site's immediate and wider context and local character, with extensions being of an appropriate scale and subservient in relation to the existing building. Moreover, the proposal conflicts with Policy ENV9 of the Bidford on-Avon Neighbourhood Plan, which indicates that proposals that do not positively contribute to local character will not be supported. There are no material considerations which indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Gunn

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR