The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 October 2020 by S Watson BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/D/20/3257707
21 Welsh Road West, SOUTHAM, CV47 0JW

- 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 Sandeep Singh against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
- The application Ref 19/03191/FUL, dated 12 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2020.
- The development proposed is described as a 2 storey side extension, single storey rear extension, detached double garage, formation of new vehicular access and provision of parking area and driveway.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was carried out by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in a prominent position on the south side of Welsh Road West at the junction with St James Road. It contains a semi-detached dwelling set within a large and spacious garden. At the time of my visit there was no boundary treatment to the side of the property and only a low fence across part of the front. However, a small area of the rear garden immediately behind the dwelling had been fenced off to provide a private amenity space. The surrounding area is characterised by open, spacious frontages and corners. The appeal site makes a positive contribution to the spacious character of both Welsh Road West and St James Road.

5. Although sympathetic to the design of the host dwelling, the scale of the two-storey side extension would be such that it would result in a dominant feature which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property. Furthermore, this part of the proposal would unbalance the semi-

detached pair of which the host property forms part. The existing uniformity of the dwellings would also be adversely affected by this side extension.

6. Moreover, the siting of the side extension in an otherwise open area would result in a prominent feature within the streetscene which would significantly erode the open and spacious character of St James Road. Notwithstanding the harm identified above, I do not find the proposal to be overdevelopment, as the site has sufficient space to accommodate such an extension without appearing cramped.

7. I consider that the new vehicular access and associated parking to the front of the site would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene, as would the new garage. However, given the openness of the appeal site to public views, the proposed driveway would be an intrusive, jarring feature as it would run parallel to St James Road. This is especially so given its close proximity to the edge of the site and the public pavement.

8. As no boundary treatments have been proposed under this scheme, I cannot consider them. I also cannot take any possible future treatments in to my determination of this appeal as they do not form part of it. The appellant has hinged their case on the Council's Committee Report which recommends the granting of planning permission. While I am mindful of the recommendation, elected members of the Council are entitled to reach a different decision to that reached under delegated powers, and it cannot prejudice my decision making.

9. In light of the above I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene, contrary to Policies CS.9 and CS.20 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy. The two policies require development to be of a high-quality design and to respond positively to its surroundings.

Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Watson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

R C Kirby

INSPECTOR