



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2021

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/D/21/3277962

Trevose Cottage, Bottom Street, Northend, SOUTHAM, CV47 2TH

- 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 Alex Attley against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00595/FUL, dated 21 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the demolition of existing garage and storage buildings, and the construction of a new detached garage building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

- The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area around Bottom Street in Northend.

Reasons

2. Trevose Cottage is a detached house situated on the western side of Bottom Street, close to The Green in the village of Northend. It is a wide-fronted brick house with a two-storey rear extension and a high single-storey extension at its southern end. The main body of the house is set a short distance back from the front boundary, and the southern extension abuts the rear of the pavement. There is a detached garage/outbuilding further south in the plot, which is in a poor state of repair, and a greenhouse and outbuilding at the southern end of the garden. The south-eastern boundary consists of a 1.8 metre high wooden fence.
3. The existing garage would be demolished as part of the development and the proposed new garage and store building would be set back 6 metres from the front boundary of the property at the southern end of the plot. The proposed building would be some 11 metres long by 6.3 metres wide. It would have an ironstone gable wall to the eastern elevation and timber walls to the south and west. It would include an open-fronted double garage and storeroom on the ground floor, with a small log store attached, and stairs to a first-floor room providing an office/workspace with wc. The building would have a high-pitched roof with two flat-roofed dormer windows in the north roof slope.

4. The Council contends that the proposed garage, by reason of its size, scale and design would introduce a large, prominent and domesticized building that would compete with the main dwelling-house. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and visually detract from the amenities of the wider street scene.
5. The appellant contends that the design and appearance of the garage are appropriate with regards to the provisions of the relevant local policies and guidance, and that the garage would not be of a scale that would compete with the dwelling and is subservient to the dwelling in both floor area and height. In addition, the building would be set down some 0.6 metres below the level of the pavement and would not be readily visible in the street scene. Finally, the appellant notes the existence of other garages and outbuildings in the vicinity that are positioned at or close to the front boundary of their respective plots.
6. Policy CS9 of the Council's Core Strategy (CS) indicates that proposals, including layout and orientation, should be sensitive to the setting, existing built form, neighbouring uses, and topography of the site and locality. Proposals should reflect the context of the locality, ensuring a continuity of key design features that establishes the identity of the place, not harming existing public views. Policy CS20 of the CS indicates that proposed outbuildings should be of an appropriate scale, and subservient in relation to the existing building, taking into account the site location and the cumulative impacts of previous extensions and development on the site where appropriate. Part E of the Council's Development Requirements SPD indicates that flat roofed dormers with cornice moulding may be acceptable on buildings in a Classical idiom.
7. The appeal site slopes down gently from east to west, and also from south to north, such that the proposed building would be set with a base level approximately the same as the southern extension of the house and a little above the base level of the main house. The proposal would result in a large, effectively two-storey building sited some 12 metres from the house and a similar distance from 'The Bungalow', the adjacent property to the south. It would have an overall height of around 5.9 metres to roof ridge. On this basis, it would appear higher than the southern extension to the house and only a little lower than the ridge of the house itself.
8. By virtue of the forward projection of the southern extension to the house, the proposed new building would not be readily visible in the street scene when approaching from the north. However, it would be a prominent feature when viewed from the front of the site and when approaching from the south. Although it would be sited 6 metres back from the front boundary, because of its height and relatively open position, it would be clearly visible above the front boundary fence and would have the appearance of a more dominant structure than the bungalow to the south. Moreover, its overall scale, while smaller than the existing house, would be large enough, and the building high enough, to result in it appearing as a significant feature on the plot that would compete with the main house.
9. I note the existence of a large garage building at Blencow Brow, the dwelling opposite, but in this case, by virtue of its design and lower overall height, it is less prominent and is of significantly lower height in relation to

the dwelling behind it. Similarly, other garages and outbuildings visible along Bottom Street and close to the rear of the pavement, are much lower in height than that currently proposed for Trevose Cottage and are generally better integrated into the street scene by way of boundary planting and tree screening in the immediate vicinity.

10. Finally, I consider the use of flat-topped dormer windows in the north roof slope to be an alien and unsatisfactory feature within the general surrounding area, where such dormers characteristically have a gable fronted design with a small pitched roof above the window.
11. I accept the view of the council that the overall materials used for the proposed building are appropriate to the area. However, in view of its large scale and siting within the context of the host property and its immediate surroundings, it would result in a somewhat over-dominant visual impact, accentuating the cumulative impacts of previous extensions and development on the original house. This would result in the building having a harmful effect on the character and appearance of both the host property in its context and also on the wider street scene.
12. On this issue, therefore, and in the light of the above, I find that the proposed extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of Bottom Street in this part of Northend. It would, on this basis, conflict with policies CS9 and CS20 of the CS, and with guidance in the SPD.

Conclusion

13. I find that the proposed extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around Bottom Street. Accordingly, I dismiss this appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR