



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2022

by Emma Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/D/22/3296814

6 Callaways Road, Shipston on Stour CV36 4HB

- 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 P Langford against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00235/FUL, dated 26 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension to form larger garage and bedroom.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dormer style dwelling, located in a residential area made up of properties of a range of architectural styles. Whilst of differing designs, the adjoining properties in the row are set back a similar distance from the road, which creates a strong and consistent front building line. This contributes positively to the pleasant open character of the street scape on this side of the road.
4. The proposed two-storey extension would project forward of the front elevation of the existing dwelling and that of the adjoining properties. It would introduce a gable feature with an eaves level higher than the eaves to the front elevation of the host dwelling. The ridge height of the proposed front gable would reflect that of the existing two storey side wing, being just below that of the ridge of the main house.
5. Despite this, as a result of the siting, height, scale and design of the two-storey extension, it would appear as an incongruous and unduly dominant feature in relation to the host dwelling. Furthermore, it would unbalance the dwelling and fail to complement its appearance. As such, it would read as a visually prominent and anomalous feature in the street scape, eroding the quality of its open character.
6. Consequently, the proposed extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and would therefore conflict with Policies CS9 and CS20 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011 to 2031, which seek to

ensure local distinctiveness and high-quality design. The proposal is also contrary to Policy ENV3 of the Shipston on Stour Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016 to 2031, which requires development to respect local distinctiveness through excellent design.

Other Matters

7. Planning permission was also refused as insufficient information was submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would incorporate appropriate measures to address climate change. The Council have indicated that the matter could be dealt with by condition should permission be granted and as such the proposals would comply with the relevant parts of the development plan. I have no reason to disagree. This would however be where a form of harm could be acceptably mitigated and as such does not weigh in favour or against the proposal. The proposals would also be acceptable in regard to, amongst other things, parking provision. But as a lack of harm this would be a neutral matter.
8. A number of other examples of similar development have been brought to my attention. Nevertheless, the precise details of each case are not before me that I may be able to draw comparisons with the appeal scheme such that my conclusions thereon may change. In any case, each development proposal is to be considered on its own merits.
9. I understand the appellant's desire for the extension due to the present economic climate and in particular the housing market, and that the proposal would allow for multi-generational living, as well as accommodation which could be adapted to meet the future needs of the occupants. However, this does not mean that the proposed development is an acceptable solution given the harm it would cause.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Emma Worley

INSPECTOR