



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2022

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/W/22/3299976

15 Manor Green, Stratford-upon-Avon, Warwickshire CV37 7ES

- 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 Shaun Wolstenholme against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04069/FUL, dated 18 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of double garage and utility and replacement with a detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached 2 storey house with a single storey side garage. It lies on the outside of a bend in the road in a predominantly residential area with a mix of single storey and 2 storey dwellings of different styles. Despite the variation in appearance, houses on Manor Green tend to have wide frontages that face the road and are set back a similar distance from the pavement. This urban grain is readily appreciated within the street scene and is a fundamental characteristic of the locality.
4. The proposed house would be visible from both directions along Manor Green. The front elevation of the dwelling would consist of a gable wall which would be noticeably narrower than the retained part of the appeal property. Also, it would be narrower than other dwellings along Manor Green.
5. The small width of the house would be emphasised by the subdivision of the existing plot in order to accommodate the proposed development, even though the frontage would remain open. Also, the front of the dwelling would be set back behind the principal elevation of the appeal property and the adjoining house. As a consequence, the proposed building would look unusually cramped and enclosed by the adjoining houses when seen from the pavement. In these respects, it would be out of keeping with the rest of the street.
6. The appellant suggests that the width of the plot for the proposed dwelling would be comparable to others in the area, with specific reference made to 7 Manor Green (No 7) as being slightly narrower. However, the proposed

dwelling and the retained appeal property is shown as sharing a plot frontage, whereas this is not the case for any other house on the road. From my observations and the details as shown on the appeal plans, I consider that the proposed house and the associated plot would be perceived as being significantly narrower than any other nearby dwelling, including No 7.

7. Given the variety of house styles in the surrounding area, the modern look of the proposed house would not be incongruous. As a detached unit, it would follow the predominant form of housing in the locality. The plot for the proposal would not be unusually small in overall size as it would have a large back garden. However, these factors do not address nor justify the failure of the development to reflect the distinctive pattern of properties with wide frontages.
8. The Council's Design Guide 2001 (DG) indicates a variation in the type of design is appropriate on corner plots. It is unclear from the DG whether this advice applies to housing on the outside of bends in the road such as the appeal site. In any event, the appeal property is already designed to reflect the curve in the highway through the angled link between the main part of the house and the garage. The proposed house would be orientated in a similar manner to the front of the garage but it would introduce a new and uncharacteristic narrow-fronted property. As such, I am unconvinced that the DG advice on corner plots provides justification for the scheme's incompatibility to the established pattern of development.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. In these respects, it would not accord with policy CS.9 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011 to 2031 and policies H5 and BE2 of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan 2011-2031 (NP). Amongst other things, these policies look to ensure development reflects the character and distinctiveness of the locality. NP policy BE5 is referred to in the Council's refusal reasons but it contains no provisions relevant to this particular issue.

Other Matters

10. The development would be acceptable in terms of its effect on living conditions of nearby residents, parking and highway safety. Acceptability in these respects is a neutral factor rather than a benefit to which I attach positive weight. The dwelling would be within a built up area with good accessibility to services and facilities. Also, it would add to the housing stock. However, as only a single unit is proposed, these factors attract only modest weight in support of the scheme, particularly as the Council is able to demonstrate well in excess of 5 years supply of land for housing.

Conclusion

11. The harm identified in respect of the main issue means that the proposal would not accord with development plan policies when read as a whole. There is insufficient justification to make a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR