
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2025 by S Indermaur

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/Z/25/3360058

8-12 Tiddington Convenience Stores, Main Street, Tiddington, Warwickshire, Stratford-Upon-Avon CV37 7AZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Simon Myatt against the decision of Stratford-upon-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02612/FUL.
 - The development is roller shutter door across the front doors and windows for security (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure and Main Issue

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal. The main issue in which is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

3. A solid roller shutter and box that spans the width of the shop's glazed frontage sits on the outside of the building, below the first floor. The shutter covers the entrance to the shop when closed, located to the right hand end of the terrace in which the building sits when viewed from the road. The group of buildings, the amalgamated ground floors aside, form a traditional two storey terrace with simple form and design. The wider street scene retains a good quality village feel, with a variety of cottages, older and more modern detached and terraced buildings set back from and actively facing what is Tiddington's main thoroughfare.
4. When closed, the shutter obscures the glazed entrance entirely. Whilst the shop front at this point is clearly not original, the semi-industrial appearance of the shutter is stark, oppressive and deadening against the more active traditional qualities of the street scene. The box atop the entrance is not overly obvious in itself and the shutters would not be closed all of the time, but this would not be sufficient to make it visually acceptable.
5. The installation would not sit appropriately with the guidance set out in Part H of the Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document which explains, amongst other things, that roller shutters create a blank, unappealing appearance to a shopfront and streetscape.

6. A roller shutter can be an effective security measure, especially in light of a claimed number of burglaries at the appeal premises and recommendations from the police. However, I remain to be convinced there are no other, less visually harmful means of achieving the same objective.
7. The development therefore causes harm to the character and appearance of the area. In this regard, it conflicts with Policies BE2, BE4 and BE5 of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan (2011-2031). Together, the policies set out that all new development must demonstrate how local character has been taken into account during the conception and evolution of a design. The Council refer to Policy CS.9 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy (2011-2031) which I am unsure is sufficiently relevant to the main issue since it refers to schemes linked to the evening and night-time economy.

Other Matters

8. Reference has been made to examples of solid roller shutters located elsewhere in the district. I am however unaware of their planning status and full details of each have not been provided. I have considered the appeal scheme on its own merits. Having regard to its specific siting and circumstances. In addition, the lack of objections to the scheme during the planning application stage is a neutral matter which cannot be used to weigh against the harm I have found.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I thus recommend, for the reasons set out above, that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR