



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/W/25/3372248

Burnside Hotel, Church Lane, Shotton, Stratford-on-Avon, Warwickshire CV37 9HQ

- 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 Rakesh Singh against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application reference is 24/02883/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a kitchen extension and storeroom extension (part retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background

2. This appeal concerns 2 single-storey lean-to extensions at the Burnside Hotel. The first is a kitchen extension, which is to be erected on the north-east elevation using white painted brick and tiled roofing to match the host building. The second is an existing timber-clad storeroom on the north-west elevation. The storeroom appears to be broadly in accordance with the plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed kitchen extension and the existing storeroom on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

4. The Burnside Hotel is a substantial white painted brick building with pitched and multi-gabled roofs, that occupies a prominent position on Church Lane within the Shotton Conservation Area (CA). The significance of the CA largely derives from its rural village character, mixed vernacular forms and the openness between buildings. The Council's Conservation Area Appraisal (CAR) describes Church Lane as having a scattered, linear form of development set along a tree-lined road, with open land contributing to its openness and semi-rural quality. While not identified as part of an important view, the CAR notes that the appeal property is a significant building in the streetscape. In my view, it makes a significant and positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
5. The site also falls within a designated Area of Restraint (AoR), which includes land that makes an important contribution to the character of the area. Within such areas, Policy CS.13 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011 to 2031 (CS) states that development must not harm or threaten its open nature.

The new kitchen extension

6. The new kitchen extension would fill the gap between the hotel's elevation facing the road and the existing boundary wall, which runs along the back edge of the footway. This gap is partly screened from the highway, and it is used to store utilitarian elements such as bins and extraction equipment. Nevertheless, the gap has significant value in visually accentuating the set-back of the main building at this point from the road. When seen from the highway, it also provides a welcome sense of space in an otherwise tight built frontage.
7. Infilling this gap with new built form and introducing a taller boundary wall abutting the footway would increase the scale and mass of the host building. As a result, this part of the hotel would gain some prominence in the streetscape. It would also significantly erode the sense of space along the highway frontage of the hotel. The differing depth and eaves height of the new addition compared to the adjacent retained lean-to would also create an uneasy transition between these projections.
8. The appellant draws attention to the sunroom, the variety of roof pitches, and the presence of other lean-tos. However, the existing projections are either set back or visually recessive; the sunroom's glazed roof and lower termination below the boundary wall combine to subdue its presence when viewed from the road. The proposed kitchen extension, by sharp contrast, would introduce a higher eaves line and a more assertive visual edge up to and alongside the footway.
9. The introduction of guttering along the raised boundary wall would also be an awkward design detail. While there are elements of the hotel building that overhang the public footway, such as window cills, a projecting sign, the eaves and a first-floor bay window, in my experience, it would be uncommon for guttering as part of a frontage boundary wall to do likewise. For all these reasons, the new kitchen extension would be a visually discordant, obtrusive and an unwelcome addition to the host building and the local area.

The existing storeroom

10. The storeroom occupies a conspicuous corner position and is evident from numerous locations along Church Lane, in both directions. The timber clad walls contrast markedly with the painted brick of the host building, and these disrupt the otherwise coherent appearance of the hotel. From the road, the storeroom draws the eye as an incongruous and poorly integrated addition.
11. I saw that timber is used on other properties visible from Church Lane and elsewhere, including the examples to which the appellant has referred and provided photographs and some details. However, these cases do not use timber as a primary facing material nor form a prominent part of the same streetscape as the site. As these examples are not directly comparable with the storeroom or its context, I attach only limited weight to them in support of the appeal.

Cumulative effects

12. The appellant argues that previous extensions cannot be considered harmful because they were permitted. However, policy requires the cumulative effect of developments to be considered, regardless of whether earlier works were acceptable individually. In this case, the combined effect of adding the new kitchen extension up to the footway edge and introducing an conspicuous timber-clad

storeroom would significantly add to the mass of the hotel as it is perceived from Church Lane. Although the appellant contends the increase is only 6% of the footprint, the visual impact would be proportionally far greater.

13. By detracting from the character and appearance of the hotel building, the proposal would diminish its positive contribution to the CA. There would also be a notable reduction in the sense of openness between the building and the road that would undermine a key spatial characteristic of the CA. Consequently, the extensions, taken together and individually, would have a deleterious effect on the character and appearance of the CA, which would fail to be preserved.
14. It is true that CS Policy CS.13 does not preclude all development within an AoR, and allowances are made for small-scale additions. However, the relevant policy test is whether development would harm or threaten the open nature of such areas, taking into account the cumulative effects. The infilling of a gap at the hotel's highway frontage, as proposed would undermine a key aspect of the AoR.

Public benefits

15. Given the localised nature of the effects, the harm to the CA would be less than substantial. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), this harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The appellant cites improved kitchen facilities, enhanced hospitality standards, support for the local economy, tourism and job creation, some of which is supported in policy terms. Several representations are also in favour of the proposal. While these are genuine benefits, they do not outweigh the identified harm.

Conclusion on the main issue

16. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed extensions cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. The character and appearance of the CA would fail to be preserved. Accordingly, it is contrary to CS Policies CS.5, CS.8, CS.9, CS.13 and CS.20 and Policies BE2, BE5 and BE8 of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan 2011-2031. Together, these policies require development to be high-quality, contextually appropriate and preserve or enhance heritage assets. There is also a conflict with the policies of the Framework with regard to achieving well designed places and protecting the historic environment.
17. In reaching this finding, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the CA's character or appearance, as required by section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Conclusion

18. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR