The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2020

by David M H Rose BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/20/3259153
Nesscliffe House, West Felton, Oswestry, Shropshire, SY11 4EH.

- 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 Julian Jones against the decision of Shropshire Council.
- The application reference 20/01600/FUL, dated 17 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2020.
- The development proposed is described by the appellant as 'First floor extension above existing ground floor structure to rear of and gable end of dwelling'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal form identifies the date of the application to the Council as 16 April 2020. Whilst the certificate of ownership carries that date, the application itself is dated 17 April 2020. In addition, although the Council amended the description of the application to 'Erection of first floor rear extension', this was not adopted by the appellant.

Main Issue

3. Whether the proposed extension would be visually unattractive and its effect on the street scene.

Reasons

4. Nesscliffe House is a well-designed, attractively proportioned and characterful brick-built semi-detached dwelling, under a half-hipped roof, which stands close to Holyhead Road. Its single storey side and rear extension is deeply set-back from the principal façade and, even with its differing hipped roof construction, it appears respectful of, and subordinate to, the main house. It is noted that the wider surroundings lack coherent composition and character.

5. The proposed first floor extension would sit above the existing well-mannered addition and its two storey bulk would project significantly rearward of the main house with a very notable rise in eaves line above the rear 'cat-slide' roof. When viewed from the side (south-east), despite having a lower finished height than the ridge of the existing house, the extension would appear disturbingly dominant and the contrasting wide plane of the roof, alongside the half-hip, would be uncharacteristic and ambiguous in design. From the rear, the height

of the proposed extension, and the relationship with the existing roof of the house, would lack balance and harmony and would be seen to be obviously out of scale and proportion.

6. Although the extension has been designed to be subordinate when viewed directly from the road, when seen in the round it would be of anomalous and cumbersome bulk and height which would be visually unattractive. Whilst it might be said that the rear incongruity in design could not be experienced from public views, and a mature tree provides a measure of filtering from the south-east, the proposal would, nonetheless, have an adverse effect on the street scene.

7. I therefore find that the proposal, despite the intended high standard of construction in matching materials, would be in conflict with local and national policies which promote good design.

8. I have noted that the Council, reflecting the views of a neighbour, had concerns about possible overlooking of the adjoining garden from the proposed Juliet balcony serving one of the new bedrooms. To my mind, given the distance of the glazed doors from the common boundary, the oblique angle of vision and the nature of the boundary shrubbery, any resultant loss of privacy would not have been sufficient to add weight to my findings on the main issue.

9. Having considered all other matters raised, including support offered by the Parish Council at application stage, I find nothing to change my overall conclusion to dismiss the appeal.

David MH Rose

Inspector