



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2021

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 DECEMBER 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/21/3279347

16 Wem Road, Harmer Hill SY4 3EA

- 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 Mrs Kim Pritchard against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00844/FUL, dated 16 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of one 2 storey side extension, removal of existing PVC conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an attractive detached dwelling comprising of stone and decorative brickwork as part of its design. Its front elevation has prominent gables at first floor level with a central entrance point. The dimensions of its front elevation are noticeably well-proportioned.
4. The Council have highlighted that the dwelling is a non-designated heritage asset. In that regard, the property is referenced as featuring on historic maps and is believed to have once been two cottages. Its original features are noted by the Council as being historically significant to the local area. Although the appellant highlights the issue as being subjective, there is no strong evidence to suggest that the property should not be treated as a non-designated asset.
5. I acknowledge that the appeal scheme would replace the existing conservatory which is substantial in size. The conservatory does not replicate the original stone and brick features of the host dwelling. Whereas the two-storey extension shown in the appeal plans does include a parapet brick gable end similar to the existing brickwork details of the dwelling.
6. Nonetheless, the position of the proposed extension would still obscure and diminish the prominence of a key gable. Moreover, the proposed increase in width of the property at first floor level would lead to an unduly excessive frontage width. The changes would detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling.

7. An extant approval is referenced by the main parties for other enlargements. I agree that the combination of all changes shown on the plans if erected together would magnify the visual impact of the two-storey extension enlargement relative to the current proportions of the property.
8. There is nothing submitted which would prevent any of the existing approved elements indicated in the evidence from being built together with the appeal proposal if it were to be allowed. A planning condition would not be an appropriate mechanism to prevent those circumstances from occurring.
9. That said, even without the other potential extensions not subject to this appeal referred to by the main parties, the proposed two-storey extension would still erode from the dwellings most attractive features and qualities.
10. Accordingly, the position, size and mass of the two-storey extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the property. The proposal would conflict with policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy; as well as policies MD2 and MD13 of the adopted Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan which all combined seek to encourage development that is respectful to local character. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which encourages good design.

Other Matters

11. I have sympathy for the appellant's circumstances in that they are seeking to provide additional living space for their growing family inclusive of additional possible care provision. The internal configuration of the dwelling is also a factor I have had regard to. However, those circumstances would not outweigh the harm I have identified. That is because allowing the development would be a long-lasting change to the property which is likely to far exceed those circumstances. There is nothing convincing to suggest that alternative solutions not involving substantive visual harm would not be possible.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal does not succeed.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR