



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2023

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/22/3311924

1 Hampton Close, Oswestry SY11 1SL

- 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 Oscar Dell against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03346/FUL, dated 17 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a front extension to a domestic house to create an office space on ground floor and an additional bedroom on the first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling which is of a size commensurate with its corner plot. At the time of my site visit it was not in an obvious state of disrepair nor did it detract from the neighbourhood.
4. The proposed two storey front extension would have a large footprint as it would project beyond the front elevation of the dwelling by a considerable amount and would be of a generous width. Its substantial massing would be readily apparent and further exacerbated by its ridge and eaves lines which would match that of the host dwelling. By virtue of these factors, the proposal would fail to read as a subservient addition but rather, as acknowledged by the appellant, it would dominate the existing, modest dwelling. It would therefore be an intrusive feature.
5. My attention has been drawn to other two storey front extensions in the locality and I observed many examples during my site visit, along with properties which had undergone modern upgrades to their facades. Although I agree that the modern upgrades to properties in this locality appears to be appropriate, the planning history of the other extensions is not clear thus I cannot make a fully reasoned comparison with this appeal. Furthermore, the contemporary design approach to the proposal and use of similar materials to the host dwelling does not overcome the proposal's harmful massing.
6. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would provide additional space for a growing family and a home office. However, I am not persuaded that the proposal is the minimum necessary to achieve the additional living space

required, or that the property could not be extended in other ways to achieve the required space. Additionally, whilst I did not observe any obvious external concerns in terms of the condition of the front of the dwelling, there is no convincing evidence before me to indicate that the proposal is required to make any necessary improvements, or that they could not be achieved in other ways.

7. Accordingly, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy CS6 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy (March 2011) and Policy MD2 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan (December 2015) which together seek to ensure that developments take into account local context and character and respond appropriately to the form and layout of existing development, amongst other things.

Conclusion

8. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no other considerations which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison

INSPECTOR