

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2024

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th April 2024

Appeal ref: APP/L3245/D/23/3336029

Glenthorne, Mill Road, Meole Brace, Shrewsbury SY3 9JT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Ms Oliver and Charlotte Waring and Roberts against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application, ref. 23/03538/FUL, dated 10 August 2023, was refused by a notice dated 19 October 2023.
 - The development is: Erection of rear extension to provide additional bedrooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the Erection of rear extension to provide additional bedrooms at Glenthorne, Mill Road, Meole Brace, Shrewsbury SY3 9JT in accordance with application ref. 23/03538/FUL, dated 10 August 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Location plan 748-01
 - Block plan 748-02
 - Existing south and north elevations 748-03
 - Existing side west elevation 748-04
 - Existing side east elevation 748-05
 - Existing cellar and ground floor plans 748-06
 - Existing first floor and attic plans 748-07
 - Proposed south and north elevations 748-08b
 - Proposed side west elevation 748-09b
 - Proposed side east elevation 748-10b
 - Proposed cellar and ground floor plans 748-11
 - Proposed first floor and attic plans 748-12b
 - Proposed site plan 748-13.

Main issue

2. The decision turns on the likely effect of the proposed rear extension works to the house Glenthorne on the amenities enjoyed by occupiers of neighbouring houses.

Appeal dwelling and proposed works

3. The appeal dwelling, Glenthorne, is a narrow detached late Victorian house on the north side of Mill Road. It stands in a row of houses built to a variety of sizes, designs and layouts.
4. The Appellants wish to enlarge their home at Glenthorne by building a full width 3 storey extension approximately 6m deep on the ground and first floors outwards from the original rear wall of the house and about 3.5m out on the second floor.
5. The stepped new rear extension appeal scheme would replace the existing short outrigger to provide a large new kitchen and W.C. on the ground floor with a large and a small bedroom on the first floor. The approximately half depth second floor extension of the existing loft would provide a 4th bedroom.

Considerations

6. Shropshire Council's planning policy, SAMDev Plan 2006 – 2026 Core Strategy policies CS6 and CS17 require development to protect and conserve the built, historic and natural environment and be appropriate in scale, density, pattern and design taking into account the local context and character. Plan policy MD2 requires that development contributes to and respects locally distinctive or valued character and existing amenity value.
7. The appeal property, Glenthorne, lies within the Meole Brace Conservation Area. A conservation area is an area "of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance", (s.69 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990).
8. The Council's reason for refusing the rear extension to the dwelling said that by virtue of its scale, height, design and siting, it would have an adverse and unacceptable impact on the amenity, outlook and light of next door to the east. Two neighbours to the west said the extension would be high, characterless and incongruous.
9. The rear wall of Glenthorne is somewhat inset in relation to its close neighbours. The Appellants' scheme seeks match the depth of the rear outrigger extension to the house next door to the west, The Hollies, although the small single storey element of the appeal extension would project further. The Hollies 2 storey rear outrigger has a pitched roof incorporating an attic room. That outrigger somewhat dominates the rear amenity area of Glenthorne close to the house as does the considerable extent of the large house immediately beyond The Hollies, Norfolk House. In my view, neither of those houses would be adversely affected to any undue extent by the Appellants' proposed extension built to the same depth and similar height to that at The Hollies. They would not be overlooked, nor would they experience any excessive degree of overshadowing or loss of light.
10. The Council's reason for refusing to grant planning permission said occupiers of the neighbouring house immediately to the east, Summer Ville, would be adversely affected. They said earlier concerns about the extension and its effect upon the Conservation Area had been largely addressed by the current layout. But an objection remained over the impact of the extension scheme on

the amenity, outlook and light at the 2 bedrooms windows on the first floor of Summer Ville.

11. The 2 storey rear outrigger extension at Summer Ville is half the width of the house, built tight to the eastern boundary. The house also has a large wide single storey rear extension. As a result, there is not a sitting out area close to the original rear wall of the house that might have been enclosed by the appeal project. The only adverse effect of the Appellants' extension proposal might be a small reduction of light at first floor level at the rear wall of Summer Ville. Those windows already lose some light as a result of the narrow Summer Ville outrigger's position alongside. The appeal extension at Glenthorne would add slightly to that effect, but not, in my view, to a material extent such that planning permission should be withheld. The Council said the impact on amenity in terms of any loss of privacy would not be so adverse as to warrant refusal.
12. I conclude that whilst the appeal extension proposal might appear overly large to those in extended properties on each side, it would be an acceptable project that complies with Core Strategy Policy CS6, drawn up to safeguard residential and local amenity and with SAMDev Plan policy MD2, a policy that requires development to contribute to and respect existing amenity value. I also agree with the Council that the extension project, albeit of rather utilitarian design, would preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Meole Brace Conservation Area.

Conclusion

13. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. Planning permission is granted subject to the general condition limiting the duration of the permission, (s.91 of the Act), and a condition to build in compliance with the submitted plans that define the project. The Council's suggested condition regarding a tree in the rear garden of Glenthorne is not essential to the grant of this permission.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR