

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2024

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/24/3343431

21 Corporation Street, Bishops Castle, Shropshire, SY9 5AL

- 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 Helen Williams against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00936/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of timber frame, first floor, bathroom extension on top of existing ground floor masonry walls. New rainwater goods and storm drainage run.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant states that the Council hindered resubmission efforts. This is a matter between the appellant and the Council.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a brick-built two storey semi-detached dwelling. It is set back from the street behind a narrow grass verge, hedge and small front garden and has a single storey detached garage and large garden to the side and a single storey lean-to extension and small garden area to the rear.
 5. The appeal property is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of largely two storey dwellings, many of which are semi-detached and are similar in appearance to the appeal dwelling.
 6. The surrounding area is characterised by the presence of large green open spaces, trees and hedges. These combine with front, side and rear gardens to create a green and spacious character.
 7. Further to the above, many of the houses in the area share similar characteristics, including brick and slate materials and similarities in design. I noted during my site visit that, whilst many dwellings have been altered and/or
-

extended, such changes generally appear modest and in keeping with host dwellings and the surrounding area.

8. Further, the juxtaposition of dwellings is such that a number of rear gardens and rear elevations are widely visible in their surroundings and I noted during my site visit that where visible, changes to the rear of dwellings appear equally modest and extensions tend to comprise small, single storey additions. This and the similarity of dwellings lends an attractive sense of uniformity to the area.
9. The proposed development would add a storey above the existing rear extension. The siting of the appeal property is such that the extension would be widely visible from various locations along Corporation Street.
10. I find that the proposal would stand out as a two storey rear extension where few exist and as a consequence, that it would appear as an incongruous feature. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated as a result of the proposal appearing widely visible in its surroundings – notably from Corporation Street to the side.
11. Whilst the existing lean-to rear extension appears relatively modest and in keeping with its surroundings, the height, bulk and overall scale of the proposed development combined with its somewhat awkward flat-roofed and boxy design would result in it unduly dominating the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling.
12. The harmful visual impact of the above would be heightened by the presence of timber cladding and an obscure glazed window, which would appear incongruous against the brick and slate materials common to the host dwelling and its surroundings.
13. Taking all of this into account, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Shropshire Council Core Strategy (2011) Policies CS6 and CS17; and to Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan (2015) Policy MD2, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

14. In support of her case, the appellant refers to other developments within the wider vicinity. However, none of these comprise developments and circumstances so similar to the proposal before me as to provide for direct comparison and in any case, I have found that the proposal would result in significant harm and this is not something that is mitigated by the presence of other developments elsewhere.
15. The proposed development is aimed at improving and “future-proofing” the appeal property. These are factors in favour of the proposal. However, they do not amount to something that outweighs the harm identified and hence the decision below.
16. In support of her case, the appellant refers to the absence of objections to the proposed development. However, an absence of objection could be for any reason and does not in itself equate to support for a proposal. I have found that the proposed development would result in harm and this is not something that is altered by the absence of objections.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR