

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2024

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/24/3344605

The Coppie, Hilton Low Junction/Woolston Road, Woolston, West Felton, Shropshire, SY10 8HY

- 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 Mr Jack Roberts against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00761/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of part two storey and part single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Previous applications to extend the dwelling the subject of this appeal have been refused.
3. In the submitted grounds of appeal, the appellant refers to a First Application¹, a Second Application² and a Third Application³. The Council refers to the refusal of two applications⁴.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the stock of affordable housing.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey, three-bedroomed detached dwelling with a detached garage. The dwelling and garage are set back from the road behind a long driveway. The dwelling is surrounded by a large garden area.
6. The appeal property is located in the open countryside. It is largely surrounded by wide expanses of farmland. Whilst there are a few scattered buildings, largely agricultural buildings and some houses, scattered around the wider area,

¹ Reference (grounds of appeal): 22/03101/FUL.

² Reference (grounds of appeal): 22/02582/FUL.

³ Reference (grounds of appeal): 23/02582/FUL (grounds of appeal also refer to 24/00761/FUL as a third application).

⁴ Reference (officer's report): 22/03101/FUL and 23/03101/FUL.

the surroundings are distinctly rural, providing for a green, open and spacious character.

7. The appeal dwelling is a self-build affordable dwelling. It is a Single Plot Exception Site (SPES). As such, the size of the dwelling is restricted to no more than 100 square metres.
8. The proposed development would comprise one and two storey additions that would, together, result in a very substantial increase to the size of the dwelling. The increase would take the size of the dwelling to well in excess of 100 square metres.
9. There is evidence before me to demonstrate that the 100 square metre size limit is not arbitrary but was determined on the basis that it allows for the development of a dwelling with adequate living space for an average-sized family, potentially providing for up to six bed spaces.
10. The appellant's case is founded on a stated need for more space – for a home office and for extra space for visitors. However, the existing property has three bedrooms and as noted above, it has a detached garage and a large garden area. It is spacious property.
11. In addition to the above, I am mindful that it is not unusual for home working to be carried out in all manner of spaces – in bedrooms, in living rooms, in kitchens and also in garages and/or in home offices in gardens. The appeal dwelling has significant internal space, in addition to a considerable detached garage and a large garden area.
12. I am also mindful that it is in no way unusual for a house to “feel” more cramped when there are visitors in addition to the dwelling's occupiers.
13. The appellant outlines circumstances relating to the occupiers of the dwelling, but none of these, either individually or cumulatively, amount to exceptional circumstances or to sufficient justification for what would not only comprise a very large extension to a house in the open countryside, but which would also greatly extend an affordable home to well-beyond its 100 square metre restriction. This restriction purposefully seeks to prevent the type of development within the open countryside that is proposed.
14. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development is unjustified and that it would result in an inappropriately large affordable home in the open countryside, to the detriment of affordable housing stock. This would be contrary to the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework; to Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (SAMDev) (2015) Policy MD7; to Shropshire Council Core Strategy (2011) Policies CS5 and CS11; and to the Council's Affordability of Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which together amongst other things, seek to provide a sustainable stock of affordable housing.

Other Matters

15. In support of his case, the appellant refers to other decisions relating to properties within the wider vicinity. However, none of these comprise proposals and circumstances so similar to the proposal and circumstances before me as to provide for direct comparison and in any case, I have found that the proposed

development would result in significant harm and this is not something that is mitigated by the presence of other developments elsewhere.

16. The appellant considers that the proposed development would not prevent the property from being affordable in perpetuity. However, notwithstanding that the property would increase in size, I am mindful that affordability is also affected by upkeep and utility bills, amongst other things and that a larger dwelling would be subject to increased expenditure.

Conclusion

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

N McGurk

INSPECTOR