



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2024

**by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 31 December 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/24/3350474**

**20 Longden Avenue, Shrewsbury, SY3 7RJ**

- 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 \* Hood against the decision of Shropshire Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/01572/FUL.
  - The development proposed is the construction of a porch and first-floor side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the area around Longden Avenue.

### Reasons

3. No 20 is a brick-built end-terraced house situated within a corner plot on the southern side of Longden Avenue, at its junction with Hill Crescent. There are short terraces of three properties on Longden Avenue, either side of the junction, and each has elevations of brick, painted brick and render to create a largely unified appearance. The appeal property has a single-storey side extension, constructed of brick and with a flat roof. The extension is set well back from the main front elevation.
4. The proposed extension would be a rectangular structure set on top of the existing side extension. It would project beyond the ground floor extension to the front and to the side, and would project above the eaves at the side of the house, such that it would visually cut across the hipped roof of the host property. It would be timber clad with aluminium capping and would be connected to the existing hipped roof by way of recessed metal cladding.
5. By reason of its situation on a corner plot, the proposed extension would be highly prominent in the street scene,. The properties on Longden Avenue and Hill Crescent consist almost entirely of semi-detached and terraced houses with a degree of symmetry throughout. They are characterised by use of traditional materials and use of hipped roofs. The small bungalows situated around Longdon Grove opposite to the appeal property are grouped in two short terraces which also

display symmetry and use of materials and a basic design that is largely sympathetic to the prevailing character and appearance of the surrounding area.

6. Whilst, in principle, there is no inherent reason why modern designs should not exist side by side with older traditional designs and materials, in this case, the proposed extension, by way of the resultant combination of unsympathetic shape, height, overhanging position, prominent siting, and uncharacteristic materials, would appear as an incongruous element, out of character with the main dwelling and with the surrounding area. There would also be an awkward juxtaposition of the flat roof of the proposed extension and the hipped roof of the host building. Finally, the siting of the extension above the existing brick extension, with its overhanging nature and a height that would cut across the hipped roof, would result in a structure that would appear to visually dominate the main house, harmful to the street scene around and beyond the road junction.
7. Policy CS6 of the Council's Adopted Core Strategy (CS) requires development to respect and enhance local distinctiveness. Policy MD2 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development document (SAMDev), indicates that development should respond appropriately to the form and layout of existing development, and that it should reflect locally characteristic architectural design and details including materials, form, scale and proportion. Policy MD2 also indicates that development should embrace opportunities for contemporary design solutions, but that it should also take reference from and reinforce distinctive local characteristics. For my reasons stated above, the proposed extension would conflict with these policies.
8. The appellant has given examples of existing timber-clad extensions within the local area. I have little detail about these, but they would not appear to be in prominent positions, and they appear to involve more sympathetic and characteristic use of design, scale and colour in their respective contexts than would be the case with this present proposal. In any event, I have dealt with this case on its own merits.
9. In conclusion, I find that the proposed extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around Longden Avenue and Hill Crescent, and that it would conflict with Policy CS6 of the CS and policy MD2 of the SAMDev. Accordingly, I dismiss this appeal.

*J D Westbrook*

INSPECTOR