



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2025

by P Brennan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/W/24/3355365

28 Woodland Close, Albrighton, Wolverhampton WV7 3PR

- 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 Kuldeep Singh against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02149/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of extension to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has amended the description of development from that seen on the application form. I have adopted the description of the development from the decision notice in the banner heading above in the interests of clarity.
3. The Council refused the application for two reasons as set out in the decision notice. The first of these reasons related to insufficient or inaccurate information as the submitted plans were hand-drawn, but dimensioned. The appellant has submitted a professionally drawn set of plans for the proposed development. Whilst these plans do not involve a substantial difference or fundamental change to the application, I have considered whether accepting the information would cause procedural unfairness to interested parties. As I consider that the acceptance of the plans would not deprive those entitled to be consulted on an application, the opportunity to make a representation, I have decided to accept them. My decision is based on the set of drawings 10/24-001 PO1, 10/24-002 PO1 and 10/24-003 PO1. I am satisfied that these plans adequately and fully address the first reason for refusal.
4. The application form states that the development was undertaken in May 2024. I saw during my visit that the front extension has been completed, which appears to accord with the plans before me. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis that the development has already taken place.
5. No development plan policies have been referred to in the second reason for refusal as set out in the Council's decision notice. However, Policy CS6 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy (SLDF) and Policy MD2 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (SAMDev) are considered pertinent to this proposal.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

7. Woodland Close is a residential cul-de-sac, characterised by a mix of one and two storey, modest sized, link detached and semi-detached dwellings. All the properties have parking and gardens to the front. The host property is a single storey, link-detached bungalow within an enclave of bungalows located at the midpoint of the cul-de-sac. The bungalow is similar in scale and form to its single storey neighbours and contributes to the enclave's consistent street character. The bungalows have a consistent gable frontage with flat roofed car port and garage to the side. The front and side elevation of the host property is visible from the road, as it is the last in a row of four bungalows and, its side elevation fronts adjacent two storey dwellings. Due to its scale and consistent proportions to neighbouring development, the appeal property makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposed front extension introduces a forward projecting gable in front of the existing flat roof car port and part of the existing bungalow providing an enclosed garage and porch. As a result of their low-set profile, the roofs of the bungalows, are an important and visually prominent part of the street scene, particularly the flat roof car ports which link the bungalows together. The additional scale and mass of the proposal's roof results in an overly dominant and incongruous addition to the property. This does not reflect the proportions of the existing dwelling or neighbouring properties. As such, the proposed front extension is disproportionate to the modest scale of the original dwelling.
9. The host property is highly visible due to its location on the outer bend of Woodland Close at the end of the row of four bungalows. The proposed front extension, due to the mass of the gabled roof, is overt within the street, fundamentally altering the character and appearance of the property to its detriment. This would be a discernible departure from the prevailing character of the host property and the street scene. The proposed development results in a dwelling that is harmfully out of character with the small group of bungalows the site is amongst in Woodland Close.
10. For the reasons set out above, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of both the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find conflict with Policy CS6 of the SLDF and Policy MD2 of the SAMDev. These policies provide an expectation that development would protect and enhance the built environment, be appropriate in scale and design, would respect local character and relate to its context. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks development that achieves high quality design that contributes positively to local character with regard to its surroundings and context.

Other Matters

11. The Council has drawn to my attention, a revised planning application that has subsequently been approved.¹ The approved plans have reduced the scale of the roof to the front extension, leaving the garage extension with a flat roof, in keeping with neighbouring properties. As this fallback position provides a realistic alternative scheme that could be implemented, this attracts weight in favour of the scheme. However, as this is smaller and would have a reduced effect on the appearance of the site and its surroundings, it conveys only limited weight in favour of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

P Brennan

INSPECTOR

¹ 24/04484/FUL – Erection of front porch and garage extension - 7 January 2025