



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2025

by **Les Greenwood MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3430/W/25/3360831

Shareshill Service Station, Junction 11 Motors Limited, Cannock Road, Shareshill, Staffordshire WV10 7LZ

- 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 Daljit Singh for Junction 11 Motors Ltd against the decision of South Staffordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00900/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a lean-to built to allow an extra dry area for employees to work on cars.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - i) Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt; and
 - ii) The effect of the proposal on living conditions at neighbouring properties.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt

3. Junction 11 Motors is a car repairs business occupying part of Shareshill Service Station, on the very busy A460 Cannock Road near Junction 11 of the M6. The site is within the West Midlands Green Belt. The business has one building which provides a main car repair area and office/reception, plus extensive outdoor areas for parking and storing cars. The appeal relates to an open sided extension that has been added to the side of the building. As the extension is already in place, the proposal is retrospective in nature.
4. Paragraph 153 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 154 explains that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the listed exceptions applies. These exceptions include: (c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

5. Policy GB1 of the South Staffordshire Council Core Strategy (CS) similarly allows for the extension of buildings in the Green Belt where these are not disproportionate to the size of the original building. Neither the Framework nor policy GB1 define the term 'disproportionate'. The Council's Green Belt and Open Countryside Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) adds some further detail, stating that any increase in the footprint of the building above the 20-40% range (in comparison to the original footprint) would likely be disproportionate simply because it would not be in proportion with the host building and therefore would likely have an impact on openness. The SPD does allow for some flexibility, stating that all cases will be dealt with on an individual basis.
6. The Council calculates that the footprint of the building has already been extended by about 45% and the proposal would bring the cumulative increase up to about 92%. These figures have not been disputed and show that the appeal extension results in an overall increase well in excess of the guideline set by the SPD.
7. In this case, however, the building's overall footprint is a particularly poor indicator of the comparative size and bulk of the various parts of the structure. The original building appears to be the main car repairs workshop. Although single storey it has high walls and a pitched roof, making it by far the largest and most dominant part of the building. The previous extensions, in contrast, are very low, flat roofed structures which add comparatively little built volume. The appeal extension is also a low structure, with a low pitched, lean-to roof. It does not have any significant new walls, so that little or no additional volume is enclosed. Even with the addition of the appeal extension, the additions to the original building remain minor, subservient parts of the overall structure.
8. I find that, despite the comparatively large cumulative increase in the footprint of the building, the existing and proposed extensions do not represent disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. I conclude that the proposal does not represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It complies with both CS policy GB1 and the Framework in this respect.

Living conditions

9. The houses at 4 Old Cannock Road and 4 Church Road sit very close to the appeal extension, with only a timber fence between. I recognise that the general area is already noisy due to heavy traffic on the A460 and that there has long been a car repairs business at the appeal site. The provision of this additional covered but open-sided area for repair work would, however, potentially facilitate a notable intensification of noisy activities and additional fumes next to neighbours' houses and gardens.
10. The appeal proposal specifically says that the new extension was built to create an extra dry area for employees to work on cars. The appellant refers to the extension being used for light work only, on very rare occasions, but this could not be effectively regulated by the Council if permission was granted. Any significant extra use of this part of the site for car repairs would unduly harm neighbours' living conditions due to noise and fumes.
11. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm neighbours' living conditions at 4 Old Cannock Road and 4 Church Road. It conflicts in this respect with CS

policy EQ9, which aims to protect the amenity of nearby residents, including in regard to noise and pollution.

Conclusion

12. Although I find no Green Belt policy objection, my concerns in regard to neighbours' living conditions are sufficiently compelling for me to conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan, taken as a whole. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR