



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by **P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/25/3364745

Saltmoor Railway Cottage, Ashford Carbone, Shropshire SY8 4BU

- 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 P Hinsley against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00082/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Householder application (retrospective) for retention of two storey building with ground floor garage and storage and first floor annex accommodation at Saltmoor Railway Cottage, Ashford Carbonel, Ludlow Shropshire, SY8 4BU'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the building was complete. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and,
 - whether the development constitutes good functional design, with particular regard to its external stair access.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Saltmoor Railway Cottage is a detached 2 storey house constructed of red brick with a clay tiled roof. It is located at the end of a wooded track, which is also a public footpath, where it meets a railway line. The footpath continues across the railway line, where it meets the A49 Trunk Road.
5. The 2 storey building is set back from the track which runs along the side of the curtilage of the house, before it tapers in to where the house is located adjacent to the railway line. The building comprises a log store on the ground floor joined to a double garage. An external wooden staircase leads to a balcony in front of the first floor annex entrance which has a wooden porch canopy above it.

6. The annex has a shallow pitched clay tiled roof and a balcony that extends along the gable end from the steps and wraps around the side to continue along half the length of the building. It appears cluttered and particularly incongruous because it projects substantially beyond the building walls at first floor level and is supported by several wooden legs that encroach beyond the curtilage and into the adjacent field.
7. I appreciate that the house and garage and annex are screened by trees along the footpath until within a few metres of them. Also, trees along the edge of the railway line and A49 restrict views from trains and motor vehicles to transitory glimpses of the buildings. However, as the footpath passes close to the appeal building it dominates views towards the main house, despite its lower ridge height, because it sits on higher ground than the house. The timber cladding, stairs and balcony appear incongruous and out of context with the red brick of the main house. I note that there is a wooden shed next to the building. However, the shed is much smaller than the garage and annex and the materials used in its construction are more appropriate to its size and function.
8. The appellant has referred to the building sitting on the footprint of a previous garage. However, the plans indicate that the original building was a single garage covering a much smaller area and would not have been as dominant and visually harmful as the 2 storey building that has replaced it.
9. Overall, I conclude on this main issue that the development appears dominant, incongruous and out of character with the host property and thus harms the character and appearance of it and the surrounding area and conflicts with Policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Core Strategy (2011) (CS) and Policy MD2 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocation and Management of Development Plan (2015) (SCAMPD) in so far as they seek good design which is appropriate to the local context and protects and enhances local character.

Design and access

10. The council is concerned that the annex is not well designed because it is accessed by external steps, which are open to the weather and may not be suitable for an aged relative. However, it is not uncommon for annexes to be severed from a main house without any covered connection, nor is it unusual for them to be on upper floors above garages or workshops. The staircase has supporting handrails either side of the steps which seemed evenly spaced and of a suitable depth to be safe.
11. Furthermore, the development provides ancillary accommodation to the main house and would not be restricted to use by elderly relatives. As needs and abilities change over time, support could be provided in the main house, or elsewhere, and the annex occupied by other household members. I am not therefore convinced that the annex would conflict with Policies CS6 and CS17 of the CS, Policy MD2 of the SCAMPD and the Framework in terms of accessibility and design, sufficient to justify with holding planning permission on this issue alone.

Other Matters

12. I sympathise with the appellant's wish to provide accommodation for his mother, close to the family home, to provide her support in the future as needs arise. However, personal circumstances and the occupation of properties change over

time and in this case do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the house and area.

13. The appellant has offered to remove the balcony and add some landscaping in the paddock to the south of the building. Removing the balcony would reduce the building's cluttered appearance but not its visual dominance over the main house or its incongruous appearance in terms of the materials used. Planting would screen the development to some extent when approaching from the south but not from the front of the house and building. In any case, potential screening does not justify allowing harmful development.
14. Given that a planning condition could limit the use of the annex for ancillary accommodation, it would not create a new dwelling on the countryside as suggested by the Parish Council in its representation, which does not, therefore, add to my reason for dismissing the appeal.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR