



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2019

by **M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 May 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/3213573

24 Love Lane, Bridgnorth, Shropshire WV16 4HE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Donald Walker against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 18/02403/FUL, dated 22 May 2018, was refused by notice dated 10 September 2018.
 - The development proposed is erection of carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of carport at 24 Love Lane, Bridgnorth, Shropshire WV16 4HE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/02403/FUL, dated 22 May 2018, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matter

2. The carport subject of this appeal has already been erected. The Council has advised that since the application was determined, a trellis panel has been added to the front of the carport. This element is not shown on the submitted plans. I have determined this appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the carport on the character and appearance of the appeal property and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dormer bungalow, which is set back and on a slightly elevated level to the adjacent highway. The surrounding development comprises predominantly detached and individually designed dwellings incorporating a range of materials. These variations create an eclectic street scene which contributes to the distinct character and appearance of the area.
5. Attached to the front of the appeal property, the carport projects forward by about 3m and extends less than half way across the front elevation of this property. It mainly comprises a timber framed roof structure, covered in plastic profile sheeting, which is no higher than the eaves of the appeal property. This lean-to roof is attached to the property and is supported by two slender posts along the front. The fascia and guttering around the roof of the carport along with the posts supporting it, match the appearance of the fascia and guttering on the appeal property.

6. Drawing on the above factors, the carport is a largely open and subordinate addition, which assimilates with the design and form of the host property. The carport is only visible from limited sections of the adjacent highway, and in light of the above reasons, it has no discernible impact on the wider area. Furthermore, based on my observations I do not share the Council's concern that the build quality of the carport is poor.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the carport does not harm the character and appearance of the appeal property or the area. I therefore find no conflict with the design aims of policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy 2011, and policy MD2 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan 2015, which amongst other things seek to secure high quality design to protect and enhance the quality and character of the built environment. The aims of these policies are consistent with the design aims of the Framework. Accordingly, I find no conflict with the Framework.

Other matters

8. Due to its modest scale and adequate separation from nearby dwellings, I am satisfied that the carport does not cause any harm to the living conditions of neighbours.

Conditions

9. As the development subject of this appeal has already been implemented, there is no necessity for any conditions.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Aqbal
INSPECTOR