



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2022

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/22/3302103

Heathfield, Rosehill Road, Stoke Heath, Shropshire TF9 2LF

- 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 D Watson against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/01475/FUL, dated 24 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is double storey side extension and outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Heathfield is a two-storey detached dwelling located in a corner position at the junction of Rosehill Road and Sandy Lane. It is situated within a relatively large plot within a rural setting. Other dwellings in its vicinity vary in form and design.
4. The proposed outbuilding would be located between two lines of trees and also between the side of the house and Sandy Lane. It would measure around 8 m deep by 14 m wide with a height of approximately 5 m. It would be timber clad on masonry walls with 2 roller shutter doors in the southern elevation. The appellant has indicated that it would be used as a domestic workshop/shed but could also be used for the storage of motor vehicles. The Council has raised no objection to the proposed materials for the outbuilding. I see no reason to disagree in view of its rural location and the fact that it is a separate structure and not an extension to the existing dwelling. However, I concur with the Council's view that it would appear rather large in size and scale, particularly when compared to the footprint of the dwelling. The appellant advises that a larger outbuilding could be constructed to the rear of the dwelling under permitted development rights. However, no indicative plans have been provided to demonstrate such a proposal.
5. The dwelling of Heathfield is built in brick. Although it is situated in a relatively large plot, its front elevation, and a side elevation, can be seen from Rosehill Road. It has an attractive front elevation with symmetrical bays and a central

porch with a single window above. The proposed two-storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation by around 3.9 m, with the ground floor built in matching brick with timber cladding above. The roof would be flat and set down from the main ridgeline with its hipped slopes at the edges clad with plain tiles to match those of the house. The side elevation of the extension would have three garage doors to allow car parking. A staircase would provide access to self-contained accommodation above.

6. A new affordable dwelling which has been built to the rear of the appeal site has extensive timber cladding. However, the context differs in the appeal case because of the external materials which characterise the appearance of the dwelling of Heathfield. The use of timber cladding at first floor level would fail to complement the existing materials used in the dwelling and would appear uncharacteristic. The proposed fenestration would not match the style and proportions of the windows in the main house and their vertical emphasis. The large garage doors would also detract from the domestic appearance of the property when viewed from Rosehill Road. Overall, the extension would have undue bulk, mass and scale and would not appear as a subservient addition to the main building.
7. I find that the proposed extension and outbuilding would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area. The proposal would conflict with Shropshire Core Strategy policy CS6 which indicates that all development should be in scale taking into account the local context and character. It would fail to comply with Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan policy MD2 which, amongst other things, requires development to respond appropriately to the form and layout of existing development including scale. Although the proposal would make more effective use of the land it would conflict with the objective of achieving well designed places in the National Planning Policy Framework and would not constitute sustainable development.

Conclusion

8. I have taken all other matters raised into account. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR