



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/22/3302166

13 Mayfield Grove, Bayston Hill, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY3 0JZ

- 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 Mrs Clare Rogers against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/00652/FUL, dated 10 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is dormer to side elevation of property, 3.4 m x 1.8 m, tiled sides, flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 13 Mayfield Grove is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated at the junction of Mayfield Grove and Sunfield Gardens. It is located within a residential area which includes dwellings of a similar form and design. The proposed dormer would be situated on the roof slope of the flank elevation of the building which faces Sunfield Gardens and is intended to facilitate a loft conversion. The Council has not objected to the proposal on the grounds of its impact of residential amenity, although the proposed windows in the dormer would allow some overlooking of No.2 Sunbury Gardens.
4. The proposed dormer would be situated in a prominent corner position where it would appear obtrusive because of its scale and flat roofed form. It would be uncharacteristic in the street scene because the immediate locality is generally lacking in roof dormers, especially side dormers. The appellant has advised that a dormer could be constructed on the rear elevation under permitted development rights. However, I disagree that such a rear dormer would necessarily still have a similar, if not greater impact than the appeal proposal on the host building and surrounding area.
5. I find that the proposed dormer to the side elevation of the property would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. It would conflict with 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. It would also conflict with the objective of achieving well designed places in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

6. The appellant has referred to other examples of dormer windows which have been granted permission. These include a dormer at No.7 Berwyn Drive, Bayston Hill. However, that dormer is situated on the front roof slope rather than in a prominent location at a side elevation. The dormer at No.14 Hafren Road is at a side elevation, but the dwelling is not located at a corner position. For these reasons the cited developments do not justify granting permission for the appeal proposal. I have determined this appeal based upon the individual merits of the proposal and its particular site circumstances having regard to relevant development plan and national planning policies and all other material considerations.

Conclusion

7. The appeal proposal would allow expansion of the accommodation, provide employment during the construction phase, would not extend the footprint of the building, and would be designed and use materials to be thermally efficient. However, these claimed benefits would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area which I have identified. In view of this visual and environmental harm the proposal would not constitute sustainable development.
8. I have taken all other matters raised into account, including the lack of objection from any neighbours and the Parish Council. However, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR