



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2014

by **I McHugh DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23 July 2014

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/14/2219211**

**Stapleton Cottage, Stapleton, Dorrington, Shrewsbury, SY5 7EQ**

- 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 & Mrs D Brander against the decision of Shropshire Council.
  - The application Ref 14/00268/FUL was refused by notice dated 14 April 2014.
  - The development proposed is extension of existing single-storey annexe with new roof creating first floor rooms.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal site.

### Reasons

3. The building, subject of the appeal, is a single-storey flat-roofed structure, which is situated in the rear garden of Stapleton Cottage. The property is located on the edge of the village, adjoining open countryside and woodland. The appeal building is currently used for ancillary domestic purposes.
4. The proposal is to extend the appeal building in order to create a first floor that would provide a self-contained annexe, comprising two bedrooms with en-suite and shower facilities on the ground floor; and a lounge and kitchen at first floor level. The building would be used to accommodate family members and would be ancillary to the existing dwelling. I note that the appellant considers it to be more cost effective to extend the appeal building rather than alter and extend the main dwelling.
5. The Council contends that the proposal would be overly large in relation to the existing dwelling, due its scale and design. It argues that the development would be tantamount to the formation of a new dwelling and that this would fail to respect the context of the site and the surrounding area.
6. Although the footprint of the appeal building would only be marginally enlarged (to provide an additional 'skin' to the external walls), the proposal would add significantly to the height and bulk of the structure. I acknowledge that it would sit within a large plot and no objections have been received from third parties. I have also taken into account the external materials that would be used in its construction, together with the appellant's argument that the roof

design would minimise the visual impact of the development. Nevertheless, in my opinion, it would appear as a dominant and overlarge structure that would be out of keeping and at odds with the existing characteristics of the rear garden, where the current outbuildings are low-rise and small-scale. The enlarged building would clash visually with the existing dwelling due to its siting and overall scale. Consequently, it would appear out of context with its location.

7. In reaching, my decision, I have given weight to the appellants' requirements to house and care for family members, and to the incorporation of energy efficiency measures in the proposed building. In that regard, I have taken note of Policies CS6 and CS11 of the adopted Shropshire Core Strategy 2011 (CS). These policies (amongst other things) require new development to respond to climate change; and require housing to be able to adapt to changing lifestyle needs. I have also noted the height of the existing crop in the adjoining field and the impact this has on the outlook from the ground floor windows of the appeal building, as this is a reason given as a reason by the appellants for providing accommodation at first floor level.
8. However, whilst I have no objections in principle to the adaptation and alteration of the appeal building, I consider that the scale and appearance of the proposal would be unacceptable for the reasons given above. In my view, an appropriate form of annexe accommodation could be achieved within a smaller building.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the site. Consequently, it would conflict with one of the requirements of Policy CS6 of the CS, where new development should be appropriate in scale and design, taking into account local context and character. In addition, it is a requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), for new development to add to the overall quality of the area and to reflect the identity of its surroundings (paragraph 58). In my opinion, the proposal would fail to achieve this.

### **Conclusion**

10. It is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

*I McHugh*

INSPECTOR