



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025

by **J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/25/3367145

17 Woodlands Close, Broseley, Shropshire TF12 5PY

- 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 Johanna Persson & Crawford Coulson against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00388/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey extensions to side and rear elevations, increase in roof height to create dormer bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The original description of development is provided in a more succinct form in the decision notice. Therefore, the above description reflects this amended description.

Main Issue

3. While there are two reasons for refusal given in the decision notice, these can be addressed fully under a single main issue. Accordingly, the main issue is the effect of the proposed side and roof extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow in a residential cul-de-sac of similar properties on the edge of Broseley, with open countryside beyond the end of Woodlands Close.
5. Policy CS6 of the Shropshire Council Core Strategy (2011) requires development to be of an appropriate scale, density, pattern and design taking into account local context and character. Policy MD2 of the Council's Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (2015) requires development to respond appropriately to the form and layout of existing development, including building heights and scale.
6. The bungalows within Woodlands Close are laid out on a staggered building line on the opposite side of the road to the appeal property, while the properties on the same side, including No 17 itself, are on a consistent building line, following the curve of the road. The appeal property has a wide frontage due to its position

facing the curve of the road, which allows for a relatively large car port to the side of the property.

7. A number of properties have side extensions while retaining the original gable feature that is characteristic of all the bungalows in the street scene. In some cases, notably Nos 14 and 15, the extended roof forms are higher than the ridge of the original part of the dwelling. However, due to the position of these properties at the end of the cul-de-sac they are not prominent and there is a good degree of uniformity of design and layout in the street scene, which contributes positively to its character and appearance.
8. The rear extension would replace an existing conservatory and would be of similar scale; as such, it would be a proportionate addition to the host dwelling. The proposed side extension would cover the full width of the existing car port, replacing it with a substantive extension that would include accommodation in the roof. This would result in an extended roof height materially greater than that of the original part of the dwelling.
9. The effects of the extended roof would be particularly apparent by contrast with the properties to either side. Moreover, the dormer window on the front roof slope would introduce an uncharacteristic design feature to the street scene, which would accentuate the bulk and presence of the extended roof next to the smaller neighbouring properties. As a result, the extension would upset the uniformity of the street scene due to the presence of the higher roof form and dormer window in a prominent position within the cul-de-sac. As such, it would appear as incongruous and uncharacteristic, resulting in material harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.
10. I have had regard to the appellants' contention that a number of the existing extensions in the close are almost identical to the current proposal. However, from the plans and inspection this is not my finding. In particular, none of them include front dormer windows. While surrounding roads contain a range of property types, Woodlands Close forms a self-contained street scene with the level of uniformity described above.
11. The fact that Council officers might not have undertaken a site visit does not have a direct bearing on this appeal decision, which is based on all the written submissions and site inspection.
12. Therefore, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed side and roof extensions would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to Policy CS6 of the Shropshire Council Core Strategy and to Policy MD2 of the Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan, as described.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR