
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2014

by T Cannon BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 September 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/14/2221917

2 Chartwell Close, Church Stretton, Shropshire, SY6 6ES

- 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 Chris Turner against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 14/00722/FUL was refused by notice dated 22 April 2014.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a two storey extension to the dwelling plus addition of new porch. Demolition of existing car port and replacement with garage and store.
-

Decision

1. For the reasons that follow I dismiss the appeal insofar as it relates to the garage and store. I allow the appeal however, insofar as it relates to the remainder of the application and grant planning permission for the erection of a two storey extension to the dwelling plus addition of new porch at 2 Chartwell Close, Church Stretton, Shropshire, SY6 6ES 349 in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 14/00722/FUL, dated 14 February 2014, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: CS01/2014/01, CS01/2014/06, CS01/2014/07 and CS01/2014/08.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The scheme involves a number of different elements. In this respect I find the two storey extension and porch to be acceptable and clearly severable from the remainder of the scheme as it is physically and functionally independent. Therefore, I propose to issue a split decision in this case and grant planning permission for the two storey extension and porch.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a modern detached dwelling occupying a large corner plot at the junction of Chartwell Close and Churchill Road. Due to the position of the existing house and landscaped frontage, views of the front and side of the site are readily available from approaches into the cul-de-sac. Where there are existing examples of detached garages in the area, they are generally single storey in height, and do not dominate the existing property or surrounding street scape.
5. It is proposed to demolish the existing flat roof car port, positioned within the side garden of the property, immediately adjacent to the southern boundary of the site, and replace it with a two storey pitched roof structure providing a garage, store and hobbies room. The new building would occupy a similar position to the existing car port and extend out roughly in line with the principal elevations of properties in Chartwell Close further to the south.
6. I acknowledge that the proposed garage would be set back from the road frontage, and a large proportion of this spacious plot would be retained. However, due to the orientation of the existing house and extensive height, depth and scale of the proposed garage, it would introduce an imposing and dominant addition within the street scene. The use of timber cladding or render as an external facing material would further add to its prominence, particularly from views into Chartwell Close, and contrast with the predominantly brick built dwellings in the locality. The introduction of concrete tiles as a roofing material and a neutral coloured finish to the render would not sufficiently reduce this impact. Nor would the existing willow tree, to the north of the proposed garage, or additional planting adequately mitigate against such harm.
7. Although a shallow roof pitch is proposed, restricting the overall height of the garage to about 5.7m, this would conflict with the steeper two storey projecting gable element of the existing dwelling and other properties in the immediate area, adding to its visual impact and prominence.
8. Consequently, the proposed garage due to its size, design and use of materials would represent an intrusive form of development which would cause material harm to both the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy 2011 (CS) which seek to ensure all new development protects, restores, conserves and enhances the natural, built and historic environment and is appropriate in scale, density, pattern and design, taking account of local context and character. There would also be conflict with one of the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that planning should seek to secure high quality design, and take account of the character of different areas, objectives with which the relevant policies of the CS are consistent.
9. The appeal proposal also seeks to add a two storey side extension and front porch. The overall design, proportions and scale of the proposed two storey element would complement the character and form of the existing house and not dominate the plot. The front porch would also be modest in size and would not project forward of the prominent two storey front gable feature, limiting its visual impact. As such, the proposed two storey extension and front porch

would preserve the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. In this respect the appeal development would comply with Policies CS6 and CS17 of the CS and the objectives of the Framework.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that there are examples in the area where houses have been extended above existing integral garages. However, such additions are extensions rather than detached buildings and they are not therefore directly comparable to the appeal proposal. I also appreciate that the garage would provide secure storage space for the appellant and no objections have been raised from neighbouring occupiers. Nonetheless, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusion

11. Those elements of the proposed development that I have found to be unacceptable are severable from the remainder of the proposal. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the two storey extension and porch. However, in relation to the proposed garage and store, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in so far as they relate to the two storey extension and porch, in light of advice in paragraphs 203 and 206 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). In addition to the standard time limit condition it is necessary, for the avoidance of doubt, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord.
13. A condition requiring the materials to be used, in the construction of the extension, to match those of the existing building is required to ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory. I have assessed the appeal on the basis that the extensions are required for purposes in connection with the residential use of the appeal property. It is not therefore either necessary or appropriate to attach a condition preventing the development from being occupied as a separate dwelling or used for commercial or business purposes.

T Cannon

INSPECTOR