Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025

by P Brennan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/24/3350010 12 Bramblewood, Broseley, Shropshire TF12 5NY

- 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 Mr Peter Hartland against the decision of Shropshire Council.
- The application Ref is 24/01643/FUL.
- The development proposed is the installation of double boxed dormer window to front roofline, raise rear roofline with installation of skylights to the rear flat roof dormer to facilitate loft conversion, and changes to fenestration.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

 The Council has amended the description of development from that seen on the application form to provide clarity and to reference operational development only. The description outlined in the banner heading above aligns with the Council's description which I find accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

- 4. Bramblewood is a residential cul-de-sac, characterised by a mix of one and two storey modest sized detached and semi-detached dwellings. All the properties have parking and gardens to the front. There is a clear absence of dormer windows to the front rooflines of properties in Bramblewood. The appeal property is a single storey, semi-detached bungalow within an enclave of bungalows located at the end of the cul-de-sac. The bungalow is similar in scale and form to its single storey neighbours and contributes to the enclave's consistent street character. The side elevation of the property is visible from the road as the adjacent two storey dwelling at number 13 is set back from the building line of number 12. Due to its scale and consistent proportions to neighbouring development, the appeal property makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
- 5. The proposed front and rear dormers would sit at ridge height and would occupy much of the front and rear roof slopes. As a result of their low-set profile, the roofs of the bungalows are an important and visually prominent part of the street scene. The additional scale and mass of the proposal at roof level would result in a bulky

- and top-heavy appearance to the property, which would not reflect the proportions of the existing dwelling or neighbouring properties. The proposed development would result in dominant and incongruous intrusions into the roof of the appeal property. As such, they would be disproportionate to the modest scale of the existing dwelling.
- 6. The proposed dormer windows of the dwelling would be highly visible and overt from the street in comparison to its primarily single storey neighbours. The dormers would undermine the uniform nature of the rooflines of the semi-detached bungalows, fundamentally altering the character, appearance, and balance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings to their detriment. This would be a discernible departure from the prevailing character of the appeal property and the street scene. The proposed development would result in a dwelling that would be harmfully out of character with the small group of bungalows the site is amongst in Bramblewood.
- 7. For the reasons set out above, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of both the appeal property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find conflict with Policy CS6 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Core Strategy 2011 and Policy MD2 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan. These policies provide an expectation that development would protect and enhance the built environment, be appropriate in scale and design, would respect local character and relate to its context. Policy D1 of the Broseley Town Council Neighbourhood Development Plan also supports these requirements. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks development that achieves high quality design that contributes positively to local character with regard to its surroundings and context.

Other Matters

- 8. While there were no objections from neighbouring occupiers to the scheme and Broseley Town Council supported the proposed development, this is not a reason in itself to allow development which I have found to be visually harmful. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of front box dormers both in Cockshutt Lane and Dark Lane. I have taken these into account in the assessment of the character and appearance of the area, as far as I am able to, based on my site visit and the information before me. Dark Lane does not have a uniform roofscape as found in Bramblewood. Furthermore, the roofscape of Cockshutt Lane is partly characterised by dormer windows, whereas they are absent in Bramblewood. Accordingly, the properties referred to me are read in a different context to the appeal property. Therefore, there is no direct comparison to be made between them that weighs in the appeal's favour.
- 9. I understand the wishes of the appellant to maximise the living space within their existing property, to provide additional accommodation. However, these are personal circumstances that do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
- 10. Reference is made by the appellant to discussions with the Council regarding the acceptability of an amended proposal. However, an amended scheme is not before me. As such, this decision is based on the proposed development before me.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

P Brennan

INSPECTOR