



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2025

**by Alexander O'Doherty LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2025

---

### Appeal Ref: 6000584

### 23 Green Acres, Ludlow SY8 1LU

- 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 Tina Mantle against the decision of Shropshire Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/02243/FUL.
  - The development proposed is roof extension to the front elevation.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises 23 Green Acres (No 23), a 1.5 storey dwelling located in a modern residential estate consisting of dwellings of a generally homogeneous form and design. Extensions at roof-level are common in the area, which has resulted in a varied roofscape.
4. The proposed roof extension would be sited above No 23's existing ground-level projection. It would have a similar width to that projection. Its roof would rise up near to No 23's main ridge. It would extend beyond the eaves of No 23's main roof and across part of the ground-level projection below. As such, due to its height, width, and depth, it would constitute a bulky and overly-dominant feature on No 23's roof plane. Due to its siting to the side of No 23's main roof, it would appear as an awkwardly-sited and contrived addition to No 23's roof slope. It would not blend well with No 23's otherwise coherent and modest appearance, even taking account of the suitable materials proposed. No 23's existing positive visual contribution to the street scene would be undermined.
5. I observed all of the examples of extensions in the locality put forward by the appellant. Although these examples demonstrate that front-facing roof extensions are acceptable in principle in the locality, their detailed designs are quite different to that proposed.
6. Specifically, in contrast to the proposed development, the roof extensions at 52 and 58 Green Acres span across the majority of the roof slope on which they are positioned. The plans supplied relating to planning application Ref 16/03854/FUL at 92 Green Acres (No 92) appear to relate to the insertion of a roof-level dormer extension on the southern elevation. In contrast to the proposed development, this

dormer sits neatly within No 92's roof plane, and does not dominate that property. I observed that the roof-level extension on the eastern elevation of No 92 is suitably centrally positioned within the roof slope, which would not be the case for the proposed development.

7. With respect to the front elevation of 5 Overton View, the plans supplied relating to planning application Ref 15/02849/FUL show a 2-storey side extension with a dormer window, and 2 other dormer windows positioned on the front-facing roof slope. Again, this markedly contrasts with the proposed development, which relates to a singular roof-level extension on No 23's front elevation.
8. As none of these examples are directly comparable with the proposed development, and as the designs of those developments are better integrated with their host properties, they do not change my findings on this main issue.
9. I therefore find that the proposed development would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point of Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy<sup>1</sup> which provides that, amongst other things, all development must be appropriate in scale and design taking into account the local context and character, and with part 2 ii. of Policy MD2 of the SAMDev Plan<sup>2</sup> which provides that, amongst other things, for a development proposal to be considered acceptable it is required to contribute to and respect locally distinctive or valued character and existing amenity value by reflecting locally characteristic architectural design and details.

### **Other Matters**

10. The proposed development would benefit the current and future occupiers of No 23, by way of providing enlarged and more functional living accommodation on site. As this would mainly comprise a private benefit, it merits little weight in favour of the proposed development. It does not overcome the adverse impacts identified on the main issue above. Overall, the material considerations relevant to this appeal do not indicate that the appeal should be decided otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the National Planning Policy Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Alexander O'Doherty*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy (adopted 2011)

<sup>2</sup> Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan (adopted 2015)