
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by Debbie Moore BSc (HONS) MCD MRTPI PGDip

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

Decision date: 14 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/W/17/3173395

12 Honeysuckle Row, Shrewsbury SY3 7TW

- 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 Mario Nicholas against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 16/05410/FUL, dated 24 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as “erection of single detached dwelling and garage”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the site address from the application form. I am aware that the Council used a different address in the decision notice, but I am satisfied that the address given by the appellant is accurate for the purposes of the appeal.
3. Similarly, I have taken the description of development from the application form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises part of the relatively large rear garden of a house which faces onto Honeysuckle Row. The site frontage is on Primrose Drive, and is marked by a fence and conifer hedge. A footpath passes close to the corner of the site, and there is a single garage in separate ownership to the north, which is divided from the site by a brick wall. The surrounding area is characterised by modern estate development with a mix of house types. The development pattern tends to be open plan with houses set back from the road. Primrose Drive has bungalows along its southern side, with two-storey houses opposite. The road sweeps round in a curve and there is a wide grass verge on one side that contributes to the area’s open appearance.

6. The proposed development is a two-storey detached house that would front onto Primrose Drive. A driveway with space for two cars is proposed that would require a new vehicular crossover.
7. The house would be sited significantly further forward in the plot than others in the immediate vicinity, especially the bungalow located to the south. The siting, combined with the curve of the road, means that the house would be highly visible and prominent in the street scene. Whilst the size and scale of the house would be comparable to others in the road, the development would extend across the full width of the plot and the front garden would be relatively shallow. Moreover, the two-storey element of the house would be furthest forward, which would accentuate its visual impact. Overall, the house would stand out as an obtrusive feature that would not blend in with its surroundings. The proposed boundary treatment would be insufficient to mitigate the visual impact of the development.
8. I appreciate that the house on the adjoining plot has recently been built as infill development, but this is less prominent than the appeal proposal, and the house complements the street scene. I have also taken into account the opinion of the planning officer, in particular, the statement that there are other built elements within the street scene that come closer to the public highway than the proposed dwelling. However, I saw from my site visit that the neighbouring garage is set further back and is single storey, so is less prominent. I also saw several boundary walls, but these are relatively small scale and are characteristic features of the estate, which complement the area. Although the fence and conifer hedge at the front of the appeal site is a visually dominant feature, its impact is not comparable with a two storey house, and its removal does not justify the development.
9. I have given consideration to the other schemes referenced by the appellant. Whilst these may prove successful, they all differ from the site circumstances before me and do not persuade me that the proposal would be acceptable.
10. I have considered all other matters raised by interested people. However, as I have found the development to be unacceptable for the reasons given, it is not necessary for me to reach a conclusion on these matters.
11. I conclude that the development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would not respond appropriately to the form and layout of existing development and the way it functions, contrary to Policy MD2 of the Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (adopted December 2015). It would also be contrary to Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy,¹ which promotes high quality development that respects and enhances local distinctiveness.
12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Debbie Moore

Inspector

¹ Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy, March 2011