



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019

by S D Castle BSC(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/W/19/3231457

Land at Tilley Green, Wem, Shrewsbury, Shropshire

- 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 Ms H Richards against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00571/FUL, dated 4 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a detached domestic garage and store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have amended the description of the proposed development in my decision to remove reference to the planning history of the site as it does not describe an act of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the appeal proposal would constitute an acceptable form of development with particular regard to the provisions of local and national policy in respect of the location of development.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a small cluster of dwellings that form part of Tilley Green, a small settlement to the south of the town of Wem. The site previously formed part of the garden associated with 6 Tilley Green Cottages. The remaining garden of No 6 is located to the east of the site, the garden of 4 Tilley Green Cottages to the South and Tilley Green Cottage to the West. Agricultural land is located to the north of the site and the small cluster of nearby dwellings are set within open countryside. A gated vehicular access to the site is located between the gardens of Tilley Green Cottage and No 4.
5. The appellant states that the purpose of the building is for domestic storage purposes only, primarily for storing vehicles and gardening equipment. Following the subdivision of the site from No 6, it no longer forms part of a defined planning unit including a dwelling. As such, the domestic storage proposed could relate to a home, or homes, that would not necessarily have a close geographic link to the site.
6. There is an existing timber shed located on the appeal site that provides storage space of a scale that could accommodate most equipment typically

required for garden maintenance. The appellant asserts that the proposed building would encourage journeys to the site by sustainable means as more equipment linked to the maintenance of the site could be stored at the site. Based on the evidence before me, I am not convinced that the proposed building is commensurate in scale with the storage of items required for the maintenance of the site, or that the building is necessary to address any particular security concerns in the area. As such, it is reasonable to anticipate that the building proposed will result in an increase in trips to the site to access the additional domestic storage space provided.

7. Whilst the Council does not appear to object to the principle of storage linked to the maintaining of the appeal site, it raises concerns that the proposed building would increase vehicles to and from the site in a remote location. On my site visit, I noted that there is a bus stop located on the B5476 to the west of the site. The route to this bus stop is, however, narrow, winding, lacking in footpaths and unlit. These circumstances would not encourage access to the site by pedestrians or public transport. I am mindful that the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas. Nevertheless, the site is located in a small cluster of dwellings surrounded by open countryside and there would be a lack of sustainable transport choices to access the domestic storage space within the building proposed.
8. Having regard to the lack of sustainable transport choices, the proposal would conflict with policies CS6 of the Shropshire Core Strategy (2011) and policy MD2 of the Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (2015). These policies seek, amongst other things, the creation of sustainable places that are inclusive, accessible and which mitigate and adapt to climate change, responding appropriately to local patterns of movement. The proposal would also conflict with the Framework which indicates that development proposals should consider transport issues at the earliest stage so that opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued.

Other Matters

9. Concern is raised by the Council and interested parties regarding the effect on living conditions, in terms of noise and disturbance, of the use of the site for the repair and maintenance of vehicles. The appellant states that the site has temporarily been used for the storage of motor vehicles but that such use has now ceased. I can only assess the appeal based on the proposal before me and that is for the erection of a domestic garage and store. The proposed building would be located adjacent to another domestic garage building of similar scale. As such, I do not consider the proposed building incompatible with surrounding uses. The proposal would not result in unacceptable harm, in terms of its impact on living conditions, by virtue of noise or disturbance.
10. The appellant's statement provides details of the appellant's intentions regarding the use of the proposed building and outlines potential travel options from the appellant's home to the site. Given the development will be permanent and the circumstances of the users of the site will change over time, the particular circumstances of the appellant carry limited weight and are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

S D Castle

INSPECTOR