

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2022

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/22/3298194

The Haven, Shepherds Lane, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY3 8BT

- 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 Mrs Johnson-Davies against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00503/FUL, dated 3 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is a detached pitched roof garage and associated alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in the erection of a detached garage close to the road frontage of this residential property. This would represent an extremely dominant new feature within the street scene. It would be a garage of a standard design that would have little architectural interest or quality in this prominent location on the outside of the bend in the road.
 4. This village street is characterised by the large number of properties that have hedges to their frontages and significant areas of planting between the road and the houses. Whilst there are properties with more open frontages and with less vegetation, these are not so numerous as to alter this overriding character. The prominence of this garage would be increased because of the openness of the remainder of the frontage of this plot and the lack of frontage vegetation to the two neighbouring plots. This proposal, being so close to the road and so exposed to view, would be entirely at odds with the prevailing character and would detract from it. The proposed high fencing would add to this concern. Whilst a planted trellis would in time offer some softening of the appearance of the garage, this would not overcome my concerns.
 5. Only one another example of a garage within the front garden was clearly apparent when passing along this road. It is less prominent given the straight alignment of the road and the vegetation associated with the properties to each
-

side. It is set beyond a relatively wide verge and a hedge has been planted. At this early stage in the growth of the hedge, the structure does detract from the overall character of the road. Given that the proposed garage would be more prominent due to the bend in the road and the more open areas to each side; and the more limited potential for planting, the existing garage does not offer any significant support for this proposal.

6. Reference has also been made to other buildings and developments within this settlement but these are not comparable or relevant to this proposal. I accept that no objections have been raised locally and that there are no highway safety concerns. I acknowledge also that the removal of the end of the hedge may have improved visibility from the adjacent lane to the side of the property. I also acknowledge that the proposal may provide benefits for the family of the appellant which is a positive consideration. The garage would also be constructed in good quality materials. However, I conclude that the matters in support do not outweigh my main concern that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of this area. I also find that the position of the garage, so close to the frontage, represents particularly poor design in this context.
7. The proposal would be contrary to Policies CS6 & CS17 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy 2011 as it would not contribute to local distinctiveness or adequately take into account the local context or character. For the same reasons, the proposal would also conflict with Policy MD2 of the Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan 2015. As these policies generally accord with the design objectives of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, I afford them full weight.
8. As the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and as there are not matters that outweigh this concern, I dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR