



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2023

by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/23/3314588

37 Lansdowne Road, Bayston Hill, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY3 0HY

- 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 Oliver Humphreys against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/04125/FUL, dated 6 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is proposed extensions to form garage and utility room, porch and covered area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed extensions to form garage and utility room, porch and covered area at 37 Lansdowne Road, Bayston Hill, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY3 0HY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/04125/FUL, dated 6 September 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan dated 18 February 2021; Site Plan dated 18 February 2021; and Plans as Proposed dated August 2022.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 37 Lansdowne Road is a semi-detached property and along this section of Lansdowne Road the dwellings are typically semi-detached although the design of the attached pairs can vary. Despite these variations the properties are generally built along a consistent building line set back behind deep driveways and gardens. This consistent building line as well as the balanced appearance of each semi-detached pair establishes a pattern of development.
4. Between each semi-detached pair there is typically hedgerow or fencing and because of this when the dwellings are viewed as a group the ground floor of the houses are partly screened by this boundary treatment. The first floor of

the buildings are however viewed together and the consistency in the building line is evident at this level.

5. The proposal would incorporate a narrow single storey side extension as well as a shallow porch and covered area that would extend across around half the width of the dwelling. These elements of the scheme are proposed to be built using similar materials to the house and given the limited scale of these extensions, they would be subordinate to the dwelling. Accordingly, these elements of the proposal would retain the balanced appearance across the attached dwellings.
6. Within the wider area there are examples of garages that have been built forward of houses. The proposed garage would be single storey with a pitched roof and again would be built using similar materials. The garage would be built next to, albeit forward of the main elevation of the house and would have a large garage door. As a result, it would appear as a separate outbuilding, despite being physically attached. Considering the limited scale of the garage in relation to the dwelling, it would appear subordinate to it and would not erode the balanced appearance across the two attached dwellings.
7. Given the deep driveway at No 37 the garage would be set back a moderate distance from the road and this set back alongside the low profile of the garage would ensure it would not appear prominent in the street scene. The screening effect of the boundary treatment as well as the limited profile of the proposed garage would retain the legibility of the building line at first floor level.
8. Even if this boundary treatment was to be removed given the subordinate appearance of the proposal, the principal elevation of the house would retain its prominence. As such, the extended dwelling and garage would not appear incongruous within the street scene. Accordingly, the proposal would not appear out of character with the established pattern of development.
9. Therefore, the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the area. Consequently, the proposal would accord with Policy CS6 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy and Policy MD2 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan. These seek to ensure development proposals respond appropriately to the form and layout of existing development.

Conditions

10. Further to the statutory commencement condition a condition requiring the scheme to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary in the interest of certainty. Furthermore, a condition requiring the materials to match the dwelling is necessary in the interest of character and appearance.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the proposal would accord with the development plan as a whole and the other considerations would not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed.

G Sibley

INSPECTOR