
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2019

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 April 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/W/18/3214886

1 Snowdrop Close, Shrewsbury, SY3 7TU

- 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 Neal Katz against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 18/00641/FUL, dated 6 February 2018, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2018.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached dwelling and the formation of a new vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The submitted plans contain minor errors. The Proposed Layout Plan (Alternative) purports to relate to a proposed bungalow, although all other documentation relates to a two-storey dwelling, whilst the drawing showing the east elevation of the house omits a ground-floor window which appears on the proposed ground-floor plan. These matters do not, however, affect the main issue of the case.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed dwelling on the character and appearance of the area around Snowdrop Close and Primrose Drive.

Reasons

4. No 1 is a detached house situated on a corner plot at the junction of Snowdrop Close and Primrose Drive. These roads form part of a modern housing estate that comprises largely detached houses on good sized plots. The estate has a generally open character and appearance, and houses are set well back from the pavement. Houses on corner plots are generally set well back from the boundaries with each road.
5. No 1 is a large detached house on a wide plot. It currently has a triangular side garden which has a 1.8 metre brick wall to the side and rear. To the side, the wall is sited at the rear of the pavement on Primrose Drive, while there is a public footpath behind the wall to the rear. The footpath gives access to an area of public open space and a playing field, between the housing estate and a nearby railway line.

6. The proposed house would be sited within the existing side garden area of the appeal property. It would be two-storey and L-shaped, with a narrow front element and a wider rear portion. The rear garden area of the proposed house would widen out to the rear, but there would be a detached garage with driveway and turning head in the rear portion of the garden, with a vehicular access at the southern end of the site. From the limited information before me, it would appear that there would be a narrow gap between the proposed house and the existing dwelling, while both front and rear elements of the proposed house would extend up to, or almost up to, the side boundary.
7. Policy CS6 of the Council's Core Strategy (CS), indicates that development should be appropriate in scale, density, pattern and design, taking into account local context and character. Policy MD2 of the Council's Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (SAMDev) continues this theme by indicating that development should contribute to and respect locally distinctive character by responding appropriately to the form and layout of existing development and the way it functions, including streetscape, building lines, scale, density and plot sizes.
8. In this case, the appeal property, along with No 8 Snowdrop Close opposite, occupies a large corner plot, within which the dwelling is set well back from the road boundaries to the front and side. This creates an open character and appearance around the road junction, which is a common feature within the wider estate.
9. The proposed development would involve splitting the property into a large, approximately rectangular plot, on which would sit the existing house, with a small triangular plot to the side. The proposed house would effectively fill the width of the plot in its middle section, and would extend almost to the side boundary at the back of the pavement on Primrose Drive. This would fail to respect the prevailing locally distinctive character of the area. It would appear inappropriate in its context, by virtue of the restricted size and uncharacteristic shape of the plot, and it would appear cramped in the streetscape, particularly when compared with its surroundings and other corner plots on the estate.
10. The appellant refers to examples of similar proposals that have been permitted by the Council. I have few details of these, and three are located some distance from the appeal site. There are two recent examples along Primrose Drive (Nos 4 and 7), but I note that both have more space to the side than this current proposal. In the case of No 7, there is an open grassed strip between the property boundary and the rear of the pavement, while No 4 has a wider plot, such that the house is set in from the side boundary, and there is a narrow area of landscaping between the boundary wall and the pavement. In these cases, therefore, the local character and context has been respected, which would not be the case with the current proposal at No 1 Snowdrop Close.
11. In the light of the above, I find that the proposed dwelling would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around Snowdrop Close and Primrose Drive, and that the proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policy CS6 of the CS, and with Policy MD2 of the SAMDev.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR