



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2019

by **Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th June 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/W/19/3225360

Land between Green Hedges and Appleby, Ford, Shrewsbury SY5 9LJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Hilary Silva against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 18/04534/OUT, dated 19 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 27 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single detached dwelling and garage with access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application was submitted in outline, with all matters reserved for future consideration. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the site is a suitable location for housing, having regard to local and national planning policy.

Reasons

4. The Shropshire Core Strategy (CS) 2011 seeks to focus new residential development within market towns, other key centres and certain named villages. Policy CS4 of the CS sets out how new housing will be delivered in the rural areas by focusing it in Community Hubs and Community Clusters, which are identified in Policy MD1 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (SAMDev) 2015. Policy MD1 of the SAMDev identifies those settlements that fall within a Community Hub or Community Cluster.
5. The site is located outside any settlement identified for residential growth within the development plan. The appellant argues that in the Council's 'planning review' 100 dwellings are to be delivered in Ford between 2016 and 2036. However, there is no indication what the status of this 'planning review' is and therefore I can only attribute it very limited weight. The Council confirm that Ford is not a settlement for residential growth within the current development plan and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I concur with this view. I have had regard to the previous use of the land and its proximity to a small cluster of dwellings and a restaurant/hotel. However,

- individually or cumulatively, these do not outweigh the fact that the site is not located within a settlement identified for residential growth within the development plan. Therefore, for the purposes of the development plan, the site is located within the open countryside.
6. Policy CS5 of the CS allows new development in the open countryside only where it maintains and enhances countryside vitality and character and improves the sustainability of rural communities. It also provides a list of particular development that it relates to including dwellings for essential countryside workers and conversion of rural buildings. There is no evidence before me to suggest that the proposal falls within any of the development listed in Policy CS5. However, the list is not exhaustive.
 7. Policy CS5 is complemented by Policy MD7a of the SAMDev, which goes on to further state that new market housing will be strictly controlled outside of Shrewsbury, the Market Towns, Key Centres and Community Hubs and Clusters. Therefore, it seems to me that although Policy CS5 of the CS does not explicitly restrict new market housing in the open countryside, Policy MD7a of the SAMDev does. As the proposal is for an open market dwelling, the proposal would fail to accord with Policies CS5 and MD7a.
 8. The appellant contends that the site once formed part of a larger site known as 'Shop Yard', which was sold for building plots in 1953. Whilst the evidence before me is not clear when the houses that were subsequently built on 'Shop Yard' were constructed, including the neighbouring properties to the site, Appleby and Green Hedges, based on my observations made on site, they were constructed a long time before the publication of the CS and the SAMDev. Therefore, these dwellings were most likely considered under different local and national planning policies than the proposal before me. The current proposal must be considered against the current development plan, which, as I have identified above, does not support open market dwellings in this location.
 9. I have been referred to a recently approved planning application¹ for a dwelling on Station Bungalow. Whilst this would likely have been considered under the same planning policies as the current proposal, the site had already been granted outline planning permission. As there is no evidence before me that the appeal site benefits, or has recently benefited, from such permission, I do not consider that there are sufficient similarities to find that the Council has been inconsistent in their consideration of the two schemes.
 10. I find therefore that the development would not represent a suitable location for housing, having regard to the Council's housing strategy, as embodied by Policies CS4 and CS5 of the CS and Policies MD1 and MD7a of the SAMDev. It would also fail to accord with the housing objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

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

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR

¹ LPA Ref 17/02154/OUT