



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2019

by Martin H Seddon BSc DipTP MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/W/18/3214977

Former garages, Newington Way, Craven Arms, Shropshire, SY7 9NB

- 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 D Nicholson & Mr S Marnic against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref: 18/02099/FUL, dated 2 May 2018, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2018.
 - The development proposed is demolition of vacant garages and erection of 6 apartments.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised in February 2019. However, this mainly concerned the housing delivery test. I consider that there is no prejudice to the main parties from basing my decision on the revised version as a material consideration.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Craven Arms is identified in Shropshire Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy policy CS3 as a Key Centre. The scale of development proposed in the development plan reflects both the role of Craven Arms as the local growth point in the A49 corridor and the potential of the town to deliver housing, employment and services. This policy is supported by Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan policy S7 for the Craven Arms Area. The Council advises that there is a particular need for housing in Craven Arms because of the relatively low completion rate. The appeal site is in a sustainable location with good access to services and facilities in Craven Arms.
5. The appeal site is situated between a two storey housing terrace and a public car park. There is a further car park and the modern building of the Craven Arms Community Centre to the rear. The proposed apartment block would be

three storeys high and would have twin gables at its front elevation facing Shrewsbury Road. There is a high apartment block further along Shrewsbury Road and permission for another block at Station Road. However, residential development in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site is predominantly two storeys.

6. The proposed apartments would have limited private amenity space. However, I accept that the site is located near adequate alternative recreational facilities including a playing field and play area, and facilities at the community centre.
7. The appellants advise that the Council has encouraged design quality and three storey landmark schemes within the town. However, development should respect and complement its surroundings. Core Strategy policy CS6 seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that development is appropriate in scale, density, pattern and design, taking into account the local context and character. The proposed apartment block would appear out of character and dominant in the street scene because of its proposed height and bulk. Its prominence would be increased because it would be sited forward of the adjacent housing terrace, with limited frontage space. It would also appear out of scale with the terrace and, whether or not the sizes of the flats meet national floorspace standards, it would still represent an overdevelopment of the site.
8. I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the locality and the street scene at this main route through the settlement. It would conflict with Core Strategy policy CS6 and with SamDev Plan policy MD2 regarding sustainable design and the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusions

9. The proposal would make a modest contribution towards the housing land supply. However, the benefits would be outweighed by the harm from the proposed apartment block to the character and appearance of the street scene. I have taken all other matters raised into account. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR