# **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/22/3298131 Bank House, Nobold Lane, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY5 8NW

- 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 Ryan Chance against the decision of Shropshire Council.
- The application Ref 22/00180/FUL, dated 13 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
- The development proposed is a garage and workshop with home office and storage above.

#### 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 a large outbuilding within the curtilage of this residential property. It would replace the existing garage which is relatively unobtrusive due to the limited height of its flat roof and its slight set back from the boundary with the road. The proposal would extend closer to the road and would be significantly higher and larger. The proposed pitched roof and materials would be more in keeping with the detailing of the dwelling, although the pitch of the roof would be significantly steeper, resulting in an overall height of nearly six metres and a very substantial roof form.
- 4. The new building would be extremely prominent when approaching the property in both directions due to its height and proximity to both the highway and the rear boundary. The pitch and scale of the roof would be at odds with the design of the dwelling and its overall height and position would ensure that it would be an extremely dominant new feature. It would not represent good design as it would fail to respect the design and proportions of the house and it would not have the design quality to justify its substantial size in such a prominent position. Whilst outbuildings are common features of residential properties, this proposal would be overly dominant in the position shown. It would detract from the character and appearance of the area and it would not represent high quality design in this particular context.

- 5. As the proposal would not contribute to local distinctiveness; respond appropriately to the existing built form; or adequately take into account the local context or character, it would conflict with Policy CS6 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy 2011 and 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.
- 6. The use of high quality materials and a pitched rather than flat roof are positive features of the design notwithstanding my concerns above. I have also had regard to the lack of objections. Reference has been made to the outbuilding abutting Nobold Hall. That garage has a much lower pitched roof and is of a lesser overall scale. It is also viewed in association with a much larger property. It provides support for the use of quality materials and a pitched roof but not for the greater height and scale of the proposed structure. The works would generate economic activity and provide flexible accommodation for the residents but the social and economic benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the environmental concerns.
- 7. Overall, whilst there would be some benefits to the proposal, they would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm that would result to the character and appearance of the area. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

**INSPECTOR**