



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2022

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/22/3301448

41, Roseway, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY1 4HW

- 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 Miss Desi Koleva against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/00722/FUL, dated 14 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is side and rear extension built to first floor above existing extension constructed under PDR.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A side and rear extension had been partly constructed to first floor level prior to the application to the Council. The application plans refused by the Council vary in detail from that part-built structure. I note that the arched brickwork detailing over the existing front door is not shown on the proposed plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the street scene.

Reasons

4. No.41 Roseway is the end property of a short terrace of two-storey dwellings. It is located in a residential area and separated from No.39 Roseway by an access way. Dwellings on the same side of Roseway have a similar distinctive short, terraced form and design. This includes bay windows at the front elevation and decorative arches in the brickwork over the front doors. Some of the end terrace dwellings have single storey side extensions or garages. I am advised that there was previously a garage at the appeal site. No.47 Roseway at the other end of the short terrace has a single-storey lean-to extension. Dwellings on the opposite side to the appeal building differ in form and design, including semi-detached houses and short terraces. There is also a social club set in its own grounds.
5. The proposed development would be in a prominent position next to the access road. The extension would not appear subservient to the main dwelling because it would be unduly large in size and scale and would lack a set-back from the front elevation and there would be no set-down of the roof from the

house ridgeline. The proposed height, form and design of the proposed development would reduce the symmetrical appearance of the short terrace of dwellings and would be harmful to the regularity in the design of dwellings at this side of Roseway.

6. I conclude that the proposal would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and the street scene. It would conflict with Shropshire Core Strategy policy CS6 which indicates that all development should be in scale taking into account the local context and character. It would fail to comply with Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan policy MD2 which, amongst other things, requires development to respond appropriately to the form and layout of existing development including scale. It would also conflict with the objective of achieving well designed places in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has referred to examples of other properties in the surrounding area where the Council has granted permission for side extensions with no set-back from the front elevation of the main building or set-down from the main ridgeline. None of the properties referred to are within Roseway and the circumstances and the setting for those developments would be different when compared to those at the appeal site. I have determined this appeal based upon the individual merits of the proposal and its particular site circumstances having regard to relevant development plan and national planning policies and all other material considerations.
8. The appellant has submitted Drawing No.DK/rjs/02/03 which was not considered as part of the application. This proposes setting the front elevation of the extension back from that of the dwelling at first floor level by 600 mm. The ridgeline of the extension would also be "dropped slightly" according to the appellant. The appellant has requested that this drawing be considered for approval under the Wheatcroft principle. However, the proposed scheme differs significantly in substance and detail from that refused by the Council, to an extent whereby to allow the scheme could prejudice the interests of the Council and any third parties who would not have been consulted.

Conclusion

9. I have taken all other matters raised into account, including the lack of objection from Shrewsbury Town Council and any neighbours. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR