



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2025

by **U P Han BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/W/24/3347200

Land adjacent 11 White Lodge Park, Shawbury, Shropshire SY4 4NS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Wootton against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/05422/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a new dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - whether the proposed development would provide adequate outdoor amenity space with particular regard to storage.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site relates to part of the side and rear garden of 11 White Lodge Park (No 11) which also contains a drive and a single garage that is attached to the garage of 10 White Lodge Park (No 10). No 11 is a semi-detached bungalow occupying a prominent position on the bend of White Lodge Park. The street contains a mix of modern brick built one and two storey semi-detached pairs of dwellings. Each pair is separated by adjoining driveways which serve garages to the rear. The site is broadly triangular in shape and greatest in width near White Lodge Park, tapering to a narrow point at the rear.
4. The appeal site is opposite a small cul-de-sac forming part of White Lodge Park and contributes to a sense of openness at this particular juncture of the road and to the overall spacious residential character of the surrounding area. The appeal site reflects the pattern of development in the vicinity. No 10 and the dwellings at the entrance of the cul-de-sac, opposite the appeal site, have comparably large front gardens. Therefore, the front and side garden of No 11 conforms to the character of the existing street scene.
5. While the proposed development would follow the building line of White Lodge Park, it would nevertheless reduce the sense of openness in this part of the street.

The loss of openness would be more noticeable due to the site's prominent position within the street.

6. Although the front of the site would be spacious, the rear would be cramped due to the proximity of the rear of the proposed dwelling to the rear of No 11. This narrow spacing is uncharacteristic of the spacing between the semi-detached pairs of dwellings in the street, which have a larger gap between them, providing views towards gardens and garages at the rear. The position of the proposed dwelling in relation to No 11 would therefore be incongruous within the general pattern of development in the street.
7. While the architectural design of the dwelling and the proposed external materials would be acceptable, they would not sufficiently mitigate the adverse effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. For the reasons given, the proposed development would unduly harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy CS6 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy (March 2011) (the CS) and Policy MD2 of the Site Allocations and Management Development Plan (December 2015) (SAMDP) insofar as they require development to achieve high quality design and respond to local character and the form and layout of existing development.

Outdoor Amenity Space

9. Based on the evidence before me, it has not been shown that the proposed rear outdoor amenity space would be inadequate in size. There is no reason why a small shed or garden storage unit could not be realistically accommodated within the rear outdoor space. Furthermore, the Council have not demonstrated that the size of the outdoor amenity space would be inadequate if a storage unit commensurate with the size of the proposed dwelling were be accommodated within it.
10. The size of the outdoor amenity space is comparable to those of 12 and 13 White Lodge Park. While those properties benefit from garages, there is no local planning policy before me which requires the provision of a garage or outdoor storage space.
11. For the reasons given, the proposed development would provide adequate outdoor amenity space with particular regard to storage. It would comply Policy CS6 of the CS and Policy MD2 of the SAMDP insofar as they require development to achieve high quality sustainable design.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

12. The proposal would provide an additional dwelling which would contribute to the area's housing supply. The site is an urban area and would represent an efficient use of land. Given the small scale of the development, these benefits would be modest and carry moderate weight in favour of the proposal.
13. While the proposed development would provide adequate outdoor amenity space, it would significantly harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This leads me to an overall conclusion that the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan, when considered as a whole.

14. Accordingly, I find that the adverse impacts of the proposal are matters of significant weight against the grant of planning permission and the material considerations, including the stated benefits, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed

U P Han

INSPECTOR