



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2018

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th October 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/18/3206777

Toad Hall, Abbey Green, Whixall SY13 2PT

- 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 Mrs Wendy Edge against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 17/05320/FUL, dated 1 November 2017, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2018.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey extension at Toad Hall, Abbey Green, Whixall SY13 2PT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/05320/FUL, dated 1 November 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: THW/PP/01; THW/PP/02; THW/PP/11; THW/PP/12; THW/PP/13; THW/PP/14; THW/PP/21; THW/PP/22 Rev D; THW/PP/23 Rev D; THW/PP/24 Rev D and THW/PP/25 Rev D.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the appeal was lodged the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published but does not raise any additional matters. For clarity, the site address has been adopted from the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a former agricultural building of brick and slate construction which has been converted to residential use. The property is sited

adjacent to a large altered dwelling with rendered walls which appears to be in general residential use rather than being occupied as a farmhouse. The land associated with both the property and the dwelling is domestic in character comprising landscaped gardens and parking areas. Beyond the residential curtilages the fields are used for arable crops and grazing, including horses. There is an extended outbuilding associated with the property which is used for storage purposes.

5. The Council consider that the property is a non-designated heritage asset. The Framework identifies that the effect of a proposal on a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in the determination of this appeal and a balanced judgement is required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Policies CS6 and CS17 of the Core Strategy (CS) and Policies MD2 and MD13 of the Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (SAMDev) require development to protect and enhance the built environment and historic assets.
6. Based upon the evidence available, the non-heritage asset designation is associated with the appeal property being part of a former farmstead and this contributes to the wider character of the surrounding open countryside. However, the appellant's Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) refers to the various changes which have occurred to the built forms of development associated with the former farmstead, including the property originally being a separate entity.
7. From what was observed during the site visit, the dwelling, property and outbuilding and their curtilages have been altered and this group of buildings now possesses a predominantly domestic, rather than agricultural, character and appearance. There is also a marked difference between the appearance of the dwelling and the property because of the external materials.
8. Although some of the physical relationship between the buildings remains, the various alterations have impacted on what might have been a visually more cohesive character and appearance associated with the former farmstead. The heritage value of both the former farmstead and the property has been diluted and, for this reason, I concur with the appellant's HIA that the significance of the property as a non-designated heritage asset is low. However, there is still a requirement to assess the effect of the appeal scheme on the non-designated heritage asset.
9. The proposed development includes the erection of a single storey extension which would project from the side elevation of the property onto a paved patio area. The Council claims that the proposed extension would be an overly contrived design. Although of a different design, the general form of the proposed mono-pitched extension would be similar to the outbuilding's addition.
10. There would be a glazed link between the property and the main part of the extension. Further, the walls of the main element of the appeal scheme would be predominantly glazed. By reason of the glazed link and walls, the design and scale of the proposed extension would not visually or physically dominate the character or appearance of the property. The property would not be subsumed by the proposed extension.

11. The appearance of the property would change but not to such an extent that its already diluted heritage significance would be unacceptably harmed. Further, by reason of siting, the appeal scheme would not be a visually prominent addition to the property when viewed from the adjoining dwelling and its curtilage. The current visual and physical relationship between the property and the dwelling would remain unaltered. For these reasons, there would be no unacceptable harm caused to the contribution of the extended property to the heritage significance of the former farmstead.
12. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would not conflict with CS Policies CS6 and CS17 and SAMDev Policies MD2 and MD13. In addition to protecting the historic environment and heritage assets, these policies also require development to be of a high quality of design and to protect, preserve and enhance built environments by considering local context.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested several conditions in the event this appeal succeeds and they have been assessed against the tests in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. For reasons of proper planning and the avoidance of doubt, it is necessary that the proposed development should be erected in accordance with the submitted drawings. To ensure that the proposed extension remains sympathetic and subservient to the host property as an on designated heritage asset, it is necessary for the external materials to be approved by the Council. The appellant has agreed to this pre-commencement condition. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR