
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/18/3207144

Walnut Cottage, 4 Pant Glas, Oswestry SY10 7HS

- 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 Heather Bond against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 18/01491/FUL, dated 27 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2018.
 - The development proposed is the removal of a timber shed and the erection of a garage and study with ancillary site works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the appeal was lodged the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published but does not raise any additional matters.

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 proposed development includes the demolition of a single storey timber shed and its replacement by a 2-storey outbuilding sited to the side of a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling. The adjoining dwelling, 5 Pant Glas, has a greater width and a single storey pitched roof garage as a side addition.
5. By reason of the difference in ground level, the dwelling and the shed are elevated above the road and are clearly visible across an open and landscaped garden. The proposed outbuilding would be of a similar width to the shed and it would have a lower ridge height than the host property.
6. The property is situated within the extensive Pant Glas and Brogyntyn Park Conservation Area where there is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. In the absence of a Heritage Impact Assessment, there is limited information concerning the significance of this designated heritage asset.
7. From what was observed during the site visit, the Conservation Area is characterised by undulating verdant and open countryside which also includes

Brogyntyn Hall and Park and both individual and small groups of buildings. The significance of the Conservation Area appears to be the historical relationship between Brogyntyn Hall and the surrounding land and buildings, including simply designed dwellings which may have housed estate workers. The appeal property is one of a small number of residential properties which comprise Pant Glas which are located within a valley.

8. The Council claim that the host property is a non-designated heritage asset. The reason for this designation is not explained in any detail other than being an historic cottage. The property and these semi-detached dwellings do, however, possess a simple design and appearance when viewed from the road and their external materials are common within the Conservation Area. Although of timber construction, because of its size and relationship to the host property the existing shed is a neutral element in the appearance of both the streetscene and Conservation Area.
9. Within the Conservation Area there are examples of outbuildings and extensions and alterations to properties. However, it was observed that the outbuildings are single storey in height with pitched roofs. The height of the outbuildings generally does not exceed the eaves of the host properties and are subservient in scale. The choice of materials and roof pitches respect their host properties. These characteristics apply to the garage at No. 5.
10. By contrast, there would be only a limited differential between the ridge heights of the host property and the appeal scheme. As the Council has identified, the proposed development would not be subservient to the host property and would visually compete with this simply designed 2-storey dwelling when viewed from the road. Further, the design of the proposed outbuilding includes a roof with a pitch that would fail to respect the host property. The design of the appeal scheme would not be appropriate to its context and would be more conspicuous from the road than the existing shed.
11. Although not alone a reason for this appeal to fail because of the existing shed's timber construction, the use of cedar boarding as a facing material at first floor level was not observed to be a common material for other buildings within the Conservation Area. This choice of external material adds to the harm.
12. As has been identified, the existing shed is a neutral feature within the streetscene and Conservation Area but because of its height and design the proposed outbuilding would not result in a high quality of design that would be a material improvement to the current situation. The proposed development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Although less than substantial harm would be caused to the significance of the designated heritage asset, the degree of harm is sufficient to outweigh the benefits of the appeal scheme, including the provision of additional accommodation for the appellant and the removal of the timber shed. The harm which has been identified would equally be detrimental to the property's characteristics which have been identified as contributing to its significance as a non-designated heritage asset.
13. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy (CS) and Policy MD2 of the Site Allocations and Management of

Development Plan (SAMDev). Amongst other matters these policies require development to be of a high quality of design and to protect, preserve and enhance built environments by considering local context.

14. No specific conflict with the Council's *Type and Affordability of Housing Supplementary Planning Document* has been identified because the design requirements for outbuildings relate to those erected on rural exceptions sites. Further, CS Policy CS5 does not include specific criteria for outbuildings within the countryside and no specific conflict has, therefore, been identified. However, for the reasons given and taking into account all other matters, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR