



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2023

by N Bromley BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/23/3323663

Curlew Cottage, Rowe Lane, Stanton Long, Much Wenlock, Shropshire TF13 6LS

- 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 David Smith against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00292/FUL, dated 19 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of an extension to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, having particular regard to it being a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

3. The host property is one half of a pair of semi-detached houses, located along a rural road in the countryside. The building is an early nineteenth century two-storey cottage constructed in local stone, brick and roofed with plain clay tiles. Its principal elevation does not front the road, instead its outlook is towards the rear landscaped private garden area, as established in a previous appeal for a certificate of lawful development (ref APP/A0665/W/20/3261183).
4. The parties agree that the appeal property is a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) and whilst there is otherwise limited supporting information in respect of it being an NDHA, I am content, following my site visit, that it can be treated as such.
5. The principal elevation contains the main entrance door and canopy, with windows either side on the ground floor and first floor. There are two chimney stacks, which further add symmetry to the appearance of the cottage. Its significance as a heritage asset derives from its quaint, cottage appearance, particularly the principal elevation, which contains its important architectural features, and has an outlook towards the tranquil and well-maintained garden.
6. The proposed development, which the appellant describes as a garden room, would project forward of the principal elevation of the cottage, and would have stone dwarf walls, brick detailing, and glazing with timber frames above. The front canopy porch would be replaced, and the extension would sit over the entrance door and one of the existing ground floor windows.

7. The proposed extension would be modest in proportion to the size of the existing house and the use of timber frames and glazing would help it to have a simple and lightweight design. The use of stone dwarf walls, with brick detailing, reflects the style of the building. However, the proposed extension would dominate this important elevation by virtue of its footprint and height. It would harm the symmetry and appearance of the principal elevation and overall, it would significantly harm and be incongruous to the character and interest of the dwelling.
8. Accordingly, given the proposed extension's discordant design in relation to the host building, and the attractive setting, I attach significant weight to the harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.
9. For the reasons outlined above, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building, such that it would negatively affect its significance as a non-designated heritage asset. Therefore, it would conflict with Policies CS5, CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy (2011) and Policies MD2, MD7b and MD13 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (2015). Together, these require, amongst other things, that development proposals; protect, conserve, and enhance the historic context and character of heritage assets. The proposal would also not accord with paragraph 203 of the Framework, which calls for a balanced judgement of any harm against the significance of the heritage asset.
10. I acknowledge that the proposed development can be constructed to ensure that it would not harm the main fabric of the cottage and that it would have limited views from any main vantage points, whilst also providing additional internal accommodation for the appellant. I also note that the Parish Council supports the application. However, these factors do not override the harm identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I have found that the proposed development would conflict with policies contained within the development plan. Whilst it may not conflict with other policies, I consider that it would conflict with the development plan as a whole. I have found no other material circumstances that would outweigh that conflict. As such, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Bromley

INSPECTOR