



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2019

by Elaine Benson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 April 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/19/3223806

1 Brick Kiln Cottages, Racecourse Road, Oswestry SY10 7PJ

- 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 Terry Edwards against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 18/04414/FUL, dated 20 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is extensions and alteration to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed extensions on the appeal property, which is a non-designated heritage asset, and on its setting.

Reasons

3. The appeal property (No 1) is a vacant dwelling in need of renovation within a very small hamlet of former farming cottages and outbuildings which the Council identifies as a non-designated heritage asset. The Council indicates that it can be seen on the 1900 OS map and has historic origins associated with brick workings in the area. The dwellings are modest in appearance and size, constructed of traditional building materials and are organic in their layout. The rear elevation of No 1 is also the side wall of the adjacent cottage, with the 2 buildings forming an L-shape. Some of the cottages have been altered externally but nonetheless retain a cohesive cottage character and appearance. The evidence and my observations on site lead me to conclude that the significance of the non-designated heritage asset includes the modest appearance and size of the cottages in the hamlet, their layout and the historic context.
4. The front and side elevations of No 1 have been heavily and un-sympathetically altered over time and as such it has lost much of its original character. No 1 is the first building one sees when entering the rural hamlet which is approached by a single-track lane. Its location gives its frontage particular prominence. The proposed development would result in a rather imposing set of 3 two-storey gables on the front elevation, including a contemporary glazed central element. Notwithstanding that No 1 has been altered over time, the appearance of the property within its context would be further harmed and its appearance would fail to take reference from or reinforce local character and distinctiveness.

5. The two-storey front and single storey side extensions would further add to the floor area of the appeal property which has already been significantly increased in size over the years. The greater floor area and overall volume of the dwelling would lead to a prominent and excessive form of development which would further harm the character of No 1 and of the surrounding area by reason of the bulk and scale of the extended dwelling. The disproportionate size of the extensions could not in my view be satisfactorily addressed by the suggested alternative design approaches. Moreover, the proposed development would represent an increasingly large and more expensive property in this rural hamlet at the expense of a smaller, lower cost dwelling of the type that the *Shropshire Type and Affordability of Housing SPD* (SPD) seeks to restrict.
6. I have noted support for the proposal from Oswestry Rural Parish Council but this is insufficient to outweigh the identified concerns. This decision does not preclude the future consideration of any alternative proposals.
7. The extent of the alterations would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. I acknowledge that the proposed works would bring No 1 back into use and in principle would improve its overall internal condition. However, based on the evidence before me, I conclude that this harm to significance would not be outweighed by any public benefits.
8. For the foregoing reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CS5, CS6 and CS17; the Environmental Networks, Site Allocation and Management of Development Plan Policies MD2 and MD13; the SPD and the design objectives of the Framework, including the need for sympathetic development which respects local character and historic context, with which the Council's policies are consistent.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR