



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2024

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/24/3339364

**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 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Smith against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/05406/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of extension to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of extension to dwelling at Curlew Cottage, Rowe Lane, Stanton Long, Much Wenlock, Shropshire TF13 6LS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/05406/FUL, 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: LGA 727D03 REV A As Proposed – Elevations; LGA 727D04 REV A As Proposed – Plans; LGA 727D05 REV B Site Plan; and LGA 727D06 REV B Location Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr David Smith against Shropshire Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The site has been subject to previous appeal decisions. A copy of the most recent, reference APP/L3245/D/23/3323663, relating to the erection of an extension to the dwelling, has been provided, which I have taken into account in my decision. Nonetheless I have reached my own findings based on the evidence that is before me.

4. Harm to the landscape and scenic beauty of the Shropshire Hills National Landscape, within which the appeal site lies, and which was formerly known as the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, did not form part of the reason for refusal. As the proposed extension would be located to the rear of the dwelling it would not be prominent in views from the highway, particularly as it would not require the removal of any roadside hedgerow. Consequently, the proposal would conserve the natural beauty of the area and therefore I have no grounds to disagree with the Council in this regard.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the significance of the host property, a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

6. The host property is a previously extended early nineteenth century, two-storey, semi-detached cottage of local stone and brick construction with a plain clay tiled pitched roof. The Council recognise it as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA), and this was accepted by the Inspector in the previous appeal. Having carefully considered the evidence before me, I do not consider this to have been an unreasonable conclusion to reach.
7. The proposed extension would be added to the elevation that faces the rear garden space, which previously has been established as the principal elevation of the property. Based on my observations, I have no reason to disagree.
8. The principal elevation contains the main door into the cottage, centrally positioned beneath a lean-to canopy. The door is set between two ground floor windows of similar size and appearance, with two upper floor windows that vertically align. This gives the principal elevation a simple, symmetrical appearance which is emphasised and enhanced by the position of two brick chimneys within the roof. Such features contribute positively to the character and appearance of this NDHA, the significance of which is derived from its architectural and historic cottage character within a tranquil, rural location.
9. The proposed extension would be centrally positioned in front of the door and between the ground and upper floor windows. The proposed pitched plain clay tiled roof would reflect the appearance of the roof of the existing cottage and would sit comfortably below the eaves. The symmetrical appearance of the principal elevation would therefore be retained, and the large extent of glazing proposed would ensure that its original form would remain legible.
10. The extension would project further into the rear garden than the scheme that was dismissed in the previous appeal, and its depth would be broadly comparable to that of the original cottage. Nevertheless, its overall scale would amount to a modest and proportionate addition to the cottage, and the proposal would have a considerably reduced width and footprint when compared to the scheme dismissed in the previous appeal. Overall, the proposed extension would harmonise with the simple, original appearance of the cottage and, as such, would not harm, or lead to any material loss of significance of, this NDHA.

11. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would not harm the significance of the property as a NDHA. Consequently, it would accord with Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy and Policies MD2 and MD13 of the Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan which requires development to be of a high-quality design and seek to protect, conserve and enhance the historic context and character of heritage assets. It would also satisfy the requirements of section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which is also concerned with the safeguarding of heritage assets.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have included a condition that specifies the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition relating to matching materials is also necessary to ensure that the appearance of the new development would be satisfactory.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR