



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2025

by **U P Han BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/24/3353300

Pipe House, 43A Bridge Road, Benthall, Broseley, Shropshire TF12 5RB

- 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 Peter Blanchflower against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02347/FUL.
 - The development proposed is 'gabled extension to rear of existing garage (permitted as ancillary accommodation: PP ref. 20/03598/FUL) together with alterations to the facade materials via the addition of cedar cladding to each gable inset.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site is within Broseley Conservation Area (CA) wherein I have a statutory duty under Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (PLBCAA) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

Reasons

The Significance of the CA

4. The significance of the CA stems from its historic importance, the survival of its historic pattern of settlement and buildings that reflect Broseley's evolution. The Broseley Conservation Area Appraisal (March 2008) (BCCA) highlights the diverse but traditional styles and architectural detailing which epitomises the buildings in the CA. It is noted that Broseley is a predominantly brick and tile town, reflecting the local tradition of brick construction in the area. The BCCA notes that the use of non-traditional materials and inappropriate detailing risks eroding the character of the CA.

The Effect of the Proposed Development on the Significance of the CA

5. The appeal site relates to a relatively modern detached two storey house which is set back from Bridge Road behind a stone wall, rising garden land and driveway. A brick built double garage with a dual pitched roof sits to the front of the house. The site's position on elevated ground makes the house and garage highly visible from

the road. Planning permission¹ has been granted to convert the garage into ancillary accommodation, including installation of an external staircase to the upper floor of the garage. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, containing houses of various ages, size and design.

6. The proposal seeks to add a single gablet extension to the northern roof slope of the garage and cedar cladding to each of the three gables (including the proposed new gablet). The submitted Planning and Design Statement contends that the proposed architectural style and materials palette would reflect the main house, neighbouring properties and those in the wider area.
7. The main house is largely of brick construction with a tiled roof and dormer gables. There is no cedar cladding to the exterior of the main house and the dormer gablets are lead clad. Within this context, the proposal would introduce a material which would be discordant with the materials palette of the main house.
8. While there are examples of timber cladding on buildings in the area, the cladding remains subservient in coverage to their host building. In contrast, the proposed timber cladding would fill the gables of the garage from their apex to the eaves line of the building, covering a large proportion of those elevations and creating a dominant feature on the building. The proposed cladding would be visually intrusive by virtue of its coverage, elevated position and anomalous material, drawing attention to its incongruity.
9. While the garage is not of particular architectural merit, the proposal to introduce a relatively large gablet to the building would create an unbalanced and visually awkward addition that would undermine its cohesive and proportional design. Despite the mature vegetation on the east side of Bridge Road, the proposed alterations to the garage would be highly visible from the street due to the site's elevated position.
10. The appellant has pointed to a variety of gables in the immediate and wider area. However, the majority of these relate to houses which are materially different in size, massing and design to the garage. Of the limited examples provided relating to garages, I do not have the full details of these schemes so I cannot be certain that the circumstances of those cases or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration are the same. In any event, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.
11. Given the above, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA, thereby harming the significance of the CA. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to accord with section 72(1) of the PLBCAA.
12. The degree of harm to the CA would be less than substantial in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) given the scale and nature of the proposal. In such circumstances, paragraph 215 of Framework establishes that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset (in this case the CA), this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

¹ Ref. 20/03598/FUL.

Public Benefits

13. The proposal would enhance ancillary accommodation and provide benefit to its occupiers in terms of increased space. However, this would amount to a private benefit to occupiers, so I am only able to give this very limited weight.
14. The appellant contends that the proposal would make a positive contribution to the CA. However, for the reasons given above, I find that the scheme, on the contrary, would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
15. Paragraph 212 of the Framework advises that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Furthermore paragraph 213 of the Framework indicates that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.
16. The very limited public benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm the appeal scheme would cause to the significance of the CA, which carries great weight.
17. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Hence it would conflict with Policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy (March 2011), Policies MD2 and MD13 of the Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (December 2015) and Policy D1 of the Broseley Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2038 (March 2020) insofar as they require development to protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment, reflect local character and achieve high quality design. Additionally, the proposal would conflict with the overarching aims of section 16 of the Framework 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment'

Conclusion

18. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

U P Han

INSPECTOR