



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2025

by A O'Neill BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/25/3363733

Llwyntidman Lodge, Maesbrook, Shropshire SY10 8QB

- 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 Reuben Wrisdale against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/04214/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Erection of part first floor extension, part two rear storey extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. It is clear from the plans and evidence submitted that, as described, the development proposed is reliant upon extensions and alterations which would be implemented under permitted development rights. I noted during my site visit that these extensions and alterations have not been implemented. I have therefore based my decision on the submitted proposed plans.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building, having regard to its significance as a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

4. The site is located at the junction of two roads and its boundaries are defined by mature trees and vegetation. The host building is a detached two storey dwelling, which was originally built as a tollhouse, but which has been altered and extended from its original form.
5. The Council identifies the building as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) with reference to its entry in the Historic Environment Record. Its significance and special interest derive from its historical use as a tollhouse as part of the turnpike system. It is understood that the building originally had an octagonal footprint, but previous alterations and extensions have changed this. However, architectural interest is retained in its triple faceted east elevation and central chimney stack which remain from the original structure.
6. Paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) confirms that the effect on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken

into account in determining an application. A balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

7. The building would be extended to the north and west with an 'M' type roof. It is suggested that this type of roof follows local context, although this has not been evidenced. Notwithstanding, the proposed roof form does not relate well to the roof line of the existing building, particularly when viewing the east elevation, which incorporates the original part of the tollhouse. From this view, there would be an awkward relationship between the roof of the extension and the existing pitched roof. As a result, the east elevation would have a confused appearance with the extension appearing unrelated to the existing building.
8. The overall height of the extension would only be marginally lower than the original building. Combined with its overall size, the mass of the extension would dominate the existing building. Consequently, despite the use of sympathetic materials, it would not have a subservient appearance.
9. It is the appellant's case that the significance of the building as a NDHA has already been altered and could be further lost through extensions and alterations which could be implemented through permitted development rights. It is also suggested that the building has negligible importance based on the historical evidence provided by the Council and the relatively short-lived era of turnpiking the highways. I am also mindful that the tollhouse's original triple faceted elevation and chimney stack would be retained, and that it is proposed to reinstate the tollhouse door and dormer window.
10. Nevertheless, based on the evidence before me including my own observations, whilst the original tollhouse building has been altered, it does retain a discernible historical and architectural significance. The design and scale of the proposed extension would overwhelm the original part of the building and detract from the remaining original features. As a result, there would be harm to the significance of the NDHA.
11. While I acknowledge that the site is largely screened from the public highway by mature trees and boundary vegetation, this does not alter my conclusion that the proposed extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the building, and therefore to its significance as a NDHA.
12. Taking all of the above into account, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and would negatively affect its significance as a NDHA. As such it would conflict with Policies CS5 and CS6 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy (2011) and Policies MD2 and MD13 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (2015). Amongst other things, these policies require development to be of high quality design which conserves and enhances the built and historic environment, avoiding harm to, or loss of the significance of NDHAs and taking account of local context and character, including scale and proportion. The proposal would also not accord with paragraph 216 of the Framework, which calls for a balanced judgement of any harm against the significance of the NDHA.

Other Matters

13. Reference is made to Llwyntidman Farmhouse and Llwyntidmon Hall, both Grade II listed buildings located in proximity to the appeal site. Mindful of the statutory duty set

out in s66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of these buildings.

14. The significance and special interest of Llwyntidman Farmhouse stem primarily from its architectural interest as a surviving example of a 17th Century farmhouse and barn constructed of timber framing with brick infill and limestone rubble. The structure's later additions demonstrate rural domestic and agricultural evolution. The significance and special interest of Llwyntidmon Hall stems from its architectural interest as a late 16th or early 17th Century timber framed farmhouse, remodelled in brick in the 18th Century.
15. The appeal site is separated from Llwyntidman Farmhouse by a series of fields defined by mature trees and vegetation. Llwyntidmon Hall is separated from the site by roads also lined with mature trees and vegetation. Views between the appeal site and the two listed buildings are largely obscured and this would not change as a result of the appeal proposal. As such, this proposal would not affect the significance of the two listed buildings. I note the Council had no concerns in this regard either. Nevertheless, this lack of harm weighs neutrally and does not amount to consideration in support of the appeal nor does it alter my overall conclusions on the main issue.
16. I appreciate that the proposal is acceptable in relation to ecology, flooding, drainage, highways and living conditions and that undeveloped land would be retained around the building. Nevertheless, the lack of harm in these matters do not outweigh the harm I have found to the significance of the NDHA.
17. My attention has been drawn to the Historic Building Record for another tollhouse in a different location. It is suggested that this tollhouse is more important than the appeal property due to its location, but that it was allowed to be demolished. However, the example building has a different appearance and site context to the appeal building and as such, the two are not directly comparable. In any event, the demolition of another tollhouse, does not justify the appeal proposal, in light of the harm I have found.
18. It is stated that the appellant and their family are currently living in temporary accommodation which they are outgrowing and that the appeal dwelling is currently uninhabitable. However, it has not been demonstrated that the needs of the appellant could not be met without harm to the significance of the NDHA.
19. I understand that this is a revised scheme following discussions with the Council. However, I have dealt with the proposal on the basis of the plans and evidence before me.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

A O'Neill

INSPECTOR