



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2019

**by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 02 August 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/W/19/3225266**

**1 Station Road, Newport TF10 7EW**

- 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 S Sharma against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
  - The application Ref TWC/2018/0902, dated 26 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2019.
  - The development proposed is erection of a single dwelling house and provision of vehicular parking area and altered highway access.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised on 19 February 2019 and this post-dates the Council's refusal notice. I have had regard to the revised Framework in the determination of this appeal.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the grade II listed building, 1 Station Road.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site forms part of the garden to No 1. The front boundary adjoins Station Road and the site includes a vehicular access from the highway. The site is overgrown and contains several mature trees and bushes that can be seen from Station Road.
5. The site lies immediately to the south of 1 Station Road. Part of the significance of No 1 lies with its age and the retention of its original form and many architectural features. Particularly striking is the attractive front elevation that contains architectural details and a degree of symmetry. As it was a stationmaster's house, No 1 also has a local historic significance, especially given its address and the fact that neither the station nor railway it served no longer exists.
6. The appeal site and garden area to the north of No 1 are free of any buildings and so provide a degree of openness that allow good views of the front and side elevations of the listed building from Station Road and Station Court. The space on either side also allows better appreciation of the front symmetry

without competition for attention by other buildings. Whilst it is now garden as opposed to field, the un-built on character of the appeal site makes an important contribution to the spaciousness around the listed building and maintains some semblance of its past, more rural setting. It would also maintain the openness between the listed building and the neighbouring site on which planning permission has been granted for a dwelling. The appeal site therefore makes a positive contribution to the setting of the listed building that adds to the overall appreciation of its significance.

7. The introduction of the proposed dwelling would result in a loss of openness of the appeal site. There would be very limited scope for any meaningful planting along the front boundary given the extent of the proposed frontage parking and turning area and the need to provide acceptable access. Therefore, whilst set back from the road and away from the side elevation of No 1, the proposed house would be seen in the same views of the listed building, particularly when walking southwards on the opposite side of Station Road and on Station Court. This would detract from its attractive roadside elevation and diminish the remaining semblance of the historic rural setting.
8. For these reasons, the proposal would diminish the significance of the listed building. Whilst this would not reach the very high hurdle of substantial harm, it would nonetheless lead to less than substantial harm to the listed building's significance that requires clear and convincing justification. Due to separation distances and lack of inter-visibility, I find the proposal would cause no harm to the character or appearance of any other heritage asset in the area.
9. In these circumstances, the Framework indicates that harm caused to the significance of a heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal. However, great weight should be given to an asset's conservation.
10. Whilst I note the intention to provide some new landscaping, the amount of open space and scope for vegetation cover on the site would not adequately address the overall harmful effects of the proposal. No evidence has been submitted to show how the appeal proposal would provide new wildlife conservation benefits and therefore I find no public benefit in this regard.
11. The appellant suggests the proposal would allow the reintroduction of a feature on No 1's historic boundary, although the Council contend it would not strictly follow the original line. In any case, this would be of limited benefit to the significance of the listed building when associated with the negative aspects of the proposed dwelling. I note the appellant's intention to restore No 1, but no evidence has been provided to show the building is at risk or that the appeal proposal is required to fund any restoration.
12. The proposed turning space and alterations to the access to improve visibility for vehicles leaving the site would be a benefit to the scheme. However, the access only serves a single dwelling and I have no evidence to indicate the current site parking and access arrangements create a significant highway safety problem. As such any benefit to the proposal in this regard would be modest.
13. The proposal would contribute to the supply of housing, providing a new energy efficient dwelling in the designated Newport urban area. The proposed dwelling would be located within reasonable walking distance of nearby facilities and the town centre, thereby promoting non-car travel. Occupiers of the proposed

dwelling are likely to use local services and the proposal would generate employment and other economic benefits during its construction. However, any benefits of the scheme in these regards would be modest, given the proposed development is for only a single additional dwelling.

14. In addition to the above suggested benefits, I have noted the other points made by the appellant in support of the appeal scheme. However, these do not either singly or in combination, lead me away from my overall conclusion.
15. I find the public benefits do not outweigh the identified less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset. Consequently, the proposal fails to preserve or enhance its character or appearance. It would be contrary to policies SP4, BE1 and BE4 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2018 and policy H2 of the Newport Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017-2031, which seek, amongst other things, to ensure development proposals are in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and conserve or enhance listed buildings and their setting. It would also run counter to the Framework.

### **Conclusion**

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

*Jonathan Edwards*

INSPECTOR