



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 24 August 2021

by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/21/3275232

Holly Cottage, Grimpo, West Felton SY11 4HL

- 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 Gemma Davies against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04713/FUL, dated 13 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey extension at Holly Cottage, Grimpo, West Felton SY11 4HL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/04713/FUL, dated 13 November 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: WD.01 Revision E; WD.90 Revision G; WD.100 Revision G; WD.101 Revision G; WD.102 Revision G; WD.300 Revision G; WD.400 Revision E; and WD.80 Revision G.
 - 3) Prior to the commencement of the relevant work details of all external windows and doors and any other external joinery shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall include full size details, 1:20 sections and 1:20 elevations of each joinery item which shall then be indexed on elevations on the approved drawings. All doors and windows shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 20 July 2021, the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have not asked for further comments from parties as the revised Framework does not materially alter the national policy approach in respect of the main issues raised in this appeal and therefore no parties have been prejudiced by my consideration of it.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and host dwelling and its impact on this non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on a lane to the north-east of West Felton, the lane has a rural character with a narrow carriageway, hedge and tree lined edges and small groups of dwellings. The appeal site lies adjacent to the highway on a triangular shaped plot with two other dwellings neighbouring the site. The area is characterised by detached dwellings on large plots with a mix of both traditional red sandstone dwellings and more modern red brick dwellings.
5. The host dwelling is a traditional two storey dwelling finished in red sandstone. The dwelling has been altered with the addition of a red brick single storey extension to the rear and a conservatory to the front elevation. The site is bound by highways to its east and southern boundary, whilst existing mature hedgerows screen the dwelling, it can be glimpsed through gates and gaps in the hedgerow.
6. The Council identifies that the host dwelling is a non-designated heritage asset. Whilst the dwelling has had a number of rather unsympathetic alterations in the past, it nevertheless retains a pleasant, traditional stone cottage character, wherein lies its significance. Paragraph 203 of the Framework states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale and harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
7. The proposed development introduces a large two storey extension to the side of the host dwelling. Due to the constraints of the site the side extension is angled and projects beyond the front elevation of the host dwelling. The site is mostly screened from nearby highways, however, when visible, the extension would be seen as part of the existing building.
8. The extension would be modern in design and introduces timber cladding to the dwelling. However, it would use design features such as the small dormer roofs and red brick chimney that echo the host dwelling and ties the two elements together. The stepped link element and contrasting use of timber cladding ensure that the proposal would be viewed as an extension and allow the host dwelling's traditional form and character to be easily read.
9. Furthermore, the stepped link element and combined with its location to the side of the dwelling would ensure that the extension appears subservient to the host dwelling. Whilst the extension would project forward of the front elevation, the angled nature of the proposal softens the projection, which would only minimally be in front of the existing conservatory and the front elevation of the dwelling would remain unaltered. The side elevation of the extension would face towards one of the gates where the site is visible, whilst this would have a modern appearance, the windows would be simple in their design and the chimney would use matching material to the chimneys in the host dwelling.
10. Taking the aforementioned into consideration, the proposal would not be overly dominant and prominent and would not detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area.
11. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area or the host dwelling, which is a non-

designated heritage asset. I find no conflict with Policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Council Core Strategy (2011) and Policies MD2 and MD13 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (2015), or the guidance contained within the Shropshire Council Type and Affordability of Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2012) which seek, amongst other things, to ensure development contributes to and respects locally distinctive or valued character and avoids harm to non-designated heritage assets. I also find no conflict with paragraphs 130 and 203 of the Framework which seek good design sympathetic to local character and development that does not harm non-designated heritage assets.

Conditions

12. The Council has provided a list of conditions, which I have assessed in regard to the advice provided in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). A condition relating to the adherence to plans is necessary in the interest of clarity. I also consider the condition relating to window and door details necessary to ensure that the character and appearance of the area and host dwelling is safeguarded. I have altered the wording of some conditions in order to ensure they comply with the PPG.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR