
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2022

by Helen Smith BSc (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Wednesday 21 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/W/22/3296163

Manor Farm, Castle Hill Farm Junction to A529 Junction Spoonley, Spoonley TF9 3SR

- 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 & Mrs Mark Connell against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00097/FUL, dated 8 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing extensions and construction of single storey extensions and alterations to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the appellant's grounds of appeal, they submitted revised drawings in appendix 1. However, these revised drawings were not attached to the original submission and were therefore received at a late stage during the appeal. These revised drawings include amendments to the proposal's front porch and the outbuilding that fronts the road. Taken cumulatively, they materially alter the nature of the original application. Furthermore, the Council have not had the opportunity to see these revised drawings, given they were submitted late. Consequently, I have not taken these revised drawings into account. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the plans considered by the Council.
3. The Council did not request a Heritage Statement. Policy MD13 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan (2015) states that proposals which are likely to affect the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be accompanied by a Heritage Assessment. Nevertheless, I have been able to determine the appeal on the information before me.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a former farmhouse and outbuildings positioned within spacious grounds to the west of Adderley Road. Adjacent to the appeal site are

- a cluster of buildings known as the Stables which are in separate ownership. The surrounding area is open countryside.
6. The proposal seeks planning permission for the construction of single storey extensions and alterations to the appeal property, including demolition of some existing extensions to the rear and side of the existing dwelling. It would also demolish an existing traditional outbuilding. The proposed scheme would provide an enlarged kitchen/dining area with utility, a lobby, and entrance hall and a porch.
 7. The appeal property is recognised as a non-designated heritage asset. It was accepted as a non-designated heritage asset in the previous approved planning application 16/03801/FUL. The significance of the heritage asset relates, in part, to its gable features and architectural detailing, which has characteristic features relating to its original function as part of a historic rural farmstead. The appeal site itself, because of the combination of the well-maintained historic property and its setting within spacious grounds, makes a positive contribution to the rural character of the surrounding area.
 8. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) states that account should be taken of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and that new development should make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. In terms of non-designated heritage assets, the Framework at paragraph 203 requires that a balanced judgement is made when assessing the application, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
 9. The proposal would result in a flat roofed extension with extensive fenestration on its elevations in the form of full height glass windows and small high-level windows. The high-level windows would result in a blank brick elevation on its western side, which would obscure the original form of the dwelling. The deep fascia design combined with the overhang feature on the southern elevation would be an overly large, top-heavy addition that would compete with the well-proportioned roof form of the host dwelling. Furthermore, the scale of the proposed extension would extend across the full width of the southern and western elevations. The appearance of the proposed flat roof porch would also visually detract from the gable features of the original dwelling. As such, the proposal would result in an incongruous addition that would be out of proportion with the host dwelling.
 10. Consequently, the proposal would contrast jarringly with the traditional design features of the non-designated heritage asset. It would significantly erode the architectural integrity of the host dwelling and detract from its gable features and pitched roof form. How screened the proposal may be from the street scene would not acceptably reduce the design harm that would arise.
 11. The proposal would demolish an existing outbuilding that is contemporary to the original dwelling. Its loss and replacement with a flat roof structure would not be in keeping with the original character, which would result in harm to the appearance of the heritage asset. Due to its positioning fronting the road, it would appear unduly prominent in the street scene.
 12. The proposed demolition of the existing extensions, which would include the oak framed extension and the brick extension, would be neutral as they have no historical significance. Based on my observations and the evidence before me, I have no reason to consider that these existing extensions are harmful to

the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. Therefore, these neutral matters do not weigh in favour of the proposal.

13. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the non-designated heritage asset.
14. Whilst the appeal property may not be a 'model' type farm and its original sash windows have been replaced with bay windows to the front elevation approved by planning permission, it is still a non-designated heritage asset of historical significance.
15. The appellant has submitted photographs of other buildings with glass box style extensions. From the limited information submitted, it appears that these other properties are of a different style and form to the appeal dwelling and are viewed within a different context. Therefore, the proposal is materially different to the buildings within the photographs. I acknowledge that the concept of glass box extensions for heritage assets is accepted. However, for this particular case before me, it would not be appropriate for the reasons given above. Consequently, I attach limited weight to these other extensions.
16. Therefore, the proposal fails to accord with Policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy (2011) (Core Strategy), and Policies MD2 and MD13 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan (2015). Collectively, these policies seek to ensure development is of a high quality design which respects its surroundings, including heritage assets and their significance. Furthermore, the proposal would conflict with Sections 12 and 16 of the Framework relating to design and the historic environment.
17. In their reason for refusal, the Council cite Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy. However, it seems to me that this policy relates to developments in open countryside and Green Belt, and not to proposed extensions in non-Green Belt areas. Accordingly, I do not consider this policy to be relevant to the main issue.

Other Matters

18. The proposal would provide the appellant with the inside outside style of living that they desire and additional living accommodation. Nevertheless, this would be a private benefit to which I attach no weight against the harms I have found.
19. The proposal would incorporate sustainable design techniques, use rainwater harvesting, heat pumps and solar panels, exceed current building regulation standards, and would not impact on the existing landscaped gardens within the property grounds. However, these benefits do not outweigh the harm that has been identified.

Conclusion

20. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Helen Smith

INSPECTOR