
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2022

by S. Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/22/3304250

Riverside Cottage, A458 From Cound Junction to start of Shrewsbury Road Cressage, Cound, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY5 6AF

- 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 Tim and Mrs Mandy Mulloy against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01912/FUL, dated 20 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor extension over an existing garage and the installation of dormer windows to be formed in an existing bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first-floor extension over an existing garage and the installation of dormer windows to be formed in an existing bedroom at Riverside Cottage, A458 from Cound Junction to start of Shrewsbury Road Cressage, Cound, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY5 6AF in accordance with the terms of the application ref 22/01912/FUL, dated 20 April 2022, subject to the following conditions: -
 - i. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - ii. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - drawing 21.025.004B (Proposed floor plans)
 - drawing 21.025.005C (Proposed elevations)
 - drawing 21.025.006C (Proposed site plan)
 - drawing 21.025.001 (Location and existing plans)
 - iii. No development shall commence until details of the external materials to be used in the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter accord with approved materials.

Procedural Matter

2. The proposed development is described in the application form as for a '*first floor extension over existing garage to form 2 bedrooms, 1 ensuite & 1 bathroom. New dormer windows to be formed in existing bedroom*'. The local planning authority (LPA) describes it as for '*the erection of a first-floor extension over an existing garage and the installation of dormer windows to be formed in an existing bedroom*'. I have used the latter description both in the banner heading and in the decision as it more precisely describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the building and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a former livery stable and granary, originally associated with the adjoining Grade II listed Riverside Inn. In the twentieth century, the stable and granary buildings were joined together by a single storey, flat roof, linked building which includes a domestic garage. The whole structure is now a dwelling.
5. The proposed development is to construct a second storey over the garage area to create two extra bedrooms. The alterations would also include two dormer windows to the west facing elevation and for roof lights facing in the direction of the listed building (LB).
6. The immediate area includes the three-storey listed inn, while to the west are relatively new, two-storey, brick-built houses.
7. The appeal building has had an historic association with the LB, though it is not itself separately listed, nor is it in a conservation area. However, the Council's Conservation Officer considers that the appeal building '*while not necessarily curtilage listed would likely represent non-designated heritage assets*.' The officer report notes that there are no objections from the Council's Archaeology (Historic Environment) section, though I accept that heritage matters refer not just to archaeological considerations.
8. Even if the appeal building were considered to be a non-designated heritage asset, its single storey, flat roofed link does not enhance the character or appearance of the overall building or the area which is characterised by pitched roofs of differing heights. In this regard, the addition of the proposed first floor extension with a pitched roof would add positively to the character and appearance of the building and area. I find that the proposed dormer windows, by their limited size and being set down below the ridge, would also form satisfactory additions, as would the proposed roof lights.
9. The proposed extension would not exceed the existing height of the former granary building and the overall effect would be to keep the dwelling, by its limited height and size, subordinate to the much more dominant inn, and in

keeping with the character and appearance of the building itself and that of the immediate area.

10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Core Strategy 2011 (CS) which aim to protect the built and historic environment, taking into account local context and character, and policies MD13 and MD2 of the Shropshire Site and Management of Development Plan 2015 (SAMDev) which require development to protect the historic context including non-designated assets. Even if I were to take the view that the appeal building were a non-designated heritage asset, considering its historic use and/or appearance, I do not find that any harm would be caused to any such significance with reference to paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Other Matters

11. The appeal building is physically separated from the Grade II listed Riverside Inn and where its setting is characterised by open areas immediately around it, some given over to car parking. Until some years ago, there was an intervening listed building, but which has been demolished. The LPA in its officer report, considers that *'given the scale and nature of the proposal it is not considered that the setting would be adversely affected'*. I have no reason to disagree with this conclusion and accordingly find that the proposal would preserve the setting of the aforementioned listed building.

Conditions

12. I have imposed the standard time condition and a condition to ensure the development is in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. In the interests of good design, it is necessary to impose a condition relating to external materials. I have given the parties an opportunity to comment upon this matter and the appellants have agreed to it being a pre-commencement condition.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR