
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/C3240/D/22/3302133

Poynton Green Farm, Lammas Barns, Marlbrook Way to Poynton Manor, Poynton, Telford SY4 4JN

- 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 Chris and Tara Skillicorn against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref: TWC/2022/0251, dated 2 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at Poynton Green Farm, Lammas Barns, Marlbrook Way to Poynton Manor, Poynton, Telford, SY4 4JN in accordance with the terms of application Ref: TWC/2022/0251, dated 2 March 2022, and 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: AO1(location plan and proposed block plan), AO4 (proposed elevations), AO5(proposed floor plans), AO6 (Proposed 3-D views), AO7 (proposed 3-D image) and AO8 (proposed elevations).
 - iii. Notwithstanding what is shown on the submitted plans, the external materials shall match those of the host building.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant describes the proposed development as a single storey dining room and utility extension, whereas the local planning authority (LPA) describes it as a single storey rear extension. I have used the LPA description in the banner heading above and in the decision as it better describes the location of the proposed extension.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling, which used to be an agricultural building, has an L-shaped plan consisting of two long, narrow wings. It is single storey, apart from a two-storey extension to one of the wings. The walls are clad in horizontal shiplap wooden boarding which adds positively to its overall character and appearance.
5. There are other detached buildings adjoining the appeal dwelling which, when considered along with the two wings of the appeal building, create what the LPA describes as a courtyard effect immediately to the rear of the appeal property.
6. The proposal is for a rear extension facing into the courtyard by almost the same extent as the width of the existing wing of the house and for much of its length. It would be single storey though it would include, central to it, a pitched gable extending in its height almost to the ridge of the existing property and which would reflect the same design feature of the existing extension on the end of the wing. External materials would appear to match those of the existing building.
7. The appeal building is not listed, nor is it in a Conservation Area. The LPA's officer report notes that the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) states that the effect of a proposal upon the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account when determining applications. However, it is not clear whether the LPA considers the building to be such a non-designated asset.
8. However, even if it were to be regarded in this way, I consider that the proposed extension, by its limited size, the use of matching materials and its overall design, would complement the existing building. It would be subordinate to it and would not harm its character or appearance.
9. While it would extend into what the LPA describes as the inner courtyard, it would take up only a minor part of it. It would make a modest alteration to the form of the building and its relationship to the courtyard and would be acceptable in terms of its design.
10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would be acceptable in character and appearance terms and would not conflict with the character, appearance, design and conservation requirements of policies BE1 and BE2 of the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031 and chapters 12 and 16 of the Framework.

Planning conditions

11. 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.

Conclusion

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

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR