



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2023

by A. Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/D/23/3320077

46 Kyrle Close, Ironbridge, Telford TF8 7BQ

- 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 Barney Tierney against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref: TWC/2023/0053 dated 26 January 2023 was refused by notice dated 24 March 2023.
 - The application is for erection of wooden bike storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published in early September 2023 whose main focus was not directly relevant to this appeal. Nevertheless, I have determined this appeal in accordance with the revised provisions within the Framework.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the setting and significance of the Grade II Listed Building, Lincoln Grange.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a private dwelling located within a conversion of the Grade II Listed Lincoln Grange complex of buildings that were previously part of the Madeley Union Workhouse. The Madeley Union Workhouse dates to between 1871 and 1875 and represents a physical manifestation of a Pavilion Plan workhouse based around new theories of the time concerned with stopping the spread of infections through the circulation of fresh air. The buildings within the complex are therefore testament to these theories and as such exhibit both aesthetic and associative heritage values.
5. The buildings form a near complete example of such a workhouse and encompass an H shaped arrangement with most communal facilities being accommodated within a central range, this central element being where the appeal property is housed. The property is located to what could be seen as the rear elevation of the complex at the opposite side to what was the main

- gatehouse range. Despite this, this protruding gable element maintains a symmetrical style with the central range sporting three lancet windows upon who's steeply pitched roof is located a lead capped vent of conical form.
6. It is this central element that largely gives this elevation much of its aesthetic appeal, being as it is located centrally, and promoting a striking, architectural element. As a result, this protruding gable with its steeply pitched roof and gothic window provide something of a focal point here and likely mark out the former principal, communal uses (the dining hall) of the complex in this location.
 7. The appeal property occupies this protruding, central gable and has no rear garden. As such an area has been demarked with black painted railings to its frontage so as to contain an area of amenity space for the residential unit through which access is gained to the principal door of the property. The appeal proposal itself concerns a detached timber bicycle store that has been erected to one side of this gable so as to store the owner's bicycle and avoid damaging the features and decoration within the building itself caused by internal storage.
 8. In considering whether to grant planning permission therefore Sections 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The Framework also states that when considering the impact of proposed development on the significance of the heritage asset, 'great weight' should be given to the asset's conservation.
 9. In this case, I have already found that this central, protruding gable is a defining characteristic of this overall aspect of the complex of Listed Buildings as a whole. As such this element provides a true focal point that helps link the symmetry of the complex together. Unfortunately, due to this, such a location is very sensitive to any changes that could affect this uniform and symmetrical appearance.
 10. In this case, although very modest in scale and size, the bicycle store is very visible and does introduce an unfortunate physical structure onto this principal elevation. As such, the symmetry is altered with a structure of much poorer quality materials that bears little architectural relationship to the special qualities of the building itself. Although I saw on my site visit that other properties did house more ancillary type shed structures within their respective curtilage, the introduction of one in this location is noticeably more visible and therefore potentially harmful.
 11. For whatever reason, at the time of conversion of this complex, a communal cycle store was not constructed as part of the scheme. As a result, it would appear that there are no alternatives for residents to store bicycles other than within their properties. Although I note therefore the potential benefits of being able to avoid the potential damage a pedal cycle could cause through being stored within a house belonging to the Listed Building, and, although I consider the use of more active travel could be considered a public benefit in favour of this scheme, ultimately, the introduction of this structure would result in significant enough harm to cause greater cumulative harm that these benefits could not outweigh.

12. As such, and on balance, the proposal before me would lead to a harmful cumulative change to the Listed Building and as such would be in conflict with Policies BE1, BE2 and BE4 of the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR