

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2023

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24.11.2023

Appeal ref: APP/L3245/D/23/3329696

The Granary, Angel Bank, Bitterley, Ludlow SY8 3EY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jeff Hall against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application, ref. 23/02411/FUL, dated 2 June 2023, was refused by a notice dated 23 August 2023.
 - The development is: Erection of a single storey garden room extension to side/rear elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single storey garden room extension to side/rear elevations at The Granary, Angel Bank, Bitterley, Ludlow SY8 3EY in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 23/02411/FUL, dated 2 June 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Block Plan – Plan ref: 2301-5-013 005, rev. B, dated 14 March 2023; Existing Elevations – Plan ref: 2301-5-013 002, rev. B, dated 14 March 2023; Garden Room Proposed Plan and Elevations – Plan ref: 2301-5-013: 001, rev. C, dated August 2003.

Main issue

2. The decision turns on the likely effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of The Granary and its immediate surroundings.

Appeal property and proposed extension

3. The appeal dwelling, The Granary, is located immediately south of the A4117 Ludlow Road, west of the small settlement of Angel Bank. The Granary had been converted to residential use by adapting part of a former granary building. It is one of 3 in a group, including the semi-detached Threshers Barn and Long House.
4. Mr Jeff Hall, the Appellant, wishes to extend his home by adding a single storey 24m² floor area garden room extension wrapped around the eastern and

southern elevations of the house. The extension would have a plain clay tiled pitched roof; the walls built with brick to also match the existing building.

Considerations

5. Mr Hall said the present appeal project, (drawing 2301-5-013 001, rev. C), was a modification of an earlier scheme, (drawing 2301-5-013 003, rev. B). It was changed following criticism of the earlier mansard type roof design. The Council's Conservation Officer had welcomed the alteration to the roof design. But the footprint remained excessive. Harm to the character of the building as a non-designated heritage asset would be caused, although of less than a substantial nature.
6. The Council said the extension would have an unacceptable impact on the original dwelling. It would overwhelm the original barn, intrinsically and irreversibly altering its character, appearance, form and layout. The harm to this non-designated heritage asset would be substantial. The addition would not be of a subservient scale to the main dwelling. It would be an overdevelopment of the property.
7. I agree with the Council's view that the former granary buildings retain some of typical historic farm stead character of the area, but that the conversions to 3 dwellings means they no longer have features that would characterize a former granary. As the Council said, their significance lies in their traditional appearance, particularly in terms of their facing brickwork, stone walling and roof tiles. The proposed use of matching roof tiles and walling brickwork would help retain much of that traditional appearance, even though the extent of glazing proposed would add a degree of incongruity. But especially as much of the earlier granary character has been lost, the modern addition as proposed would not, in my view, be so visually harmful to its host building as to be unacceptable. The preference for the extension's fully tiled pitched roof reaching up close to its eaves is likely to reduce some of its subservience to The Granary dwelling. However, I agree with Mr Hall that it would not be a disproportionate addition to The Granary.

Conclusion

8. I conclude that planning permission should be granted for the appeal extension. The general condition limiting the duration of the permission is applied, (s.91 of the Act), as is a condition defining the amended scheme as shown on submitted drawing No. 2301-5-013: 001, rev. C.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR