



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2025

by **E Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/24/3354120

Sandford Cottage, 3 Powk Hall Cottages, Pound Street, Claverley, Shropshire WV5 7AD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs S Powell against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02194/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of porch to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the Council's description of development as set out on the Decision Notice in the banner heading above, as it more accurately describes the development, and I note that the revised description has been used on the appeal form. However, I have omitted the words that are not acts of development.
3. At the time of my site visit the construction of the porch had begun but was not complete. For the avoidance of doubt, I have therefore considered the proposal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on the host property and whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Claverley Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a terraced dwelling which sits in a short row of 4 properties within the Claverley Conservation Area (CA). The Claverley Conservation Area Appraisal (CCAA) sets out that its special interest is derived from its situation within the surrounding rural landscape, the local topography and its historic buildings, notably those within its historic core and along the streets leading to it. It notes the row of dwellings, of which the appeal property forms part, as comprising a short terrace of picturesque 19th century brick cottages which define the western edge of the village, facing towards the village at the junction of Pound Street with the lane to Chyknell.
6. While not listed or afforded protection through the provision of an Article 4 Direction, the appeal property is identified as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) by the Council, which the appellant has not disputed. The age of the

building, along with its attractive frontage, including interesting architectural details and a simple vernacular style, contribute to its significance as a NDHA. The appellant has provided an assessment of the effect of the development upon the heritage assets as part of their Statement of Case.

7. The appeal property can be seen in the photograph '*view west down Pound Street*' contained in the CCAA. The image shows the front of the dwelling prior to the commencement of the development, and other alterations which have taken place to the frontage of the property. Like the others in the row, the appeal property had a modest pitched roof canopy above the front door. The canopy roof was positioned directly below the first floor window and mirrored the pitch and form of the gables above it and similar features on the adjoining properties.
8. Despite minor differences in the proportions of the front elevations of the dwellings in the row, and the external finish to number 4, the properties were nonetheless consistent in terms of their architectural features. These include lean-to canopy roofs to the ground floor windows, pitched roof canopies above the front doors with a decorative brickwork gable, which reflect the pediments at eaves level above the first floor openings, and decorative ridge tiles. The presence of these architectural features creates a pleasant sense of uniformity to the group of dwellings.
9. In light of these considerations, the pitched roof canopy at the appeal property was an attractive feature which contributed positively to the character and appearance of the NDHA, and the overall group value of the terraced row. Moreover, despite its peripheral position on the edge of the CA and external materials, the row occupies a prominent position at the entrance to the village and is clearly of an age which informs the interpretation of the evolution of the CA. Having regard to these factors, the appeal property contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA and its significance as a heritage asset.
10. The appeal proposal, which has resulted in the loss of the pitched roof canopy above the entrance door, comprises the construction of an open porch. Alterations to the existing canopy roof above the ground floor windows are also proposed. While the porch includes traditional materials and would be viewed against the backdrop of the host dwelling, by virtue of its design, including a gable at odds with the pitch of that of the existing gable features, combined with its overall scale and massing, it nevertheless appears as an anomalous feature in relation to the original dwelling. As such, the introduction of the porch adjunct to the front elevation, which is of considerable bulk and proportions, disrupts the traditional architectural detailing of the original frontage of the property. Furthermore, notwithstanding the position of the porch, set back from the front boundary of the property, due to the height of the front boundary wall, it is nevertheless visible from the road, both immediately to the front of the property and in views towards the site along Pound Street. Consequently, the porch represents an unsympathetic addition which appears as a visually dominating component of the host property.
11. In light of the above considerations, the porch compromises the architectural composition of the host property and the cohesive appearance of the group of the terraced properties. As such, it has a harmful effect on the significance of the NDHA and diminishes the contribution it, together with the group, make to the significance of the CA. Thus, in that regard, the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character of the CA and would undermine its significance as a NDHA. In finding harm, this is something to which I have given considerable importance

and weight to. Further, the Framework sets out that great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset.

12. However, as the harm relates to only a small part of the CA, the effects are localised and therefore cause less than substantial harm to the CA in the terms of the Framework. In relation to the NDHA, the Framework indicates that a balanced judgement will be required, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss, and the significance of the heritage asset. The appellant contends that the porch is required to provide protection from the elements, given that the original entrance door opens directly into the living room of the property. However, there is no clear evidence to demonstrate that the appeal proposal represents the only available solution, or that the scale of the porch is the minimum necessary to meet these requirements. Furthermore, such benefits are largely private and do not justify a porch of this scale and design. Thus, I attribute little weight to these benefits, which would not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset.
13. For the foregoing reasons I therefore find the proposed development has a harmful effect on the significance of the host property as a NDHA and fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Accordingly, the development conflicts with those aims of Policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy, adopted March 2011 which seek development of a high quality, which protects, restores, conserves and enhances the historic environment and is appropriate in scale and design, having regard to heritage assets. It would also fail to accord with Policies MD2 and D13 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan, adopted December 2015 which, among other things, require development to protect, conserve and enhance the historic context, character and significance of heritage assets.

Other Matters

14. While it may be that the construction of a porch of a similar design, position and height at the property would constitute permitted development¹, it would appear a porch in that case would be considerably smaller in footprint than the appeal proposal. Moreover, it has not been demonstrated that a porch constructed as permitted development would be equally or more harmful than the appeal scheme in so as to justify the extent of harm that the appeal scheme causes.
15. The absence of harm in relation to other matters and lack of objection from interested parties would not render the scheme acceptable. Furthermore, whether the development which has been carried out was done so as a genuine mistake on the appellant's behalf is not relevant to the determination of the appeal.

Conclusion

16. The development conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole. Material considerations have not been shown to be of sufficient weight to indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

E Worley INSPECTOR

¹ Class D, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015