
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 2 September 2025

by **H Smith BSc (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/L3245/W/25/3367937

8b College Hill, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY1 1LZ

- 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 Mr James Owen against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/04616/FUL.
 - The development proposed is change of use to residential, all associated internal alterations and alterations to roof profile.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/L3245/Y/25/3367940

8b College Hill, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY1 1LZ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr James Owen against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/04617/LBC.
 - The works proposed are change of use to residential, all associated internal alterations and alterations to roof profile.
-

Decisions

1. **Appeal A** is dismissed.
2. **Appeal B** is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As the proposal relates to a listed building which is within a conservation area, I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).
4. The two appeals concern the same scheme under different, complementary legislation. I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would i) preserve the Grade II listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and ii) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Shrewsbury Conservation Area.

Reasons

Special interest and significance

6. The appeal property is a three-storey, mid-terrace, Grade II listed¹ building dating from the 19th century, located in Shrewsbury town centre. It is a former warehouse constructed of painted brick with a plain tiled roof. The front elevation features a tall doorway with cambered brick head and double wooden warehouse doors at ground-floor level. Painted signage on the large beam above the warehouse door opening indicates the building's former use, reading 'Alfered Mansell & Co. Auctioneers'. Paired windows are present at first-floor level, with a window and a blind window at second floor, all with cambered brick heads. The traditional brickwork, window style, and door openings contribute to the listed building's heritage value.
7. Internally, the building comprises a simple brick and timber construction, with some surviving floor elements. Notably, several substantial timber structural components remain, which add architectural interest.
8. Based on the evidence available to me, I consider the special interest and significance of the listed building to be largely derived from its historic and architectural interests. Key contributors relevant to the appeals include its surviving historic fabric and design, its pleasing architectural form, and its historical development and use. Its significance is also informed by its historic context, forming part of a continuous row of listed buildings holding group value. These buildings generally share a traditional roofscape, which is pertinent to the appeals.
9. The listed building lies within the Shrewsbury Conservation Area (CA), which is largely defined by its historic street pattern and its buildings that reflect the town's development as a military, administrative and commercial centre. The evidence suggests that College Hill was historically a high-end residential area interspersed with collegiate and civic buildings. It combines remnants of timber-framed structures with elegant Georgian townhouses, characterised by red brick, sash windows, predominantly hipped or pitched slate roofs, and refined classical details such as pediments and cornices. The Greek Revival Masonic Hall (now Museum and Art Gallery) also backs onto the street. The urban layout and architectural form of the buildings along College Hill inform the character and appearance and thus special interest and significance of the CA.
10. The appeal listed building largely retains its external historic character and detailing, thereby making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and, consequently, to its significance as a designated heritage asset.
11. The evidence indicates that the roof form of the appeal building may have evolved over time, resulting in a flat roof at the front. The appellant suggests that this feature is of reduced significance due to its less traditional form and later historic fabric compared to the rest of the building and neighbouring properties on College Hill. Nevertheless, it still contributes in a tangible and meaningful way to the special interest and significance of the listed building and the CA.

¹ List Entry Number: 1247070, Grade II listed

Proposal and effects

12. The appeal building currently features a pitched plain-tiled roof to the rear and a flat roof deck at the front, which sits lower than the adjoining property at No 8a. The proposal seeks to introduce a roof extension incorporating metal cladding and a contemporary glazed projection.
13. The glazed projection would occupy a significant portion of the front roof. Its reflective, smooth surface would appear overly modern and sleek when juxtaposed with the textured, weathered character of the listed building's subdued walls. It would also contrast sharply with the modest scale of the existing fenestration, disrupting the building's visual balance. Despite being set slightly back into the roof, the addition would be large and conspicuous, dominating the simple front elevation and drawing undue attention. The result would be an awkward and contrived appearance, highlighting that the external form has been dictated by internal layout rather than by architectural coherence.
14. While the proposal would not be visible from the east along College Hill, during my site visit I observed that the glazed structure would be highly prominent from the west along College Hill. This is primarily due to the excessive scale of the proposed glazing and its reflective, sleek finish, which would make the extension appear incongruous within the established streetscape. It would also be visible when viewed from neighbouring properties.
15. The appellant contends that the frameless glazing would create a see-through or 'invisible' structure. However, the glazing would likely require sufficient thickness for structural integrity, resulting in visible edges, junctions, seals, or support details that would compromise the intended seamlessness. Furthermore, the horizontal and vertical planes would strongly reflect the sky, sunlight, and surroundings, while dirt, condensation, and any tinting would further emphasise its presence. Rather than disappearing, the glazing would read as a distinct and intrusive element within the historic roofscape.
16. Consequently, the introduction of this rectilinear glazed structure would create a noticeable dissonance between the extension and the listed building, thereby undermining its special architectural and historic interest.
17. Although the appellant notes that roofscapes along College Hill vary, for the reasons outlined above, the proposal would erode the architectural integrity of the listed building.
18. In relation to the CA, the proposal would diminish the integrity of a valuable component in the town's social and historical evolution. The simple vernacular character of the former warehouse would be compromised, and the visual harmony of the surrounding area disrupted. Accordingly, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.
19. Reference has been made to page 44 of the National Model Design Code Part 2 Guidance Notes 1.2, which explores the identity of buildings through differing roof forms. The guidance emphasises the importance of considering how a building is designed, including the way it relates to the street, the design of its roof, construction details, and materials used. For the reasons given above, the proposal would appear as an inappropriate addition rather than a sensitive continuation of the historic architecture.

20. Attention has also been drawn to number 15 College Hill, an example of a modern addition to College Hill which features a set-back glazed frontage on its upper floor. However, unlike the appeal building, this property is not listed. I have also been referred to a previous appeal decision², although I have not been provided with full details. It appears to concern a building that is also not a listed building. While the Inspector for this other case found the use of glazing to lessen the impact of the structure, I have not found that to be the case with the proposal before me. Therefore, there are significant differences between these examples and the proposal before me, which relates to a listed building requiring careful consideration under the stringent requirements of the Act.
21. Reference has been made to a previous permission (ref: 17/04760/FUL) at 68 Mardol, Shrewsbury. I do not have the full details before me. Nevertheless, it appears that this other permission involved a mansard roof design with symmetrical window features and traditional materials. This is markedly different to the proposal before me, which features a contemporary rectilinear design formed of extensive glazing. As such, I am unable to draw any meaningful comparisons with the appeal scheme.
22. Reference has also been made to a planning permission at Chronicle House, a non-designated heritage asset on Chester Road (ref: 21/02363/FUL). It was considered that the proposed roof-top extension had a traditional design, proposed to be clad in Welsh slate with reduced glazing, and set back sufficiently from the building's edge so that it would assimilate with the existing roof top structures on the adjacent historic buildings. Its scale, design and appearance were not considered to have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the building or the conservation area. In contrast, the appeals proposal would appear incongruous for the reasons explained.
23. The appellant has referred to a scheme where permission was granted for a mansard roof on a visually prominent listed building (refs: 17/00005/FUL and 17/00006/LBC). However, there are notable differences between this and the scheme before me. That building was significantly larger and wider, and the mansard was not part of a terraced row. In contrast, the appeal building is narrow, and the proposed roof extension would appear out of keeping with its modest exterior. In any event, each proposal should be considered on their individual merits. Consequently, this consideration does not alter my decision.
24. The appellant has highlighted other glazed additions in the area, but I have not been provided with sufficient details to make a suitable comparison. In any event, these do not set a valid precedent for listed buildings, which are subject to the statutory duties of sections 16(2) and 66(1), as well as the relevant provisions of national and local policies. There would also be different contextual relationships with the surroundings of these other buildings, some of which may not have the same historical importance as the proposal before me. Each listed building is unique, and I have determined these appeals based on the evidence before me and my own observations.
25. Drawing the above together, I find that the proposal would not i) preserve the Grade II listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest

² APP/L3245/W/19/3221461

which it possesses, and ii) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. In doing so, it would harm the significance of these designated heritage assets.

Public benefits and balance

26. With reference to paragraphs 214 and 215 of the Framework, in finding harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Given the extent and fairly localised nature of the proposal, I find that the harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets assessed above would be individually and cumulatively 'less than substantial', but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. I consider this harm to fall within the mid-level of the 'less than substantial' range. Paragraph 215 of the Framework requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing the asset's optimum viable use.
27. The listed building is currently vacant and in a state of disrepair and deterioration. The proposal would bring this unused building back into active use, and investment in its fabric would prevent further decline of the heritage asset, which would represent a wider public benefit.
28. The proposal would contribute towards the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing by providing one family dwelling on a brownfield site in an accessible location. Economic benefits would be delivered through the manufacturing and construction phase, as well as through general investment into the property. The scheme would also generate direct and indirect social and economic benefits, including employment during construction and local spending by future occupiers. Financial benefits would include increased council tax revenues and contributions via the community infrastructure levy.
29. I have carefully considered the appellant's comments regarding the extant planning permission and listed building consent (refs: 22/02138/FUL and 22/02139/LBC) and the submitted commercial viability appraisal, dated June 2025. The appellant states that the revised scheme, which is the subject of these appeals, was submitted to address practical and financial constraints associated with the approved scheme. It is argued that the previously approved design is financially unviable and therefore undeliverable, primarily due to its restricted internal layout and limited headroom.
30. The appellant contends that the revised proposal would offer a more deliverable solution, with improved internal spatial arrangements and increased headroom, thereby enhancing both the practicality and viability of the conversion. These changes are presented as necessary to secure the building's optimum viable use, in line with paragraph 215 of the Framework.
31. However, while the appellant has identified specific shortcomings in the approved scheme, I have not been provided with substantive evidence of a thorough exploration of alternative design solutions, particularly roof forms, that might achieve viability without incurring the same level of harm to the building's historic interest and significance. In the absence of such comparative analysis, it is difficult to conclude that the revised proposal represents the only or most appropriate viable option. As such, the justification for the extent of harm proposed remains insufficiently evidenced.
32. Having regard to the above, while I acknowledge that sustaining and enhancing the significance of this designated heritage asset is the preferred outcome, the

evidence before me indicates that, on balance, this would not be achieved in this instance. The proposal, while aiming to secure a viable use for the building, would do so at the expense of its special architectural and historic interest. Although viability is a relevant consideration, it does not override the statutory duty to preserve the significance of listed buildings. The proposal fails to demonstrate that the level of harm is necessary to secure the building's future, nor that less harmful alternatives have been fully explored or discounted.

33. Due to the harm identified, the proposal would not align with the conservation of the listed building's special architectural and historic interest. It would compromise the building's conservation to an unacceptable degree and would not conserve it in a manner appropriate to its significance.
34. In weighing the public benefits as a whole, I attribute moderate weight to them. However, they do not outweigh the considerable importance and weight I attach to the harm identified to the significance of the designated heritage assets.
35. I conclude that the proposal would not i) preserve the Grade II listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and ii) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Shrewsbury Conservation Area. It would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment.
36. It would also conflict with Policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2011), and Policies MD2 and MD13 of the Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan (adopted 2015). Collectively, these policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure development is designed to a high quality which conserves and enhances the historic built environment, and contributes to and respects locally distinctive or valued character.

Other Matters

37. The Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply and therefore a presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. However, with reference to paragraph 11d) of the Framework, an exception is provided where policies in the Framework that protect assets of particular importance provide a strong reason for refusing the proposal. Footnote 7 establishes that this includes heritage assets. I have found that the proposal would harm the listed building and the CA. It would therefore not accord with policies of the Framework. Consequently, those policies provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed.
38. In addition to the matters I have addressed above, letters of objection from local residents have raised other concerns including, living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with respect to loss of natural light. These other matters are not in dispute between the main parties and as I am dismissing the appeal, I do not need to give these matters further consideration.
39. I note the appellant sought pre-application advice. Nevertheless, this does not alter my conclusions.

Conclusions

40. **Appeal A:** The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations which indicate that

the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed.

41. **Appeal B:** For the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

H Smith

INSPECTOR