



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 June 2021

by Samuel Watson BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/21/3273241

Laburnum Barn, Mill Road, Wollerton, Market Drayton TF9 3NE

- 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 Tom Edwards against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00259/FUL, dated 18 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a detached garage at Laburnum Barn, Mill Road, Wollerton, Market Drayton TF9 3NE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00259/FUL, dated 18 January 2021, 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 approved plan numbered 2037D01C.
 - 3) Prior to the commencement of any works above ground level, samples and/or details of the roofing materials and the materials to be used in the construction of the external walls shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in complete accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is within a rural setting which is primarily characterised by agricultural fields interspersed with small groups and rows of buildings. The appeal site itself is a large plot which contains a detached dwelling that has been converted from a barn or stable building. It is set back from the Mill Road behind a neighbouring dwelling, also within a large spacious plot. To the side of the site is a further property which has a large detached garage. The proposed garage would be between the appeal dwelling and this neighbouring garage.
4. I note from the submissions before me that Laburnum Villa, the dwelling in front of the site, and Laburnum Barn are non-designated heritage assets (NDHA) recorded on the Council's Historic Environment Record as part of a

Historic Farmsteads Characterisation Project. I find their significance to stem from the extent to which their appearance, relationship and rural setting are still intact. I note that the appellant questions whether the villa and barn were part of a farmstead, suggesting instead that the barn had once served as a stable for the villa. However, the submitted evidence is not sufficient for me to make an assessment on this.

5. By way of its location set back from the road, and the tall brick wall along the front of the site, the proposed garage would largely be screened in views from the road. However, given the openness of the rear of the site, more distant views would be afforded from across the fields to the rear. Moreover, the road rises up to a bridge a short distance away and from the bridge views of the proposed garage would also be possible. Nevertheless, in all of these instances the garage would be read against, or in relation to, the surrounding dwellings and garage. Within this context the garage would appear as an outbuilding, which are not uncommon within the area.
6. However, while close to other buildings it would not result in an unacceptably dense form of development given the overall size of the site and spacious gaps between each building. This spaciousness would also ensure that the garage would not, cumulatively with the existing buildings, result in a terracing effect.
7. Whilst the ridge line of the proposed garage would not be significantly lower than that of the host dwelling, it would still be noticeably lower than it. Likewise, the proposed ridgeline would also be below that of the neighbouring garage which is of a similar height to the host dwelling. Moreover, the roof drops down to significantly lower eaves which, given the above, would result in the building appearing much shorter than the neighbouring buildings. This coupled with the footprint of the garage, which is smaller than the footprint of the host dwelling, would ensure that the garage is subservient to the host dwelling.
8. Given the appearance of the proposed garage, it would not be read as contemporary with either Laburnum Villa or Barn. In this way it would maintain the legibility of the setting and relationship between both buildings. However, while clearly a modern building it is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the two NDHAs and therefore would not harm the appreciation of their appearance. As such the proposed garage would not harm the significance of the two assets as a development within their setting.
9. I note also the Council's concerns regarding the air source heat pumps which, by way of their siting at the back of the garage, would face the front of the appeal site. However, they would be screened from any public views by the surrounding boundary treatments. Moreover, from within the appeal site it is unlikely that they would be readily visible given their closeness to the boundary wall and their positioning behind the log store. I therefore find that they would also not harm the significance of Laburnum Villa or Laburnum Barn.
10. Overall, by way of the proposal's siting, scale and appearance it would not harm the character and appearance of the area or the significance of the two NDHAs and their setting. As such the proposal would comply with Policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy, and Policies MD2 and MD13 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (SAMDev) which, amongst other things, require development to be of a high-quality which respects local distinctiveness

and protects the historic environment and its significance. The proposal would also comply with the overarching aims of the National Planning Policy Framework with regard to the protection of the historic environment.

11. Although the Council have also referred to SAMDev Policy MD7a, this relates to the replacement or conversion of existing buildings for residential use within the countryside. I therefore find that it is not directly relevant to the proposal before me. Moreover, whilst the Council also referred to the Historic England Advice Note 12 (Statements of Heritage Significance) in their reason for refusal, I have not been directed to any specific conflict with this document. It has therefore not materially affected my determination of the appeal.

Other Matters

12. I note the Council's concerns over the lack of any information as to the location of the hardstanding or driveway. However, both a driveway and hardstanding are existing and are not part of the proposal before me.

Conditions

13. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council and the advice on planning conditions set out by the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In the interests of clarity and enforceability I have made some changes to the wording.
14. For certainty I have set out the timescale for the commencement of works. A condition is also necessary, for certainty, requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
15. The proposal is close to two NDHAs which could be adversely affected by the use of inappropriate external materials on the proposed garage. Therefore, in the interests of protecting these assets, as well as the character and appearance of the area, a condition requiring further details of external materials is necessary. While the council have also suggested a condition requiring external materials to match those of the existing building, this condition would conflict with the purposes of the above condition for further details. As such I have not imposed this condition.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Samuel Watson

INSPECTOR