



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2025

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3425/D/25/3359904

131 The Mount, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY3 8PG

- 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 & Mrs Hebborn against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/04030/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a garage extension and carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Shrewsbury Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site includes the dwelling of 131 The Mount and its relatively long rear garden. The property has a single storey garage with access from Barracks Lane. The garage is set back from Barracks Lane by an area of hardstanding. The area of garden at the rear of the garage is at a higher ground level.
4. In accordance with the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Shrewsbury Conservation Area. Moreover, paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of new development on the significance of a designated heritage asset such as a conservation area, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
5. The Shrewsbury Conservation Area is based upon the historic core of the town. Its special interest relates to the age, form, design and layout of the settlement's urban and suburban development. The Mount is identified by the Council as a special

character area at the western side of the conservation area. Barracks Lane is a long, narrow road which provides access to several garages and outbuildings of varying ages, size and design. The majority of these front directly onto the road. There are also remnants of old red brick boundary walls.

6. The proposed “carport” would be of a simple utilitarian design with a large double sized door and flat roof. It would occupy the current area of hardstanding, introducing development closer to the road frontage.
7. The proposed two storey building, with further garaging space at ground floor level, would appear overly large in scale and would extend to the property boundary, resulting in an irregularly shaped footprint. It would be visually prominent when viewed from Barracks Lane and from neighbouring dwellings and their gardens at Richmond Drive. This is because of its proposed height and bulk. The proposed dormer windows would be out of character with surrounding development giving the appearance of a domestic use rather than that of an outbuilding. Overall, I consider that the proposal would constitute over-development because of its extent, height and scale. Although the development could be built using appropriate external materials, I find that the design approach and detailing would not be sympathetic to its context and the proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.
8. Nevertheless, the harm to the conservation area as a whole and its significance would be less than substantial. Paragraph 215 of the Framework indicates that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. However, the benefits from the proposed garage extension and carport, including improved security and better use of space, as claimed by the appellant, would primarily constitute private benefits, rather than public benefits, and would not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the conservation area as a designated heritage asset.
9. The appellant has referred to the National Planning Policy Framework and the achievement of sustainable development. However, whilst the proposed development would make effective use of land it would fail to protect or enhance the historic environment.
10. I find that the proposed development would conflict with policy CS6 of the Shropshire LDF Core Strategy and policy MD2 of the Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan which together require proposals to respect local context and character. It would also fail to conform with SAMDev Plan policy MD13 which, amongst other things, seeks to encourage development which delivers positive benefits to heritage assets.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has referred to a proposed development granted permission at 123 The Mount. However, that proposal differs in that the outbuilding is set back from Barracks Lane, and is of a different design and orientation, with no dormer windows.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development would conflict with the heritage objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and the development plan as a whole and should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR