



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2025

by Alexander O'Doherty LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: 6000607

Fox House, A442 from Quatt Loop at Quatford, Quatford, Bridgnorth WV15 6QJ

- 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 Ben Brown against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01986/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as, "Single Storey side extension and garage conversion".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of Fox House; and
 - whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Quatford Conservation Area.

Reasons

Character and appearance of Fox House

3. The appeal site includes Fox House, a charming 19th century brick-built slate-roofed double-fronted dwelling with twin gables (incorporating concave wave decorative facias), colourwashed in cream with green detailing. The site is located in a predominantly residential area on a north-south plot which straddles an historic lane and the more recent A442. A sandstone outbuilding is positioned at the northern end of the plot, adjacent to the junction between the lane and the A442. An open yard separates Fox House and the outbuilding.
4. It is common ground between the main parties that, due to its age, design, and materials, Fox House qualifies as a non-designated heritage asset. I have no evidence which indicates otherwise. I observed that the heritage significance of Fox House arises primarily from its architectural style and surviving original features. Paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) provides that, amongst other things, in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

5. The proposed single-storey side extension would link Fox House to the outbuilding. As its width would nearly equal that of the lean-to positioned to the side of Fox House, it would infill the vast majority of the yard space between the 2 buildings. Its maximum height would nearly equal that of the ridge of the outbuilding, and its roof would roughly equal the height of the lower portion of Fox House's first-floor windows.
6. As such, whilst the proposed materials would be appropriate and the poor quality yard space would be infilled, the proposed development would constitute an addition to Fox House of considerable proportions. It would not be subordinate in scale to Fox House. Rather, due to its significant bulk, it would unduly dominate Fox House. Its attractive symmetrical design would be undermined.
7. Considering the amount of space in-between the 2 buildings, which is not insignificant in the context of the site as a whole, the openness of the site would be markedly reduced. I observed that the proposed extension would be especially noticeable when standing on the lane in front of the site. Due to the low height of the fencing which separates the site from the A442, the above-mentioned adverse impacts would also be clearly visible to passers-by walking along the footway adjacent to the A442.
8. The proposed development would thereby detract from Fox House's architectural and historic interest. The significance of Fox House as a non-designated heritage asset would be harmed. Its heritage value to this and future generations would be compromised.
9. I therefore find that the proposed development would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of Fox House. It would conflict with the 4th bullet point of Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy¹ which provides that, amongst other things, it must be ensured that all development protects, restores, conserves and enhances the natural, built and historic environment and is appropriate in scale, density, pattern and design taking into account the local context and character, and with the 1st bullet point of Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy which provides that, amongst other things, it must be ensured that all development protects and enhances the diversity, high quality and local character of Shropshire's natural, built and historic environment.
10. The proposed development would conflict with part 2. iii. of Policy MD2 of the SAMDev Plan² which provides that, amongst other things, for a development proposal to be considered acceptable it is required to contribute to and respect locally distinctive or valued character and existing amenity value by protecting, conserving and enhancing the historic context and character of heritage assets, their significance and setting, and with part 1. of Policy MD13 of the SAMDev Plan which provides that, amongst other things, Shropshire's heritage assets will be protected, conserved, sympathetically enhanced and restored by ensuring that wherever possible, proposals avoid harm or loss of significance to designated or non-designated heritage assets, including their settings.

¹ Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy (adopted 2011)

² Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan (adopted 2015)

Conservation area

11. The site is within the Quatford Conservation Area (conservation area). The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) provides at s72(1) that with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
12. The significance of the conservation area, as a whole, as a designated heritage asset is derived predominantly from its clusters of historic buildings (including listed buildings) commonly modestly-sized and of brick construction, often with well-preserved architecture (especially that from the 18th and 19th centuries), found within a minor dispersed rural settlement of medieval origins, located within an otherwise hilly and largely woodland landscape setting opposite the River Severn. As an attractive historic property, with clearly-evident historic features (described on the first main issue above), Fox House contributes to the significance of the conservation area by virtue of its architectural and historic interest.
13. As explained on the first main issue above, due to its scale and bulk, the proposed single-storey side extension would detract from Fox House's architectural and historic interest. Specifically, although the original layout of Fox House itself would be retained, its attractive modest appearance and symmetrical proportions, which relate to its architectural and historic interest as a 19th century building, would be undermined. The proposed link extension would accordingly appear as an incongruous feature in the street scene, thereby compromising the good quality of architecture which typifies the conservation area as a whole.
14. It follows that harm to the significance of the conservation area would result. As this harm would be localised, the proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area. The localised nature of the adverse impacts also means that the extent of the harm within this category would be moderate. Nevertheless, any harm to a designated heritage asset is of considerable importance and weight. The Framework requires such harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development.
15. The proposed development would provide enlarged accommodation on site, and would enhance the utility, and acoustic and thermal performance of Fox House. However, these would mainly entail private, rather than public benefits. The scale of any improvements with regards to energy efficiency, and therefore positive impacts on climate change, have not been quantified.
16. The proposed development would result in investment in the site, thereby potentially contributing towards the future viability of Fox House and the outbuilding as buildings in residential use. However, the evidence does not indicate that these buildings are at risk of loss or significant deterioration in the absence of the proposed development. Nor has it been demonstrated that a less harmful scheme could not achieve the same aims.
17. The appellant has referred to the suitable and sustainable location of the proposed development. As the proposed development would merely provide additional accommodation on site, rather than any net increase in dwellings, it has not been demonstrated that any benefits to the local area arising from the site's location would be significant.

18. Taking all of the above into account, the public benefits of the proposed development would be limited. It follows that the public benefits of the proposed development attract little weight. The public benefits accordingly do not outweigh the harm identified, taking account of the great weight given to the conservation of the designated heritage asset, as required by paragraph 212 of the Framework.
19. I therefore find that the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. It would conflict with the 4th bullet point of Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy which provides that, amongst other things, it must be ensured that all development protects, restores, conserves and enhances the natural, built and historic environment and is appropriate in scale, density, pattern and design taking into account the local context and character, and with the 1st bullet point of Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy which provides that, amongst other things, it must be ensured that all development protects and enhances the diversity, high quality and local character of Shropshire's natural, built and historic environment.
20. The proposed development would conflict with part 2. iii. of Policy MD2 of the SAMDev Plan which provides that, amongst other things, for a development proposal to be considered acceptable it is required to contribute to and respect locally distinctive or valued character and existing amenity value by protecting, conserving and enhancing the historic context and character of heritage assets, their significance and setting, and with part 1. of Policy MD13 of the SAMDev Plan which provides that, amongst other things, Shropshire's heritage assets will be protected, conserved, sympathetically enhanced and restored by ensuring that wherever possible, proposals avoid harm or loss of significance to designated or non-designated heritage assets, including their settings.

Other Matters

21. It is common ground between the main parties that the proposed development would not affect the setting or significance of any nearby listed buildings. I have no evidence before me that points to a different conclusion.

Other Considerations and Planning Balance

22. The public benefits of the proposed development have been summarised above, which attract little weight.
23. The proposed development would benefit the current and future occupiers of Fox House through the provision of enlarged and enhanced habitable accommodation on site. However, these benefits would be mainly private in nature. Collectively, the public and private benefits of the proposed development would not be significant. No more than moderate weight is ascribed to these in support of the proposed development.
24. The proposed development would harm both the significance of Fox House (as a non-designated heritage asset) and the conservation area (as a designated heritage asset). It would conflict with the development plan in these respects. Taking account of the great weight given to the conservation of the conservation area, which is an irreplaceable resource, the benefits of the proposed development would not outweigh the harms identified. The relevant material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

25. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alexander O'Doherty

INSPECTOR