

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2016

by Nicola Gulley MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/D/16/3154605

26 Paradise, Coalbrookdale, Telford, TF8 7NP

- 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 Paul Wyatt against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2015/0182, dated 8 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a detached workshop following demolition of existing garage/workshop.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the planning application differs from that on the appeal form. I note that Council has considered the proposal on the basis of the description on the appeal form and I will determine the appeal on the same basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and on land stability.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a small area of land located in a prominent position immediately opposite a block of traditional terraced properties which front the elevated rural road of Paradise. The area immediately beyond the appeal site is heavily wooded and drops steeply down towards Dale Road. The site is located within the Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site and the Severn Gorge Conservation Area.
 5. Policies CS14 and CS15 of the adopted Telford and Wrekin Core Strategy (CS) (2007) seek to protect and enhance the unique built and cultural assets of the Borough and to ensure that new development strengthens local identity. In addition Policies UD2, HE3 and SG1 of the adopted Wrekin Local Plan (LP) (2000) aim to ensure that new development is of a high standard of design,
-

respects and responds to its context both in visual and functional terms, preserves or enhances the character or appearance of conservation areas and has regard to the World Heritage Site designation. This approach is consistent with the requirements of section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012). The area surrounding the appeal site is characterised by short blocks of red brick, terraced dwellings and modest, single storey detached red brick garages / workshops with narrow slated pitched roof lines. Whilst there are exceptions to this pattern, this does not undermine the characteristic uniformity of the design of the buildings in this part of the streetscene.

6. The development proposes the demolition of the existing small garage / workshop and its replacement with a steel clad building with solid oak frame, doors and windows. The proposed building would be 8.3 metres long by 3.7 metres in wide, with a canopy in the side elevation of the building facing the woodland that would overhang an approximately 1.4 metres and have a small dormer window in the side elevation facing the road.
7. The substantial scale of the proposed building coupled with the use of materials, that are not typical of those in the immediate area, and the design of the roof structure which includes a dormer window and a canopy would result in an incongruous form of development that would fail to reflect the prevailing scale, character and appearance of buildings in this part of the streetscene. As such I consider that the proposal but would not preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area or the World Heritage Site and would be contrary to the objectives of CS Policies 14 and 15 and LP Policies UD2, HE3 and SG1 and the requirements of the NPPF.

Land Stability

8. LP Policy EH14 makes clear that new development will not be permitted in areas where its structural integrity would be compromised by slope instability. In this instance, I am advised that the proposed development would be located within a known area of slope instability, as defined by the High Point Rendel Stability Report, but that, subject to the provision of a slope stability declaration prepared by a competent person, development of the type proposed would, generally, be acceptable.
9. The appellant acknowledges that the site is in a known area of slope instability but contends that an assessment of ground conditions has been undertaken and as a consequence the proposed structure has been specifically designed to be lightweight and of a construction that would ensure that the development would not adversely affect the stability of the slope.
10. Whilst I note the appellant's comments, I am nevertheless mindful that the appellant has not provided a Slope Stability Declaration and that no substantive evidence has been presented in relation to the site investigations works that were undertaken, the choice of building materials or the intended method of construction. In light of this, I consider that insufficient evidence has been presented by the appellant to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on slope stability. As a consequence I consider that the proposal would be contrary to the objectives of LP Policy EH14.

Conclusions

11. In reaching my decision I have had regard to all other matters raised in support of the scheme including that the proposed development would be manufactured locally and the suggested historical precedent for the design of the development. However, none of these factors are sufficient to alter my overall conclusions.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Gulley
INSPECTOR