
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2017

by Harold Stephens BA MPhil DipTP MRTPI FRSA

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

Decision date: 27 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/D/17/3175684

15 Newport Road, Edgmond, Newport TF10 8HQ

- 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 and Mrs S Yap against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2016/1107, dated 14 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension following demolition of existing carport and flat roof garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to No 15 Newport Road in the village of Edgmond. It is located at the junction of Newport Road with Robin Lane. The site comprises a large detached dwelling constructed in the 1950s and retains many of its original features. The property is set over two floors with spacious living accommodation at ground floor level and four bedrooms at first floor level with a room in the attic space which has the potential to be converted. The dwelling is set back from and side on to the main road.
4. The appeal proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey extension following the demolition of a range of single storey flat roof structures including a utility room and coal store, a carport and attached garage. The proposed extension would provide enhanced ground floor living accommodation, a three bay garage and two additional bedrooms at first floor. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development would match those in the existing building in terms of roof tiles, bricks, white aluminium windows and stained hardwood doors.
5. The statutory development plan includes the Core Strategy (CS) which was adopted in December 2007 and the saved policies of the Wrekin Local Plan (WLP) which was adopted in February 2000. The Council is preparing a new Local Plan. The emerging Telford and Wrekin Local Plan (TWLP) 2011-2031 was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in June 2016 and the Public

Examination ended in February 2017. In accordance with the guidance in paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the emerging TWLP has substantial weight in planning decisions at this stage. Policy CS7 allows controlled development within the rural area and Policy CS15 indicates that the design of development should assist in strengthening local identity and positively influence the appearance of the local environment. WLP Policy UD2 seeks to encourage the highest quality of design appropriate to the district through the application of urban design principles. Emerging TWLP Policy BE1 provides locally specific design criteria and Policy BE2 aims to improve the quality of existing housing and deliver high quality urban design which is locally distinctive. The NPPF is a material consideration in this case.

6. At my visit I saw that the property lies within a residential area with a mix of bungalows and two storey dwellings. The character of the area is largely defined by semi-detached dwellings and bungalows to the east along Newport Road. The majority front onto the road and follow a broadly consistent building line. These are interspersed with individual detached properties. There are larger houses in larger plots as Newport Road turns north and to the west along Robin Lane. I saw that dwellings are set well back from the highway in generous gardens with abundant ornamental planting, hedges and trees. No 15 Newport Road makes a significant contribution to this character by reason of its large garden.
7. The Appellants consider the proposal to be a positive response to the particular situation at the appeal site comprising a new 'wing' rather than 'protrusions' to the existing dwelling. It is argued that the removal of existing extensions would be an enhancement to the local environment and would provide a pleasing and appropriate visual presence. It is claimed that a 65% increase in the gross internal area of the dwelling would have little or no impact on its immediate setting. I disagree.
8. Firstly, the proposed two storey extension would extend about 9.5m out from the front east facing elevation of the main dwelling (a length of about 20.3m in total) and would have a height of about 2.3m to eaves and about 6.1m to the ridgeline. Whilst the height of the extension has been reduced considerably from previous proposals, the overall length has been slightly increased. The overall scale and mass of this extension would create a disproportionate and dominant feature in relation to the existing dwelling. The scale and bulk of the extension would not form an appropriate addition to this dwelling.
9. Secondly, I appreciate the Appellants have made amendments to the design to try and overcome the previous reasons for refusal. Some effort has been made to reflect the 1950s design of the main dwelling – including the style of the windows, the materials proposed for the garage doors and the detailing above and below the windows and doors. However, the style and proportions of some of the proposed new windows (dormer style) do not relate well to the character of the appeal property and are not reflective of the prevalent 1950s style. In my view, the appeal proposal would fail to respect the character of the area resulting in an undesirable form of development within the rural street scene.
10. Given the overall scale, mass and design of the extension, the appeal proposal would result in an incongruous, disproportionate and dominant feature which would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would

be contrary to WLP Policy UD2, CS Policy CS15 and emerging TWLP Policies BE1 and BE2 as well as section 7 of the NPPF which requires good design. On the main issue I conclude that the appeal must fail.

11. I have taken into account all other matters raised. I acknowledge that the proposal would not have a significant impact on the closest neighbouring property, No 17 Newport Road, a detached bungalow to the east of the appeal site in terms of residential amenity in that it would not adversely impact on the privacy, outlook or daylight of the occupants and would not offend aforementioned policies in this regard. Planning conditions would not overcome the objections I have described. I conclude that the proposal is in overall conflict with the development plan. None of the points raised are sufficient to outweigh this conflict. My overall conclusion is that the appeal should be dismissed.

Harold Stephens

INSPECTOR