



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2019

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/W/19/3230051

4 Sampson Park, Madeley, Telford TF7 5EQ

- 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 Richard Eden (Minster Development Ltd) against the decision of Telford & Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2019/0154, dated 7 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retrospective full planning permission to obtain permission for 1no. timber outbuilding, constructed to the front of 4 Sampson Park, with associated timber fencing. Parking space reduced from 13no. (as stated in TWC/2011/0096) to 5no. staff/visitor spaces.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. On the site visit I noted that works have been undertaken at the appeal site and I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis that the development has already occurred.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - i) Highway safety, with particular regard to parking provision;
 - ii) The character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Highway safety, with particular regard to parking provision

4. The entrance to Sampson Park is via a narrow access way from Coronation Crescent. This provides vehicular and pedestrian access to the existing dwellings and to the rear of properties on Coronation Crescent and Regents Square.
 5. Whilst the fencing, bin store and outbuilding have been erected to the front of No 4 Sampson Park it is noted that this forms part of a wider communal parking area for all the properties on Sampson Park.
 6. The site was previously a garage court and it is noted that the Council imposed conditions to secure adequate parking and maintain access to existing
-

properties. The properties on Sampson Park themselves are family sized dwellings and, considering its suburban location, there is likely to be more dependency on private vehicles as reflected in the Council's parking standards.

7. The development has resulted in a significant reduction in the number of parking spaces available. On the basis of the above I therefore consider the resulting level of parking provision available for Sampson Park would be insufficient.
8. I consider that this deficiency in on-site parking provision would lead to inappropriate parking within the communal area which would impact on the safe manoeuvrability of vehicles within the site and affect their ability to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. I saw on my site visit that although only 5 vehicles were parked within the communal area at that time, they were not all within marked-out parking spaces.
9. Whilst some on-street parking is available in the surrounding area, Sampson Park is set back with its own access from the main carriageway. It is likely that occupants and visitors will aim to park as close to this access as possible.
10. Increased demand for on-street parking in the vicinity of the access would affect the ability of vehicles to safely enter and leave Sampson Park due to lack of manoeuvring space and reduced visibility. This impact would be further compounded if vehicles had to reverse onto Coronation Crescent due to lack of manoeuvring space within the site from inappropriate parking.
11. Having regard to all of these factors, I therefore conclude that the development has resulted in an unacceptable risk to highway safety and is therefore not in accordance with Policy C3 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2018, (LP) which seeks to ensure that all developments mitigate site specific highway issues.

Character and Appearance

12. Owing to the back-land nature of Sampson Park the development is not clearly visible from the wider surrounding area. However, the outbuilding due to its size, design and positioning in the middle of the site is a prominent and incongruous addition when viewed from within Sampson Park.
13. The outbuilding does not respect the open character of the site frontage and its design is not in keeping with the existing property. Furthermore, its proximity to No 4 only serves to increase its overall prominence and visual impact. As identified above, the site is within a back-land position and there is a sense of enclosure that comes with this arrangement, from the dwellings themselves and fencing to properties on Coronation Crescent and Regents Square.
14. Whilst the fencing erected to provide a bin store and front garden for No 5 Sampson Park is not wholly out of keeping with its surrounds, it does not respond positively to this context or setting. There is little relief between the existing dwelling, outbuilding, bin store and fencing, and as a result the sense of enclosure is increased.
15. For these reasons the proposal results in harm to the open character and appearance of the site frontage and this is contrary to Policies BE1 and BE2 of the LP, which seek to ensure high-quality designs which respond and relate well to the character of the site and surrounding area.

Other Matters

16. I note the Appellant's submission regarding the current use of the properties on Sampson Park and that current tenants do not own cars. There is however limited evidence before me regarding the specific nature of the use and occupants, or to suggest that the current situation would not change in the future.
17. A condition restricting use of the development to supported living accommodation may alleviate concerns with parking provision. However, as highlighted above there is a lack of detail as to how the development operates, such as staff numbers or visitors, types and frequency of vehicles etc.
18. Therefore, even considering the use of the development as a supported living scheme, it is not possible to determine, with any degree of certainty, that the parking provision as shown would be sufficient to serve a development of this nature or that a condition would overcome the highway safety concerns, I have identified above.
19. It is also acknowledged that the timber outbuilding is required to support the needs of existing occupants. However, there is little evidence that the accommodation provided by the outbuilding could only be provided in the configuration or location sought. Therefore any utility that it performs, does not lead me to consider that the development would otherwise be acceptable.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Denby

INSPECTOR