



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by R Cooper BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/W/19/3234416

Willow Cottage, 70 Wellington Road, Muxton, Telford, Shropshire TF2 8NZ

- 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 Mrs Suzanne Swindley against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2018/0961, dated 8 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of an outbuilding to one dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The outbuilding was granted planning permission (Ref W2006/0907) to be used as a double garage with a room above. It is understood that the building is currently being used as a self-contained annex without the benefit of planning permission. This appeal seeks planning permission for the outbuilding and associated external grounds to be used as a separate dwelling.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed conversion on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to layout.

Reasons

4. The site is located within Wellington Road, the prevailing character is residential and consists of a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings fronting directly onto the street, with well-proportioned front and rear gardens. The outbuilding projects forward of the building line and is positioned so that its gabled side elevation faces out towards the road.
5. No significant alterations are proposed to the external elevations of the building. However, the proposal would result in a separate dwelling positioned directly in front of No 70, with its associated amenity space, and car parking sited in between the existing dwelling and the street. The proposal would result in fragmentation of the site, with one dwelling position directly behind another. This would be at odds with the prevailing layout of residential dwellings in the street and would not respect the character and appearance of the area.

6. The submitted plans provide little in the way of external amenity space for the occupiers. Whilst the appellant has submitted two illustrative options for landscaping and fencing around the building, the size and shape of these would not reflect the existing form of garden space along the street, and the proposals would not be in keeping with the area. I have considered the evidence in relation to other recent developments with similar sized private amenity space. However, I have not been provided the full details of these, and I am required to consider the proposal on its own merits, this does not alter my findings above.
7. Whilst the outbuilding is screened to the front by a row of tall conifer trees, the steeply pitched slopes of the roof are visible when approaching the site from the southwest and northeast along Wellington Road, and its presence is evident. I understand the proposal is to render the building, and landscape its surroundings, these matters would not overcome the overriding harm caused by the layout of the site, which would be out of kilter with the prevailing pattern of development in the area.
8. Therefore, the proposed conversion would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would not accord with Policies BE1 and SP4 of the Telford and Wrekin Local 2018 which requires new development to be of high quality design, which respects the context of the area and preserves street patterns and layouts.

Other Matters

9. I have considered the personal circumstances of the existing tenants, that they receive support from the appellant, and that they are concerned they may be evicted from the property. However, these circumstances do not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area.
10. I understand that the appellant would be willing to sign a legal agreement to ensure the building would not be sold off separately and restricted to supported living. However, I have not been provided evidence of such an agreement, therefore I can not afford any weight to this in my decision.
11. Furthermore, I have considered the appellants submission in relation to private amenity space, access, privacy, outlook and car parking provision within the site. Also, that building regulations have been granted, and that there have been no objections from local residents. These matters do not alter my findings above.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

R Cooper

INSPECTOR