The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2019

by Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/D/19/3233436
Doonguile Bungalow, Kynnersley Drive, Lilleshall, Newport TF10 9HT

- 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 Miss Cheryl Forrester against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
- The application Ref TWC/2019/0213, dated 4 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2019.
- The development proposed is the erection of a single storey extension to rear. Extension and conversion of garage to form annexe.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the name of the appellant as set out on the appeal form as it is more complete than that set out on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a single-storey converted barn. It has an 'L' shape design with brick and timber exterior walls and slate roof. On the eastern elevation is what appears to be a small addition that is set back from the main elevation and has a lower ridgeline. The simple form of the building reflects its agricultural heritage. There is an existing detached garage to the north west of the building that is similar in height to the dwelling but has a wider front elevation, which results in the pitch of the roof being shallower.

5. The proposed extension to the dwelling would comprise a double gabled addition that would project perpendicular to the host dwelling. Whilst the depth of the projection would be similar to the width of the main part of the dwelling, its width would be almost double. As a result of its width and double gabled elevation, the extension would appear as an excessively complicated addition to the otherwise linear elevation, failing to reflect the simplistic form and agricultural heritage of the existing property.

6. With regard to the proposed extension to the garage to create an annexe, whilst the gable end of the garage is wider than that of the dwelling, overall, it

is read as an ancillary building, subservient to the dwelling. Although the proposed extension to it would have a lower ridgeline, it would have a greater depth than the existing. As a consequence, it would appear as a disproportionate addition, resulting in a significantly larger building that would fail to reflect the simple ancillary nature of the building. I do not consider that the use of contrasting materials would sufficiently mitigate this harm.

7. Furthermore, the resultant size of the annexe would create a dominant feature within the site that would fail to appear subservient to the host dwelling and would itself, as a result of its size and domesticated appearance, with a significant amount of glazing, be read as a separate dwelling.

8. I have had regard to the Council's concerns regarding the materials proposed for the extensions. However, were I minded to allow the appeal, I am satisfied that suitable materials could be secured by way of an appropriately worded condition.

9. I find therefore that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property. As such, it would be contrary to Policies BE1 and BE2 of the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan 2018, which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development respects and responds positively to its context and alterations and extensions are not disproportionate in size in relation to the existing building and does not substantially alter the character of the dwelling. It would also fail to accord with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the proposal is required to provide additional living accommodation for the appellant's growing children and father. However, I do not find that these matters justify a departure from the development plan.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR