



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2019

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/W/19/3235737

164-169 Burford, Telford TF3 1LW

- 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 Antoine Sedik (York Montague Ltd) against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2018/0971, dated 26 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is creation of additional floor to facilitate the formation of 2no. flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The nature of the application was amended during the planning process, and the description of development was altered to reflect those changes, with the approval of both parties. The banner above is the modified description. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the existing waste management arrangements for the building.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a large brick-built block of apartments with flat roofs and is largely three storey, with a four storey central section. The area is predominately residential in nature.
5. The addition of two apartments would add a fourth storey to the block and would unbalance the existing design and appearance of the block. The existing four storey section creates a focal point for the building, and by introducing another four storey section, the symmetry of the block would be altered in a negative manner that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The remaining sections are three storey, and whilst the building is a design of its time, the addition of an extra storey in that location would strip the building of a key element of its character.

6. As a result, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and therefore conflict with Policy BE1 of the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan (2018) (the LP), which, amongst other matters, requires development to respond positively to context and be sympathetic to local character. I find that the proposals are also contrary to the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)

Waste Management

7. Provision has been made for additional storage adjacent to existing facilities in order to accommodate the needs of the additional two units. I consider that the size and design of this additional unit is acceptable and would be sufficient to deal with the waste management needs of the proposed new flats. As a result, with regard to this issue, I find that the proposals would be consistent with the aims of Policies BE1 and ER8 of the LP, which amongst other matters, state that development should encourage healthy living, not cause adverse impact on properties via odour, undermine existing uses, and provide appropriate recycling and refuse facilities appropriate and related to the size of the development.

Other Matters

8. I have noted the comments of the appellant in relation to the sustainable location of the proposals. I note that this is not in dispute by the Council. In addition to this, the appellant has not disputed the 5 year land supply position, but states that the proposals would help meet the requirements of the windfall allowance in meeting housing need. The additional of 2 flats would be extremely limited, and I cannot attribute any significant weight to this argument. I find that the harm to the character and appearance of the area from the nature of the development significantly and demonstrably outweighs the limited benefits of the scheme, and there are no material considerations that would lead me to determine the appeal other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all material planning considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR