



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2020

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc CMILT MCIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/D/19/3241308

16 Marlbrook Way, Roden, Telford TF6 6BN

- 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 & Mrs J & G Fullford against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2019/0642, dated 23 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as "side extension to form family room to ground floor and master suite to first floor".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of two storey side and rear extension at 16 Marlbrook Way, Roden, Telford TF6 6BN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref TWC/2019/0642, dated 23 July 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No.000 Site Location Plan dated July 2019, Drawing No.001 Existing Ground Floor Plan dated July 2019, Drawing No.002 Existing First Floor Plan dated July 2019, Drawing No.003 Existing Elevations dated July 2019, Drawing No.101A Proposed Ground Floor Plan dated July 2019, Drawing No.102A Proposed First Floor Plan dated July 2019, Drawing No.103A Proposed Elevations dated July 2019.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council has altered the description of the development on the decision notice to read "erection of a two storey side and rear extension". This is the same description used by the appellant on the appeal form. This is a more precise description of the development, and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:

- The character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area;
- The living conditions of occupiers of No.18, with particular regard to privacy and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a semi detached dwelling located within an existing cul-de-sac. The existing dwelling has a single storey side extension which protrudes slightly beyond the front elevation. It was apparent from my site visit that whilst the general pattern of development is one of pairs of semi-detached dwellings with single storey side extensions, there are several variations to this. This includes No.12 which benefits from a two storey side and rear extension, and Nos. 24A and 26A which are larger detached properties.
5. The proposal is for the erection of a two storey side and rear extension, which would extend approximately 4 metres to the rear. The Council has raised concerns that removal of the single storey element to be replaced with a two storey extension would harm the character and appearance of the area as it is not in keeping with surrounding properties within the cul-de-sac. Furthermore, the scale of the proposal would not be in keeping with the host dwelling.
6. I do not find this to be the case. The proposed extension would have a slightly lower ridge height than the existing dwelling, which would mean it maintains a degree of subservience to the host dwelling. Furthermore, the use of matching materials means it would integrate well with the host dwelling and wider street scene. I consider that the overall scale of the extension would sit well against the host dwelling, and would not harm its appearance.
7. Whilst the provision of single storey side extensions are common within the cul-de-sac, it was evident from my site visit that there is a degree of variations including two storey side extensions. This variation has not harmed the character and appearance of the area, and as such I consider the proposal would not look like an incongruous addition and would sit well within the street scene.
8. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. As such I find no conflict with policies BE1 and BE2 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031 (LP). These policies seek, amongst other things, that development is of a high quality design which does not substantially alter the character of the dwelling and respects the character of the area. The Council have made reference to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in their reasons for refusal. Whilst my attention has not been drawn to the specific conflict with this, I find that the proposal would accord with section 12 of the Framework. This seeks, amongst other things, that development is well designed and is sympathetic to the local character.

Living conditions

9. The Council have raised concerns that the proposal would harm the outlook of the neighbouring occupiers at No.18 by virtue of the scale of the proposal appearing overbearing. Whilst the extension extends approximately 4 metres

to the rear, there is a large separation distance between the two properties, which in my view means that the proposal would not feel overly dominate or overbearing to the neighbouring occupiers.

10. The proposal would include a large Juliet balcony on the first floor at the rear of the property. Whilst the inclusion of this feature could increase overlooking into the rear garden of No.18, the appeal property currently has a number of windows on the first floor rear elevation which look into this garden. Furthermore, the proposals would not include any additional windows on the side elevation which would directly face this neighbouring property. Therefore, I do not find that the proposal would increase the overlooking from the appeal site into this rear garden.
11. Consequently, the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No.18. As such there would be no conflict with policies BE1 and BE2 of the LP. Together these policies seek, amongst other things, that development is of a high quality design which does not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The Council have made reference to the Framework in their reasons for refusal. Whilst my attention has not been drawn to the specific conflict with this, I find that the proposal would accord with section 12 of the Framework. This seeks, amongst other things, that development is well designed and has a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. A condition relating to external materials is necessary to ensure that the appearance of the proposals would be satisfactory.

Conclusions

13. For the above reasons the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted.

S Shapland

INSPECTOR