
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 May 2020

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/D/20/3247427

9 Marlbrook Way, Roden, Telford, Shropshire 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 Steven Sandford against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2019/0887, dated 7 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two storey extension to form dining room, utility room, wc on ground floor and bedroom, bathroom on first floor following the removal of existing stores, wc and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey extension to form dining room, utility room, wc on ground floor and bedroom, bathroom on first floor following the removal of existing stores, wc and porch at 9 Marlbrook Way, Roden, Telford, Shropshire TF6 6BN in accordance with the application TWC/2019/0887, dated 7 October 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Site Location Plan, Block Plan, Plans as Existing, and Plans as Proposed.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached property located within a residential cul de sac. The property is set back into its plot and has a single storey side element that projects forward of the main façade. These side elements are a common feature of properties in the road. However, their alternating nature

and the varying setbacks and distances properties are positioned from the highway and side boundaries give Marlbrook Way a sense of spaciousness and variety.

4. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would not be set down or set back from the main dwelling. However, from the evidence before me there is nothing to suggest that under either Policy BE1 or Policy BE2 of the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan (2018) (LP) extensions must be subservient to the host dwelling.
5. The proposed extension would project forward an appropriate amount at ground floor, it would be flush with the main dwelling at first floor and would be less than half the width of the host dwelling. In my view the scale of the proposal would be modest and proportionate to the host dwelling.
6. I acknowledge that the single storey side elements are a feature along the road and there is no doubt that the proposed development would alter the appearance of the dwelling. However, this in itself is not necessarily harmful.
7. The proposed extension through its proportionate scale and form and complimentary appearance would be sympathetic to the host property and would not undermine the character and appearance of the area.
8. It would not, in my view, appear as an incongruous feature within the street scene or unacceptably unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties, when taking into account the scale and appearance of the proposal and as neighbouring property No 7 and the host property are not identical in appearance in part resulting from their opposing side elements and asymmetric plot widths.
9. As such, the proposed development would accord with Policies BE1 and BE2 of the LP which, amongst other things, requires development to respect and respond positively to its context and enhance the quality of the local environment. The policies also require extensions to be proportionate in size in relation to the existing building and to respect the character of the area.

Conditions

10. I have considered the imposition of conditions in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard three-year time limit condition for implementation; I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above the appeal succeeds.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR