



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2020 by S Watson BA(Hons) MSc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/D/20/3249096

10 Chapel Road, Jackfield, Telford TF8 7LU

- 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 Mark Guest against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2019/0882, dated 23 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 February 2020.
 - The development is the change of location and style of front door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was carried out by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The door has been replaced and moved and therefore I am considering this appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site (WHS) and Severn Gorge Conservation Area (SGCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site contains a detached bungalow on the south side of Chapel Road, at the edge of a small group of bungalows. It is located within the SGCA and WHS.
6. The SGCA covers a large area of the gorge, including other nearby towns. The Council's Conservation Areas document describes each of the conservation areas within Telford and Wrekin. From this I note that the significance of the area generally, derives from its long industrial history, raw materials and the use of the River Severn. Jackfield's significance stems more specifically from mining, river trade, and the manufacturing of tiles. Chapel Road appears to be a later development and is characterised by the small scale of the street and buildings, and their uniform nature. From my site visit I found that, the

dwelling demonstrate the evolution from the earlier sporadic development elsewhere in Jackfield to a later, more planned form.

7. No details of the WHS or its Outstanding Universal Value have been provided by either party. However, from the information available I understand that the reasons for its designation are similar to those for the SGCA and I have treated it as such.
8. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. In this respect national planning on heritage assets is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). At paragraph 192, it sets out matters which should be taken into account including sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Heritage assets include conservation areas, as well as World Heritage Sites which are considered to be of the highest significance.
9. While I note that there are variations by way of alterations and extensions to the dwellings in Chapel Road, on the most part there is a sense of uniformity. The bungalows are set close to the back of the pavement, behind shallow gardens. In this way the fronts of the bungalows are prominent features within the street scene. With the exception of Rainbow Cottage, which appears to be a later addition, the front elevations of the dwellings are parallel with the road, with a window either side of a recessed arched doorway, contributing to the uniformity of the streetscape.
10. The new door, whilst acceptable in terms of its appearance and colour has significantly eroded the uniform appearance of the road because of its position flush with the front elevation of the dwelling. It has introduced a jarring, incongruous feature into the street scene which is particularly prominent given the dwelling's location at the end of the group of bungalows and near the bend in the road. In this way the proposal harms the important uniform character of the bungalows within the road. Although the impact of the development is localised, it follows that the development neither preserves nor enhances the character or appearance of the SGCA. Moreover, it does not sustain or enhance the significance of the WHS as a designated heritage asset.
11. I am mindful of the scale of the development in relation to the designated heritage assets and find that the harm caused would be less than substantial. However, the Framework is clear that great weight should be given to an asset's conservation. In this case the harm that I have identified needs to be weighed against the public benefit of the development.
12. The appellant has raised that the relocation of the door allows for additional internal living space. However, whilst I have no doubt that the additional living space may be of benefit to the appellant, it does not amount to a public benefit.
13. Accordingly, I find that there is no public benefit cited which outweighs the harm to the designated heritage assets as identified above. As such the development is contrary to Policies BE1, BE2, BE3 and BE5 of the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan which collectively, and amongst other things, supports development that respects and responds positively to its context, and protects

the SGCA and WHS. It also conflicts with the purposes of Part 16 of the Framework in relation to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has directed my attention to examples of development on Chapel Road, these include the replacement of windows on a nearby property, and the installation of front facing roof lights on another. From the information available to me I find that the development is not so similar as to have any bearing on my consideration of the appeal before me. Nevertheless, all development must be considered on its own merit.

Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Watson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR