



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020

**by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2020

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/D/20/3258535**

**10 Spring Village, Horsehay, Telford TF4 2LY**

- 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 Henri and Lindsey Bedworth & Naylor against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
  - The application Ref TWC/2020/0490, dated 10 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2020.
  - The development proposed is erection of first floor side extension and two storey front and side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. I have utilised the description of the development in the banner above from the Council's Decision Notice as it describes the proposals accurately. The same was used on the appeal form by the appellant so I am satisfied that no prejudice is caused to either party.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are:-
  - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Conservation Area; and
  - The living conditions of neighbouring residents with regard to overbearing impact

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

4. The appeal property is a modest two storey property, brick built, in an area of predominately residential development. There are a mixture of properties in the locality which includes both brick built and rendered properties. The development is located within the Horsehay and Spring Village Conservation Area which was designated in 1999 and is based around the housing for employees of the former Horsehay Ironworks.
5. The element of the development in dispute relates to the proposed two-storey front extension. Due to its scale and forward projection, the two-storey front extension would appear dominant and incongruous in the context of both the host property and the street scene. On my site visit I observed that no other

property in the street had been extended in this manner and I consider that such an overwhelming departure from the established built form would be inconsistent and appear unsightly.

6. Due to its design, scale and siting, it would significantly unbalance the harmony of the modest two storey cottage, with unorthodox use of construction materials and a glazed area that would be at odds with the simple nature of the existing property and appear uncharacteristic and cause harm.
7. It would also appear overly large and prominent and intrusive with the street scene due to the size, scale and massing and the extension would not appear visually subservient and would be harmful to the character of the building and the surrounding area.
8. I have had regard to Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) which places a duty upon the decisionmaker, in the exercise of planning functions, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) further advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
9. Based on the assessment above, I therefore conclude that the proposal would also fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area as a designated heritage asset. I find that the harm to the Conservation Area is less than substantial. The Framework makes clear in paragraph 196 that where a proposed development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
10. In terms of the public benefits of the proposal, the appellant has advanced the argument that the small size of the property means that it is no longer realistically fit for modern purposes and that it should achieve a size of accommodation in line with contemporary expectations.
11. However, I find this would be a private benefit for the appellant, but not for the wider public, and therefore the public benefits do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host property, the wider street scene and the surrounding Conservation Area. It would be contrary to Policies BE1, BE2 and BE5 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan (adopted 2018) (the LP). Collectively, these policies seek to ensure that development should respect and respond positively to its context, enhance the quality of the local built and natural environment, should not be disproportionate in relation to the size of the existing building, the design remain in keeping with the existing building and respect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

### *Living conditions*

13. The boundary between the appeal site and the adjacent property (No 9) is just a small section of No 9s curtilage and a driveway to service a garage to the rear of the appeal property. No 9 has windows looking toward the appeal site whilst it is the front elevation of the appeal dwelling that faces toward No 9.
14. I find the overall height, bulk and mass of the proposal, in being site toward No 9 will give the impression of being visually overbearing. Due to its proximity with the boundary, it would represent a visually intrusive and overbearing form of development that would create a feeling of enclosure to the adjacent property, and would be detrimental to the occupiers of that property.
15. For these reasons, the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the residents of 9 Spring Village and in this regard is contrary to Policies BE1 and BE2 of the LP, which collectively expect development not to adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

### **Other Matters**

16. I understand the needs of the appellant to look to provide additional living accommodation to a modest two storey property, but I find the potential harm caused by the nature of the proposals outweighs any benefits that it could bring,

### **Conclusion**

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Paul Cooper*

INSPECTOR