



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2020 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/D/20/3258737

20 Manor Road, Arleston, Telford, TF1 2LG

- 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 Mohammed Sadiq against the decision of Telford & Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2020/0150, dated 7 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey side and rear extension at 20 Manor Road, Arleston, Telford, TF1 2LG in accordance with the terms of the application Ref TWC/2020/0150, dated 7 February 2020, subject to these conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan dated 04/02/2020; drawing showing Proposed Front Elevation and Proposed Side Elevation; drawing showing Proposed G.F., Proposed F.F., Proposed Rear Elevation, Proposed Side Elevation, and Block Plan; and drawing titled 'Parking Layout at 1:100 Total 3 No. No Porch'.
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

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

Procedural Matter

3. The description of the proposed development on the application form included a front porch which was subsequently removed from the proposed scheme. In the banner heading above, I have therefore used the description from the appeal form and decision notice, which provides a more accurate description of the proposed development.
-

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:

- whether the development provides adequate provision for car parking; and
- the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling with a single storey side/rear extension. The site is at the end of a cul-de-sac within a residential area. The proposed development would see the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension.

Car parking provision

6. A fourth bedroom would be added to the property as a result of the proposed extension. The Council states that three parking spaces would be required for a four-bedroom dwelling, as required by standards within the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031 adopted 2018 (LP). The submitted drawings show three parking spaces to the front of the property, however the Council is of the view that these spaces would be substandard in terms of their length. On-street parking is limited in the cul-de-sac, and during my site visit the parking area in the middle of the cul-de-sac was full. Nevertheless, I was able to park in the surrounding area and this was just a snap-shot in time.
7. In the event that only two cars could park on the driveway, with only one additional car parked in the cul-de-sac or adjoining streets, it is unlikely, in the absence of any substantive evidence to suggest otherwise, that this would result in significant congestion or would hamper the unfettered use of the highway. As such, the shortfall in car parking provision would not cause any harm to highway safety or to the living conditions of nearby properties.
8. For these reasons, the proposal would satisfy Policy C5 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan (2018) (LP), which requires the quantity of car parking to reflect the nature of the development. Although mentioned in the reason for refusal, I have not referred to Policy BE1 of the LP in this main issue as it does not appear to be directly relevant to car parking.

Character and appearance

9. The area is comprised of a mix of semi-detached and terraced properties. There are three terraces of properties around the end of the cul-de-sac, which includes the appeal property, and are built to a similar simple design. The appeal property is at the end of its terrace, which is at right angles to the adjacent terrace. This layout has resulted in a large gap between the appeal site and the adjacent end-of-terrace property at No 13, which contributes to a spacious character of the area.
10. The proposed two-storey extension would be set back from the front elevation and set down from the ridgeline of the existing roof of the property. The boundary with No 13 runs at an angle, and the proposed extension would be approximately 0.9m from the boundary at its nearest point at the front of the extension. As a result, its construction would cause the reduction of the gap

between the appeal site and No 13. However, due to the layout of the properties, a visible sizeable gap would remain when viewed from most vantage points within the cul-de-sac. Furthermore, should No 13 construct a similar two-storey side extension in the future, it is likely that a gap would still remain between the two properties as a result of the layout of the terraces. Consequently, the proposed extension would not unduly detract from the spacious character of the area.

11. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would accord with Policies BE1 and BE2 of the LP which, amongst other things, require residential extensions to respect the character and context of the area. Although Policy BE1 is not listed in the reason for refusal, the policy relates to design criteria and is referred to in the Council's delegated report for this main issue.

Conditions

12. The standard time limit condition and a condition specifying the approved plans are required to provide certainty.
13. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary for a condition requiring the external materials of the extensions to match the exterior materials of the existing dwelling.
14. The Council has suggested that a condition be imposed for the proposed north-facing first-floor side window that would serve a bedroom to be fixed and obscure-glazed, and further that no further windows or other openings shall be formed in that elevation unless otherwise agreed by the Council. The window in question would overlook a driveway, parking area and garage and therefore would not result in any significant loss of privacy for adjacent occupiers. As such it is not necessary to impose the suggested condition.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted subject to the conditions listed above.

D Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted subject to the conditions above.

Z Raygen

INSPECTOR