



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 12 October 2021

by R Morgan BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/D/21/3273811

43 Wellington Road, Muxton, TELFORD, TF2 8NN

- 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 Ms Heidi Jurgens against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2021/0076, dated 30 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2021.
 - The development proposed was originally described as alteration/extension to the existing rear flat roof extension to link it up with the approved annex.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the Council's decision notice, the description of development has been changed to 'erection of single storey link extension and conversion of garage into a habitable space including the creation of a new access driveway (Part-Retrospective)'. However, details of the proposed garage conversion and new access, which have previously been granted planning permission, are not included on the submitted plans, or on the application form. I have therefore assessed the appeal on the basis of the description which was used on the original application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Wellington Road is predominately residential, with a mixture of house types and styles which range from very recent developments to much older properties. The appeal property is one of a small number of two storey properties along the street which date from the nineteenth century and are described as 'Duke of Sutherland cottages'. The red brick detached appeal house is typical of this style, with its steeply pitched gables, overhanging eaves and tall chimney stacks.
5. Paragraph 9.2.4.3 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2018 (Local Plan) notes that buildings built in the Duke of Sutherland style represent an attractive and distinctive element of the borough's visual and historic environment. The appeal property, which contributes positively to the character of the area, is

identified as a 'Local Interest Building' in the Council's record of historic buildings, and as such is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.

6. The appeal property is set within a substantial plot, and the ample space around the building provides clear views of the front and side elevations from Wellington Road, despite screening at a lower level from boundary hedges. The property has previously been extended to the rear, but the flat roofed, single storey addition is set well back from the side elevations, so it does not form an obvious or prominent feature in the street scene. The original form of the building is clearly apparent, and its largely unaltered appearance contributes to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.
7. The proposed extension would not affect the main front elevation. However, it would be significantly deeper than the original dwelling and its long length, combined with the lack of set-back, would mean that the extension would appear as a continuation of the main west elevation of the host property, despite its low height. The extension would be visible from the street and would erode the appreciation of the original form of the building which currently exists.
8. The style of windows would present a modern appearance and the proposed use of white colour render, particularly along the west elevation, would draw attention to the extension, increasing its prominence from the street. As a result, the proposal would appear as an unsympathetic, modern addition which would fail to respect the historic character of the host property.
9. The existing garage is set back at an angle from the rear corner of the main house, with a fairly narrow gap between the buildings. The proposed extension would link the garage to the main house to provide a more useable internal space. Although the link would not appear unduly prominent due to the set back and its low form, it would be visible from the street and would change the relationship between the house and the garage, again reducing the appreciation of the original form of the building. Whilst construction of the link would not on its own be sufficient to dismiss the appeal, it would add to the harm to the local interest building resulting from the proposed alterations along the west elevation.
10. Across the road from the appeal property is 54 Wellington Road, a timber framed Grade II listed thatched cottage. This modest building is positioned well back from the road, with screening provided by boundary walls and hedges. From Wellington Road, the listed cottage is viewed in the context of the adjacent larger and more modern houses which it sits between.
11. The appeal property is a reasonable distance away from the listed building and separated from it by the road. Although 54 Wellington Road can be seen from the appeal property, with the potential for similar views in the other direction, the degree of separation between the buildings is such that the impact of the proposed rear extension on the setting of the listed building would be neutral. Consequently, the proposal would not conflict with Local Plan Policy BE 4, which aims to prevent development that would detract from or damage the setting of a listed building.
12. Notwithstanding that, the development would fail to respect the character of the host dwelling, a non-designated heritage asset which contributes positively to the streetscene. In this way, it would cause harm to the character and

appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy BE 1, which supports development that respects and responds positively to its context and enhances the quality of the local built environment. There is further conflict with Policy BE 6, which states that development which would have an adverse impact on the character and form of a building of local interest will not be supported.

13. The proposal would not harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers but this does not outweigh my findings regarding character and appearance.

Conclusion

14. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations which would outweigh this finding. For the reasons given, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR