



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/W/21/3288097

125 Summerhill, Sutton Hill. Telford TF7 4HB

- 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 Vadukul against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2021/0340, dated 21 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing police station building and erection of 1no. single storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:-
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.
 - The effect of the development on car parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The site is located within a predominately residential area, and Summerhill itself has a relatively uniform appearance and largely regimented building lines. The properties in the locality are two storey in nature. There is a row of private garages located on the access road at the rear, as well as a number of marked parking spaces. I understand from the evidence provided that the garages are allocated, but the parking is unallocated. There are a number of surfaced footpaths running through the area allowing access to various parts of the area, and concrete bollards located on many footpath junctions to restrict vehicular access to these footpaths where possible.
4. The appeal site itself is located between Nos 125 and 126 Summerhill, adjacent a footpath. It is a small building, which I understand operated as a police station, but its location and siting reads as an outbuilding to No 125 Summerhill.
5. The proposed dwelling would sit back from the frontage of the Summerhill properties and would markedly contrast with the position of buildings and the highway. In addition, a small single storey dwelling would be at odds with the wider two storey buildings in the row. Combined with the location, these factors would emphasise the cramped appearance of the development in

relation to its surroundings, Consequently the development would not integrate well with its context and detract from the character and appearance of the area.

6. I conclude that the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. In that regard there would be conflict with policies SP1, SP4 and BE1 of the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan (the LP), which, amongst other matters, expect development to respect and respond positively to its context and preserve and reinforce street patterns, layouts and frontages. I also find conflict with the design guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Car parking

7. The appeal site is located off Sutton Way, a winding road which appeared to be regularly used by traffic at the time of my site visit. It would appear that a number of properties on Summerhill use Sutton Way for parking as it is to the front of the properties. There did not appear to be any parking restrictions along the section of road adjacent to the appeal site but there is a bus stop in the area where residents for the proposal would be likely to park.
8. Policy C5 of the LP states that the Council will require all development to demonstrate that parking has been designed as integral to the proposal. Criterion iv) seeks to ensure that the location, quantity and quality of car parking reflects the density, nature, character and context of the development as well as its intended usage and relationship with the surrounding area including any foreseeable parking issues in the local area.
9. The Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Although I saw that there is off street parking provision at Summerhill, I am not aware of whether the residents could park there. I have no details of the levels of parking on Sutton Way at peak times, given the regular use of the main road, and the need for vehicles to manoeuvre past parked cars that I saw at my site visit.
10. Whilst I have no substantive details regarding the current state of the road network, given the proximity of the site to the bus stop and the regular use of the road, I am concerned that residents and visitors may choose to park along a section of the street which could impede the free flow of traffic and, as a result, cause harm to highway safety.
11. Thus, the appellant has failed to demonstrate that there is sufficient parking specific to the site, contrary to Policy C5 of the LP, or that there would be no harm to highway safety, contrary to the Framework.

Other Matters

12. I note the comments of the appellant with regard to the delivery of a unit accommodation with regard to housing delivery. There has been no information provided that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing supply, and one unit would be a very modest addition, and would not outweigh the harm that would be caused by the appeal proposals in terms of the character and appearance and highway safety.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR