



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/W/21/3285527

11 Bank Road, Wellington, Telford TF1 1SA

- 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 Mahmood against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2021/0657, dated 18 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two-storey side and rear extension and a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development was modified due to amended plans being submitted. I have no detail to show that this modification was formally agreed but the appellant used the updated description in the appeal form. I have removed the "Amended Plans" notification from the modified description. I will take the revised plans into account in my determination. Therefore, I am satisfied that neither party is prejudiced in this matter.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the existing dwelling and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a brick built two storey semi-detached property located in a residential area, on a corner plot at the junction with Orchard Way.
5. The appeal proposals constitute a two-storey side extension that protrudes beyond the rear elevation and a rear single storey extension that marries up to the rear element of the side extension.
6. I find that due to the scale of the works and the prominent corner nature of the host dwelling, the extensions would appear dominant and incongruous in the context of both the host property and the wider street scene. Whilst there have been alterations to properties in the area, I consider that a departure of this magnitude from the established built form would be both inconsistent and unsightly.

7. Due to its design, scale and siting, it would unbalance the host property and the pair of semi-detached dwellings as a whole, appearing overbearing in this prominent location, uncharacteristic and causing material harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposals are contrary to policies BE1 and BE2 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan which collectively, amongst other matters, expect development to respect and respond positively to its environment, demonstrate an integrated design approach and ensure that the altered building respects the character of the area.

Other Matters

9. I note that the proposals were amended during the lifetime of the application, in an attempt to mitigate the impact of the extensions. However, I find that the revisions are still harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
10. The appellant has referred to other properties in the surrounding area that have been altered in a similar manner to that which is proposed. I observed a number of these on my site visit. Although I do not have the full details of the background in relation to these extensions to other properties, they are crucially in different contexts to that of the appeal property. Some of the examples I observed also served to confirm the harm that can be done in relation to inappropriate extensions. I have also, in any event, determined the appeal on its own individual planning merits.
11. I have also noted the personal reasons of the appellant for seeking to extend the property. These however have little weight in the appeal and do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR