



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2022

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/D/22/3302247

19 Finsbury Drive, Priorslee, Telford TF2 9GU

- 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 Hany Hana against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2022/0254 dated 17 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of a first-floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development in the banner above from the Decision Notice of the Council as it describes the development in a more concise manner than that on the Application Form. Whilst there is no record of a formal agreement in front of me, I note that the appellant has used the revised description on the Appeal Form. I am therefore satisfied that neither party is prejudiced by this action.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling, located within a residential area. The property already benefits from a single storey extension to the rear.
5. The proposed development would add significantly to the size of the overall dwelling with regard to bedrooms at the rear of the first floor of the property. The new extension would be constructed above the existing flat roof of the ground floor kitchen and dining room (the previous extension), projecting over 5.3m from the existing main wall at first floor level. The new roof would incorporate a pitched element, instead of the flat roofed single storey structure at present. The external walls would match the original part of the house.

6. The existing building is undistinguished architecturally, but it is in keeping with the character and appearance of the surroundings. In this case, the proposed extension would be awkward in form, adding an ungainly and incongruous addition to the existing structure. The bulk and incongruity of the extension would be unsympathetic to the original proportions and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding properties. As a whole, when finished, the extended rear elevation would be intrusive and unattractive in views from those surrounding properties.
7. The depth and height of the extension and its resulting scale and mass would be disproportionate to the original house and insufficiently subservient to it given the absence of a step-in and the overall unbroken projection of the extension. It would therefore be detrimental to its character and appearance viewed from neighbouring properties and out of keeping with the general pattern of development in the estate.
8. Evidently, the appeal site lies within an established urban area, which is "sustainable" in planning terms, and the proposed development would considerably increase the size of the existing house. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the harm that would be done to the character and appearance of the existing house outweighs the benefits of the project.
9. The National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 130 requires that developments must be sympathetic to local character to create high quality buildings and spaces amongst other things and at paragraph 134 states that development that is not well designed should be refused.
10. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area would be contrary to policies BE1 and BE2 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan (2018) which collectively, amongst other matters, expect development to respond positively to its context, should be proportionate in size to the existing building and respects the character of the area.

Other Matters

11. I have been referred to a number of other properties in the vicinity with extensions which the appellant considers justifies his proposals. However, none of these appeared to involve the scale of rear extension envisaged at No 19. However, in one important respect this proposal is fundamentally different in that the majority of rear extensions surround the host dwelling are either conservatories or single storey extensions. I am not persuaded that any of these extensions are sufficiently similar to what is proposed at No 19 to be relevant and therefore I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no other considerations that outweigh this conflict. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR