



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2022

by D Wilson BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/D/22/3303542

16 Marsh Road, Edgmond, Newport TF10 8EP

- 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 & Mrs Graham & Karen Hunt against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2022/0212, dated 11 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a detached garage at 16 Marsh Road, Edgmond, Newport, TF10 8EP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref TWC/2022/0212, dated 11 March 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings Nos 3130/1a, 3130/6a and 3130/7a
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development shall be constructed only of the materials indicated in the application form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 16 Marsh Road is a detached property occupying a large plot. Marsh Road contains a mix of housing styles of various sizes that are predominantly positioned along one side of the road with mature hedgerows and fields opposite. 16 Marsh Road has a larger, open frontage when compared to the majority of other properties along the road which tend to be located closer to the road.
4. Whilst the proposed garage would result in a building that sits forward of the front elevation of the property it would still be set back from Marsh Road. It would be of a relatively modest scale and would be fronted by low boundary treatments and hedgerows as well as more substantial existing hedgerows on either side. In these ways, the proposed garage would maintain the

characteristic openness of the existing plot and would not be prominent in the street scene.

5. I note that garages forward of the front elevation are not a general feature of the area. However, many of the other houses nearby are set much closer to the road when compared to 16 Marsh Road and as a result the proposed garage would follow and complement the existing pattern of built form in the street scene.
6. The design of the proposed garage, including the use of matching materials broadly accords with that of the existing property with the exception of a flat roof. Whilst this differs from the main property, I noted during my site visit that properties nearby do have flat roof elements on the front elevation which are of similar scale to the proposed garage. The garage would therefore reflect this characteristic.
7. Views of the proposed garage would be limited due to its modest scale, height and existing screening. The remaining views of the flat roof would blend in with the existing frontages and complement the existing dwelling.
8. I therefore consider that the garage would not be an overly dominant feature in the street scene and would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policies BE1 and BE2 of the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031 adopted January 2018, which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure high quality design that respects the character and appearance of the area.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard condition which relates to the commencement of development, I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to materials is also necessary to ensure that the appearance of the garage would be satisfactory in the street scene.
10. The Council have proposed a condition to limit the use of the garage for incidental use and prevent its use for living accommodation. I do not consider it is necessary to impose this condition as a separate use for independent living accommodation would require a separate grant of planning permission.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

D Wilson

INSPECTOR