

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2024

by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/W/24/3342700

Storage buildings/garages next to Former Estate Office and Water Tower, Roden Lane, Roden, Telford, TF6 6BJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Robin Hooper (Verity House Limited) against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref is TWC/2023/0755.
 - The development proposed is change of use of redundant storage buildings/garages to be a dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and area, including its impact on a nearby non-designated heritage asset; and the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is located within a cluster of buildings, predominantly in residential use but with some commercial buildings. The appeal building and adjoining buildings formed part of an estate, with the office being converted in to a residential use. The buildings are finished in red brick under a tile roof. Some have timber detailing. Adjoining the appeal site to the south is a two-storey water tower, finished in similar materials, and is noted by the Council as being a non-designated heritage asset.
4. The appeal building appears to have been amended over time, historically having a central door and two small windows. Currently the appeal building has two garage doors to its front elevation giving it a commercial appearance, more akin to the water tower which it adjoins. The converted estate office and residential dwellings have detailed timber work and windows.

5. The proposed development would remove the garage doors and replace one with a door and adjoining window and a separate window. The windows and doors would have an overtly simple domestic appearance. They would have little of the detailing found in the windows and doors of nearby residential buildings and would contrast awkwardly with the commercial character and appearance of the adjoining non-designated heritage asset. It would not represent a good design and would detract from the character and appearance of the area.
6. Whilst I have been provided with historic photographs of the building prior to its use as a garage, this shows a more detailed elevation more akin to the neighbouring residential dwellings than that currently proposed.
7. The proposed development would therefore not comply with Policies SP3, SP4, BE1 and BE6 of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan (2018) (LP) which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments respect and respond positively to its context and do not have a detrimental impact on the setting of buildings of local interest. The proposed development would also be at odds with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) which seeks to ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Highway Safety

8. At the time of my visit Roden Lane was quiet with minimal opportunities for on street parking. The appeal site is accessed via an existing access road off Roden Lane which provides access to buildings to the south, some of these appear to be in commercial/agricultural use. The access lane was very lightly trafficked and two cars were parked on this access during my visit. I appreciate my site visit provided only a snapshot of highway conditions. Nevertheless, based on my observations, it would be reasonable to conclude that levels of traffic would increase at peak hours when traffic is at its heaviest.
9. The proposed development would create an additional dwelling in the place of a pair of garages. The Council are concerned regarding the lack of parking in the area and that the appeal site was proposed as parking for the residential dwelling to the north. Roden Lane and the access lane are lightly trafficked and relatively straight roads with minimal on street parking. As such, vehicles exiting the access lane would have good visibility of any oncoming traffic, even if cars were parked on the lane. Additionally, the evidence submitted along with the plans, clearly demonstrate that there is sufficient space to park vehicles safely for the appeal scheme and the adjoining property.
10. Whilst some detailed information has not been provided with the submission, this could be conditioned, were I minded to allow the appeal. However, as I am dismissing the appeal on other issues, I have not pursued this matter further.
11. The appellants submission details that parking can be undertaken to the front of the property without hindering on highway safety. As such, the area of land to the rear of the building would be utilised for private amenity space

and not vehicular parking. There would be sufficient amenity space which would address the Council's concerns.

12. For the reasons set out above I consider that the proposed development would not be detrimental to highway safety. Accordingly, I find no conflict with LP Policies C3 and C5 which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that the location, quantity and quality of parking reflects the density and nature of the development. The proposal also complies with paragraph 115 of the Framework which seeks to ensure that development does not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Other Matters

13. The Council can demonstrate a sufficient supply of housing, and the appellant For the above reasons given above, having considered the development plan, the approach of the Framework and all other relevant consideration, the appeal should be dismissed. with this. Nevertheless, they have put forward a number of benefits in support of the appeal scheme. Whilst the proposed development would provide socio-economic benefits associated with the use of the building as a dwelling, this would be limited by the scale of the proposal. As such I can only give the provision of a single dwelling moderate weight.
14. I have found harm regarding the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and to a non-designated heritage asset. I give great weight to these harms which would be long standing. As such, whilst the proposed development would provide limited benefits, this would not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons given above, having considered the development plan, the approach of the Framework and all other relevant consideration, the appeal should be dismissed.

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR