
Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 26/11/13

gan Richard E. Jenkins BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 19 Rhagfyr 2013

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26/11/13

by Richard E. Jenkins BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 19 December 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/A/13/2205289

Site address: 1 Elmanoak Grove, Llay, Wrexham, LL12 0LZ

The Welsh Ministers have transferred the authority to decide this appeal to me as the appointed Inspector.

- 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 C. Williams against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref LLA P/2013/0450, dated 28 June 2013, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2013.
 - The development proposed is extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. During the processing of the application revised plans were submitted which reduced the scale of various elements of the scheme. The Council determined the application based on the amended plans and I have considered the appeal on the same basis.

Main Issue

3. This is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property occupies an important corner plot at the junction between Elmanoak Grove and Fair Oaks Crescent, incorporating open frontages at both elevations. The open aspect of the appeal property is consistent with the pattern of development on the estate generally and, as a corner plot, it makes an important contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The appeal proposal would erect extensions to the front and rear elevations, whilst also erecting a detached garage to the side of the property.
5. The front extension would significantly alter the principal elevation of the appeal property by introducing a large gable extension at the same height as the existing building. Whilst this element of the scheme would be set in from the side elevations of the existing property, its visual impact would remain substantial. In addition, whilst the appeal property is set forward from the adjacent dwelling at No 16 Fair Oaks

Crescent, the proposal would extend the property further forward resulting in a significantly reduced distance between the property and the public highway. As a consequence, a significant proportion of the open frontage at Fair Oaks Crescent would be lost. For these reasons the proposed front extension would appear as a prominent and visually intrusive form of development that would be detrimental to the street scene.

6. Meanwhile, whilst the rear extension is not disputed by the Council, the proposed garage would be sited at a visually sensitive location to the side of the appeal property and would be highly visible upon the approach to Elmanoak Grove. Critically it would extend significantly into the frontage of the appeal site, beyond the building line of both the host building and the adjoining property at No 3 Elmanoak Grove. Consequently the proposal would erode the existing frontage at the appeal property and would introduce a visually prominent structure that would significantly disrupt the open characteristics of the surrounding area.
7. I have considered all matters raised, including the fact that the adjacent bungalow at No 16 is, at its closest point, located approximately 3.5m from the public highway. However, the proposed extension and garage would be sited within this distance at no fewer than three locations. As such the impact of the proposed development would be materially different to that exhibited at No 16 and, for this reason, I do not consider it necessary to alter my overall conclusions.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would introduce a prominent and visually intrusive form of development that would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. As such it would be contrary to Policy GDP1 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan, 2005 which, amongst other things, requires all development to accord with the character of the site and to make a positive contribution to the appearance of the nearby locality. I also consider it to be in conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled Local Planning Guidance Note 20: House Extensions which, amongst other things, states that front extensions should not detrimentally affect the overall character and appearance of the street scene.
9. For these reasons and having regard to all matters raised, including those raised by interested parties, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard E. Jenkins

INSPECTOR