
Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 29/10/13

**gan Melissa Hall BA(Hons) BTP MSc
MRTPI**

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 10/12/13

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29/10/13

**by Melissa Hall BA(Hons) BTP MSc
MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 10/12/13

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/A/13/2204563

Site address: 2 Briar Close, Cross Lanes, Wrexham LL13 0QB

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 Anthony Greenhalgh against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/2013/0276, dated 18 April 2013, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2013.
- The development is described as a proposed annexe.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is part of a modern residential development. Briar Close is characterised by large detached two storey dwellings and whilst there is a common architectural language, there is also variation in terms of design, form and external appearance.
4. Relative to a previous appeal at this site (APP/H6955/A/12/2186446), the proposed annexe would be of a similar scale, form and design. In this context, and having regard to the character and appearance of its surroundings, I agree with the previous Inspector that there is sufficient variety in the type and sizes of other buildings within the estate for a development of the type proposed not to look out of place despite the concerns raised by other parties in respect of this matter.
5. This current proposal seeks to address the concerns of the previous Inspector and in particular, amendments have been made to show the architectural detailing on the existing building, including the ridge tiles, bands of brickwork, window headers, window proportions and gable features, together with the external finishes. It is

evident that the detailing and finishes of the annexe would replicate that of the existing dwelling. In doing so, however, the horizontal band of dark blue brick which would continue the existing pattern to the front elevation of the annexe would dissect the proposed round headed window on this elevation. Furthermore, the dark brick header over the same window would be positioned below the horizontal band it abuts, which would be a different arrangement to an existing and similar round headed window in the side elevation. The proposed front dormer would appear dominant by reason of its proportions and position partly within the eaves relative to the other gable features on the front elevation. Additionally, the depth of this dormer and the ground floor front window would not replicate those on the existing dwelling and would therefore appear out of alignment, an effect made more apparent by the horizontal banding. Consequently, I find the composition of the front elevation awkward and incongruous in relation to the host dwelling such that it would have a harmful effect on its appearance and that of the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies PS2 and GDP1 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 2005 (UDP) and the Council's Local Planning Guidance Note No 20 'House Extensions'.

6. I note the Council's concern regarding the interruption of a section of an existing wall and semi-mature trees to accommodate parking provisions and the resultant effect on the street scene. Given the position of the wall at the end of a turning head and that it is not especially prominent, I do not consider that its removal and repositioning further back in the site would have a serious adverse effect on the street scene. Whilst I accept that the trees provide some amenity value, their loss would not be significant in terms of their limited contribution to the street scene. Although I do not find conflict with UDP Policies PS2 and GDP1 in this regard, it does not override the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area for other reasons.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Melissa Hall

INSPECTOR