

## Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 10/03/14

gan Kay Sheffield BA(Hons) DipTP  
MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru  
Dyddiad: 10 Ebrill 2014

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10/03/14

by Kay Sheffield BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers  
Date: 10 April 2014

**Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/A/14/2213295**

**Site address: 87 Pentre Street, Llay, Wrexham, LL12 0NF**

**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 Chris Jones against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/2013/0432, dated 10 May 2013 was refused by notice dated 9 August 2013.
- The development proposed is the erection of a wooden two storey garage and storage area.

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The appeal site lies between Pentre Street and Bron Alyn in a predominantly residential area where the majority of the properties are two-storey semi-detached dwellings. The appeal property is one such property although it has been altered and extended. Vehicular access to the site is gained from Bron Alyn which runs between the rear boundaries of several dwellings fronting Pentre Street and Council Street and contains a block of garages. At its eastern end Bron Alyn continues as a footway to the front of 1 to 6 Bron Alyn, a row of single storey dwellings.
4. At the time of my site visit the garage was substantially complete externally. It is set slightly off the boundary with Bron Alyn and the common boundary with the adjoining dwelling. The building is timber clad with timber doors and window frames and a felt roof. The windows had not been glazed and the steps to provide access to the ground and first floors on the elevation facing the dwelling were not in place. The Council has commented that the roof has been felted rather than tiled, but the application form proposes a felt roof and I have determined the appeal on this basis.
5. The boundaries of the appeal site with Bron Alyn and the adjoining dwelling are marked by high hedges, the former only being broken by the garage and high gates to the vehicular entrance alongside it. Whilst the planting effectively screens the building

from some directions, it would be seen from the rear of the houses on Council Street and also by those passing the site to access 1 to 6 Bron Alyn. I also found that the upper floor of the building is visible from Council Street in views between the houses and from the pedestrian link which runs between Council Street and 1 - 6 Bron Alyn.

6. The use of timber externally on the building is in keeping with the garages and sheds in the gardens to a number of the properties in the locality and also complements the wooden doors to the block of garages. However, these are all single storey and of simple design and moderate scale. The height and scale of the garage together with the dormer window are out of character in these surroundings and although the full extent of the structure is only seen from a limited number of viewpoints, I nevertheless consider it to be incongruous and unduly dominant in this setting.
7. The evidence therefore leads me to conclude that the development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies PS2 and GDP1 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan, 2005 and the Council's Local Planning Guidance Note 20: House Extensions which seek to ensure that all development makes a positive contribution to the appearance of the area.
8. Whilst the submitted plans indicate that the upper floor of the building would be used for storage, the Council has stated that it could be used as habitable space ancillary to the main dwelling. Although I have no reason to dispute the appellant's intentions to use the space for storage, any permission would run with the land and despite the restricted headroom the first floor could, in the future, be used as additional living accommodation from where views towards the neighbouring properties would be possible. However, given the separation distances, screen planting and the angle of view, I do not consider that this would necessarily harm the privacy of neighbouring residents although it does not outweigh the other concerns I have identified.
9. Whilst the appellant has stated that the development is supported locally, the Council reported one objection citing visual intrusion which I have addressed above. In addition a representation from an interested party has been received in response to the appeal raising issues in respect of potential loss of parking, restricted access for emergency vehicles and the safety of pedestrians, although no substantive evidence has been submitted. However, parking would be available within the garage in addition to existing parking space within the curtilage of the dwelling. I therefore do not consider that the development would result in parking on Bron Alyn. The Council, in reaching its decision on the application, concluded that the scheme would not harm highway safety and on the evidence before me I have no reason to reach a different conclusion.
10. The appellant contends that if a change in ground levels as part of the landscaping of the site had not taken place, permission would not be required for the development and he has offered to reinstate the ground levels. However, I have no details regarding the original ground levels or the extent of the landscaping referred to by the appellant. Moreover, I am required to determine the appeal on the basis of the plans before me and am unable to place any weight on this matter in reaching my decision.
11. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

*Kay Sheffield*

Inspector