

Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Appeal Decision

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 05/09/13

Site visit made on 05/09/13

gan Kay Sheffield BA(Hons) DipTP
MRTPI

by Kay Sheffield BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Dyddiad: 04/10/13

Date: 04/10/13

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/A/13/2203058

Site address: The Barn, Pentre Saeson, Brymbo Road, Bwlchgwyn, Wrexham, LL11 5TY

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 Geoff Fielding against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/2013/0332, dated 9 May 2013, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2013.
- The development proposed is the amendment to planning permission Ref: P/2012/0864 for a two storey extension by the substitution of a roof light serving an en-suite for a dormer window.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the amendment to planning permission Ref: P/2012/0864 for a two storey extension by the substitution of a roof light serving an en-suite for a dormer window at The Barn, Pentre Saeson, Brymbo Road, Bwlchgwyn, Wrexham, LL11 5TY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2013/0332, dated 9 May 2013, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than five years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Drawing No. 12113 (PL) 002.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing building.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large detached former agricultural building which has been converted into a residential dwelling with a separate garage. The dwelling is a two storey stone property under a slate roof set back from the road within a large landscaped plot in open countryside. Whilst it would appear from the front of the

property that regard was given in its conversion to the character of the former building by the use of original openings, it is clear from the planning history of the site that subsequent alterations and extensions have taken place to the extent that its agricultural origins are not dominant in the external appearance of the building or its setting.

4. The existing building contains three dormers to the northern elevation which from the planning history of the site would appear to have been allowed in retrospect in 2012 (Application ref: P/2012/0299). The scheme for the two storey extension for which the Council granted planning permission (Application Ref: P/2012/0864) contains a dormer and a roof light on the northern elevation and it is substitution of this roof light with a dormer window which is the subject of the appeal.
5. The Council contends that a dormer window in lieu of a roof light would introduce a more uniform appearance uncommon with the character and rural nature of the building, although no explanation of the reasoning behind this conclusion has been given. I agree with the Council that dormer windows are not normally found on agricultural buildings and I note that Local Planning Guidance Note 3: Converting Rural Buildings (LPG3) states that their installation will be discouraged unless there is a clear precedent for their use on traditional buildings in the locality. However the use of dormers on the existing building has already been established and has been permitted on the proposed extension. Moreover, there is no regular pattern to the existing dormer windows and I am not convinced that the introduction of a fifth to a roof plane which already contains three and has permission for a fourth would create a uniform appearance.
6. The Council is also concerned that the number of dormer windows would result in a cluttered roof space. Whilst a total of five dormer windows on a single roof plane might seem excessive, I am satisfied that this number would be easily accommodated within the roof plane which is of a significant length. In addition the siting of the dormers in two pairs and a single at irregular intervals would not give rise to a cluttered appearance to this elevation.
7. On the evidence before me I therefore conclude that the substitution of the roof light allowed in the permitted scheme for a dormer window would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building, in accordance with Policies GDP1 and H3 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan, 2005 and LPG3. Whilst the Council also cited Local Planning Guidance Note 13: Housing in the Countryside in its reason for refusing planning permission, no reference to this document or relevant extract from it has been submitted as part of the Council's case and I have therefore had no regard to it in reaching my decision.
8. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions in the light of Circular 35/95 *The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions*. I have imposed the standard condition regarding the commencement of the development and for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning I have confirmed the drawings on which my decision is based. In order to ensure the development is in keeping with the building I have also required the use of materials to match the existing dormers.
9. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore allowed.

Kay Sheffield

Inspector