



Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 11/01/12

gan David Fitzsimon MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 24/01/12

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11/01/12

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 24/01/12

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/A/11/2165321

Site address: Laurel Grove Cottage, Ridley Wood, Wrexham LL13 9US

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 Mrs Helen Mitchell against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HOL P/2011/0352, dated 17 May 2011, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2011.
 - The development proposed is an extension to side of existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its setting.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a modest dwelling which has been constructed in recent years as part of a scheme which involved the redevelopment of a farmhouse and associated barns. It has a large curtilage and it enjoys an open countryside location, with agricultural fields directly to the north and west.
4. The detailing and external materials of the proposed extension are appropriate, it would be set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling and it would have a lower ridge. It would also be broadly in line with the requirement of the Council's Local Planning Guidance Note 13 that extensions to dwellings in the countryside should be no more than a third of their original floor area.
5. Nevertheless, at over 5 metres, the proposed side extension would be very wide. In fact, it would be wider than the host dwelling. It would also provide the house with a prominent front door covered by a porch facing the public highway, whereas the existing entrance door is located discreetly to the side. The combination of these factors leads me to the view that the extension would not be subservient. From the

roadside, it would appear disproportionate and overly dominant, and it would not respect the overall scale and form of the host dwelling.

6. The proposed extension would effectively bring the dwelling closer to the adjoining open countryside. Whilst it would be buffered to a degree by the existing large detached garage at the appeal property, I consider that the excessive sideward projection of the proposed extension, particularly at first floor level, would appear unduly prominent against this backdrop of open countryside. As a result, the open and rural setting of the dwelling would be unduly harmed. In this respect, the proposal is materially different to the proposed sun lounge extension at 3 Laurel Grove Barns recently considered by my colleague Inspector, which although found to be unacceptable for other reasons, was accepted as being '*within a cluster of established buildings*'.
7. Given the above, I conclude that the proposed extension would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its setting. As such, it conflicts with policies GDP1 and PS2 of the adopted Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011 and the general design aims of the Council's Local Planning Guidance Notes referred to by the appellant.
8. In reaching my decision, I am mindful that planning permission has been granted for the erection of a single storey extension at the appeal property, which has yet to be implemented. This would be much deeper than the proposed extension and the Council does not dispute the appellant's assertion that its volume would be marginally greater. I am also mindful that the roof profile of the approved extension would not be consistent with that of the host dwelling, and the roof would also have an awkward arrangement with the first floor windows on the existing side elevation. Nevertheless, the approved structure would be much lower and it would be nowhere near as wide as the proposed extension. On this basis, its visual effect would not be as harmful when viewed from the public domain and therefore it does not justify the approval of the scheme before me.
9. I understand that the Council has permitted alterations to other dwellings within the group, but none I saw were directly comparable to this scheme. In addition, I note that the occupiers of the neighbouring property have raised no formal objection to the proposed extension which would not affect any hedges, trees or boundaries, or the existing parking spaces and vehicular access which serve the host dwelling. Nevertheless, these and all other positive aspects of the proposed extension, neither alter nor outweigh the significant harm I have identified.
10. In light of the above factors, and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

Inspector