



Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Appeal Decision

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 28/02/11

Site visit made on 28/02/11

gan Iwan Lloyd BA BTP MRTPI

by Iwan Lloyd BA BTP MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Dyddiad: 07/03/11

Date: 07/03/11

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/A/11/2143983

Site address: 3 Laurel Grove Barns, Holt Road, 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 Ms Helen Mitchell against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HOL P/2010/0858, dated 11 October 2010, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2010.
 - The development proposed is a sun lounge extension.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the location of the site summarised above is taken from the appeal form, as no such description appears on the submitted planning application. The submitted plan shows a sun lounge extension projecting from the rear of the residential barn conversion and extending across parts of Units 3 and 4. The proposed plan appears to show one building extension since there is a continuous wall and roof plane over both dwellinghouses. The Council indicate that there is an identical planning application submitted for the proposed extension to Unit 4, but this appeal relates only to Unit 3. It is clear that should this appeal succeed then it follows that the identical extension to Unit 4 is also likely to be considered favourably. This is therefore in my judgement a material factor in the consideration of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and its group.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling forms part of an L shaped outbuilding converted to 4 residential units. The complex as a whole includes garage blocks and a large separate dwellinghouse. The proposal shows a lean-to slate and brick construction projecting below the eaves of the main building. The composition of the proposed extension is simple and horizontal in form to reflect the style of the converted outbuilding. Openings on the rear elevation of the outbuilding are confined to the ground floor living space with the exception of 4 near flush roof lights in the roof and one window

in the end gable at first floor level. A small extension has been permitted on the gable of Unit 4 to form a utility room as part of the conversion scheme.

5. The inherent character of the building is its layout which has been retained by its sub-division to separate units within its originally conceived L shaped form. The integrity of its simple composition has also been successfully retained by utilising openings and keeping new features to a minimum. In my judgement, the building retains the agricultural character primarily because the L shaped configuration remains and large areas of wall in particular in the rear elevation are intact. This treatment has therefore resulted in a simple and unifying appearance that retains its agricultural character.
6. In my judgment, because the rear elevation of the building has retained its appearance as a barn when viewed from the roadside and the fields nearby, an extension of the proposed form would disunite the simple linear composition of the building and disrupt its originally conceived layout. I therefore consider that policy H3 e) of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan (UDP) is broadly engaged, since it emphasises that the floor plan of the existing building is sufficient to create a habitable dwelling, and by analogy, had the extension been considered at the initial submission then the conversion scheme as a whole may have contravened this policy. I note that Unit 4 is extended, although this development continues the linear form of the building, but not at least across the full width of the end gable.
7. Although extensions are not excluded by reference to Local Planning Guidance Notes 13 *Housing in the Countryside* and 20 *House Extensions*, they also qualify this guidance with a cautionary note that extensions will be permitted in appropriate cases. I therefore consider that in this particular case, due to the sensitivity of this particular rear elevation the proposal would not harmonise with the appearance of the building in terms of layout and design thereby conflicting with UDP Policy GDP 1 a).
8. However, I agree with the Appellant that UDP Policy PS2 is not contravened since the proposal is contained within the cluster of established buildings and there would be no material detriment to the wider landscape.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the building and its group. I have considered all other matters raised but none outweigh my conclusion on the main issue that this appeal should be dismissed.

Iwan Lloyd

INSPECTOR