



Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Appeal Decision

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 20/06/11

Site visit made on 20/06/11

gan Gareth A. Rennie BSc Dip TP

by Gareth A. Rennie BSc Dip TP

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Dyddiad: 29/07/11

Date: 29/07/11

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/A/11/2151990

Site address: land adjoining 5 Lakeside Close, Gresford, Wrexham, LL12 8PG

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 & Mrs M & DJ Bradbury against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref GRE P/2011/0039, dated 6 January 2011, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2011.
 - The development proposed is a single storey dwelling, single garage and utility room, & the construction of a new access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies on the banks of a small lake close to the centre of the village of Gresford and close to its Conservation Area (CA). The area has a verdant, village character that is created by the grouping of terraced housing on the north western edge of the lake and the open pattern of the remaining development. There is a good deal of both private and public open space with a large number of mature trees. The older housing seems to date from the nineteenth century. It comprises brick built terraces to the north of the lake and simple, detached houses and bungalows more loosely distributed in fairly large gardens. However, it is the amount of open space and the sense of spaciousness that it engenders that gives the area its distinctive character.
4. The garden of No. 5 Lakeside Close provides an important visual link across the lake to the public open space to the south west and is an important element in the local landscape. The mature trees within it add to this impact. The proposed dwelling and garage would take up the majority of the existing open garden area of No 5. It would dominate this section of lakeshore and the loss of open space at this point would seriously undermine the sense of spaciousness.

5. Overall the proposal would increase the urban nature of the lakeshore and its immediate surroundings. This would increase the sense of enclosure and allow this part of the lake to be dominated by the built environment. I recognise that the appeal site is part of a private garden and its appearance could be changed from the current open lawns and could have garden buildings and fences placed within and around it. Nonetheless, this would not have as harmful impact on openness and the sense of spaciousness as the construction of a dwelling and garage.
6. The lake also lies within the CA and the appeal site abuts the boundary. The proposed dwelling would also dominate the periphery of this part of the CA and would detract from the village setting and character of the CA as a whole. The result of this would be a development that is out of keeping with the appearance of the immediate area and would harm the setting of the adjacent CA.
7. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy GDP1 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan (UDP) which seeks to ensure that built development in its scale, design and layout, and in its use of materials and landscape, accords with the character of the site and makes a positive contribution to the appearance of the locality. It is also contrary to policy EC7 of the UDP which seeks to preserve and/or enhance the unique character of the CA.
8. The development would be seen against the backdrop of houses to the south west. However, rather than reducing the visual impact of the proposal I consider that it would provide a strong link to the existing development increasing the sense of enclosure and visually drawing the existing development closer to the lakeshore.
9. The appellants have submitted a unilateral undertaking under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 which covenants to make a contribution towards the making of a traffic regulation order to control the use of the unadopted road leading to Lakeside Close. This document appears to satisfy the requirements of the Act, and would have some benefit in road safety terms. Nonetheless I consider that this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
10. Consequently for the reason given, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gareth A. Rennie

Inspector