



Penderfyniad ar Apêl

Ymweliad safle a wnaed ar 19/08/10

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19/08/10

gan/by Emyr Jones BSc(Hons) CEng MICE MCMI

**Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion
Cymru**

**an Inspector appointed by the Welsh
Ministers**

Dyddiad/Date 06/09/10

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/A/10/2128871

**Site address: Bentley's Farm, Woodhouse Lane, Marchwiel, Wrexham LL13
OST**

**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 D Cole against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/2010/0155, dated 25 February 2010, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2010.
- The development proposed is described as the removal of a modern conservatory, the erection of a two storey extension lounge and bedroom, and the erection of a single storey extension kitchen.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Procedural matter

2. The description of proposed works given on the planning application is as stated above. However, the single storey kitchen extension has already been built pursuant to a separate planning permission. I will, therefore, consider the appeal as relating to the removal of a modern conservatory and the erection of a two storey lounge and bedroom extension only.

Main issue

3. I consider the main issue in this case to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding rural area which forms part of a Special Landscape Area.

Reasons

4. The existing dwelling is a former farmhouse that, according to the appellants' figures, had already been extended to 135% of the 1948 original floor space before the latest single storey extension was built. The demolition of the conservatory would represent a reduction in floorspace, but with the proposed 2-storey extension there would be an overall increase which, again according to the

appellants' figures, would take the total extensions since 1948 to 44% of the original floor space. This would go well beyond the 33% limit of *Local Planning Guidance Note No. 13: Housing in the Countryside* (LPGN 13) and conflict with the objective of retaining a broad range of rural housing accommodation.

5. Insofar as the proposed 2-storey extension is concerned, the incorporation of a feature window with dormer on the eastern elevation would not reflect the window shape and design on the existing dwelling, as recommended by *Local Planning Guidance Note No. 20: House Extensions* (LPGN 20), and would appear as an incongruous feature. Whilst this was proposed to provide greater headroom at the window, that is not sufficient reason to outweigh the resulting harm to character and appearance, particularly as the extended bedroom 1 would also feature a gable window.
6. The lack of any setting back of the extension's eastern elevation or stepping down of its ridge would give that elevation, which already represents the longest unbroken elevation on the property, an elongated and excessive length. As a result, the extension would over-dominate the existing dwelling and not have a subservient appearance resulting in further conflict with LPGNs 13 & 20 as well as harm to character and appearance.
7. I accept that the proposed 2-storey extension would not feature prominently in public views, but that is an argument that could be repeated too often to the overall detriment of an area's character. For the above reasons, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding rural area which forms part of a Special Landscape Area. As a result, it conflicts with *Wrexham Unitary Development Plan* policies GDP1, EC5 & PS2.
8. The appellants suggest that providing a break at the interface between new and old would result in a disjointed appearance. I disagree as setting the extension back from the main elevation would partly reflect the more substantial setting back of the existing northern wing when viewed from the east. The appellants also make comparisons with the neighbouring dwelling at Holmewood which features an extensive and unbroken roof slope. However, I have no information as to whether that was a feature of the original agricultural buildings pre-conversion or results from subsequent alteration and extension.
9. The appellants request that, in the event of my finding the appeal proposal unacceptable, I consider an alternative proposal described as Option C with a lower ridge/roof and reduced width. Notwithstanding, that this amounts to a substantially different proposal which has not been subject to consultation, it incorporates the same feature window with dormer which is in itself sufficient reason to dismiss the appeal proposal.
10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Jones

Inspector