
Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 01/03/21

gan **Richard E. Jenkins, BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 18/3/21

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 01/03/21

by **Richard E. Jenkins, BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 18th March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/D/21/3267261

Site address: Awelfryn, Mountain Street, Rhosllanerchrugog, Wrexham, LL14 1BU

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 Patricia Maxted against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: RHO P/2020/0469 dated 8 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of fencing and driveway gates (in retrospect).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's Notice of Decision. As this is consistent with that outlined on the Appeal Form, I am satisfied that there is no prejudice in this respect.

Main Issue

3. This is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to fencing and driveway gates that have been erected without the benefit of planning permission at a semi-detached property known as 'Awelfryn' in Mountain Street, Rhosllanerchrugog. The property is located at the junction between Mountain Street and Pentre Dwr. The fencing and gates subject of the appeal are located along the western boundary fronting Pentre Dwr and the shared northern boundary with the adjacent 'Mount View'. The Council's concerns are focused on the contention that the fencing and driveway gates located along the western side boundary have a detrimental impact upon the visual amenity of the area. I shall confine my reasoning to this principal matter of dispute.
 5. I was able to confirm at the time of my site inspection that, by reason of their scale, form and overall design, the fencing and gates erected along the frontage of Pentre Dwr represent prominent and incongruous features that have an adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area. I have sympathy with the appellant's desire to
-

increase privacy, particularly to the rear of the property. However, the fact that the structures extend along the full side elevation of the property, coupled with the fact that the boundary represents such a prominent location in the street scene, leads me to find that the structures are an excessive and insensitive addition to the property and surrounding area.

6. The appellant has referred to a number of other boundary fences and gates within the wider area that are of comparable height to that proposed in this case. Nonetheless, some of those features serve to reinforce my overall concerns. In any event, I have not been provided with anything to suggest that those features were granted planning permission under the current planning policy framework and it is relevant to note that it is a well-established principle of planning that each case should be treated on its own particular merits.
7. Therefore, on the basis that the structures cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area, I find conflict with the aims of Policy GDP1a of the adopted Wrexham Unitary Development Plan (UDP). For the same reason, the development also conflicts with the thrust of the placemaking principles that underpin national policy. For these reasons, and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.
8. In coming to this conclusion, I have considered the duty to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales, in accordance with the sustainable development principle, under section 3 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 (WBFG Act). I have taken into account the ways of working set out at section 5 of the WBFG Act and consider that this decision is in accordance with the sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers well-being objectives, as required by section 8 of the WBFG Act.

Richard E. Jenkins

INSPECTOR