

REPORT OF THE CHIEF OFFICER PLANNING AND REGULATORY – 7th OCTOBER 2019

APPLICATION NO:
P/2019 /0578

LOCATION:
WATERSIDE BARN NEWBRIDGE
ROAD NEWBRIDGE WREXHAM LL14
3JE

DATE RECEIVED:
05/08/2019

COMMUNITY:
Chirk

DESCRIPTION:
REAR EXTENSION TO INCREASE
SIZE OF KITCHEN / DINING ROOM


CASE OFFICER:
SEH

WARD:
Chirk North

APPLICANT(S) NAME:
MR & MRS G POTTS

AGENT NAME:
ROCAL.DESIGN
MR ROBERT EVANS

THE SITE



PROPOSAL

As above

PLANNING HISTORY

- 4/11993 Conversion of redundant farm buildings into 2 dwellings.
 Approved 28/06/1991
- 4/10003 Conversion of redundant farm buildings.
 Approved 22/03/1989

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The site is located outside of settlement and adjacent to the World Heritage Site (WHS) Buffer Zone. UDP Policies PS2, H3 and GDP1 apply. Local Planning Guidance Notes (LPGN) Nos. 3 'Converting Redundant Buildings', 20 'House Extensions' and 13 'Housing in the Countryside' are also relevant.

CONSULTATIONS

- | | | |
|--------------------|--|------------|
| Community Council: | No objection. | |
| Local Member: | Requests that the application be reported to planning committee. | |
| Site notice: | Expired | 27.08.2019 |
| Neighbours: | Notified | 06.08.2019 |

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Background: This application has been submitted for an extension to a previously converted agricultural building, formerly associated with Pen-y-Bont Farm which is situated just beyond the boundary of the Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal World Heritage Site Buffer Zone. The building occupies a prominent plot and is in an elevated position (see figure 1. below)



Figure 1. Existing Street Scene

Design: The extension is considered to be inappropriate in terms of its scale, design and layout because of the impact it would have upon the character and appearance of both the existing building and surrounding locality (see existing and proposed elevations below at figures 2, 3 and 4). The extension would produce an overly dominant feature, visible from public viewpoints, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area and original form of the barn which currently retains its simple L-shaped plan.



Figure 2. Existing Principal Elevation



Figure 3. Proposed Principal Elevation




Figure 4. Existing Side Elevation Figure 5. Proposed Side Elevation

In considering the proposals, reference is made to LPGN 3: Converting Rural Buildings. This states that 'there is a presumption against large extensions to the building.' The extension proposed extends to 4m from the building, reaching just over 4.3 metres at its widest point and extends across almost half the length of the elevation, obscuring much of the ground floor stonework. The scale of the extension is therefore considered to be much too large. Extensions are normally only considered appropriate to former agricultural buildings where they maintain the simple, traditional character and form of the building. The form of the proposed extension is over complicated by the central projection which creates an overly domestic feel and no information has been submitted with regards to the proposed materials.

LPGN 3, 13 and 20 provide general guidance to which this development would conflict. Specifically, LPG 20 states (at page 4) that front extensions should not project a significant amount from the front wall of the existing dwelling and should be simple in design and respectful of the original lines of the building. The proposed extension does not accord with this guidance as the projection competes with the width of the gable end of the building emphasising its disproportionality contrary to the guidance set out in LPGN 3 and 13 (at pages 2 and 4 respectively) that extraneous features of inappropriate scale, such as this, that adversely affects the building should be avoided. This is further compounded by the extent of the glazing across the entire frontage which is not reflective of the current building.

I have requested that the central projecting element be deleted and that the projection of the extension reduced to 3.3 metres (which will allow for an internal floor area of 3 metres). I have also requested that the extent of the

REPORT OF THE CHIEF OFFICER PLANNING AND REGULATORY – 7th OCTOBER 2019

glazing is reduced and better detailed to match the existing, and for submission of the proposed materials. This would result in a more modest addition, better proportioned to the existing building and of appropriate detail. The Applicants have confirmed that they are unwilling to make any amendments to the proposed scheme and I am therefore unable to support this application.

Other Matters: There are existing dwellings in the locality which have extensions, one of which is similar in scale and design to that proposed as part of this application. Please see example at figure 5. which is below the application site and adjacent to the river. I note however the context differs in that this extension is not to a former farm building and is proportionate to the building to which it is attached, being of appropriate scale and design. Please see example at figure 5. which is below the application site adjacent to the river.



Figure 5. Existing Extension at Dee House

CONCLUSION

By virtue of its overall scale, design and appearance, the proposed extension would appear out-of-scale, unbalance and obtrusive and is not considered to be sympathetic to, or accord with, the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding locality contrary to UDP Policies H3 and GDP1 and the provisions set out within Local Planning Guidance Notes Nos. 3, 13 and 20. In detrimentally affecting the surrounding countryside, the development would also be inconsistent with UDP Policy PS2.

RECOMMENDATION: That permission be REFUSED

REASON(S)

1. By virtue of its overall scale, design and appearance, the proposed extension is not considered to be sympathetic to, or accord with the character and appearance of, the existing building or the surrounding locality. The obtrusive feature would harm the form of the previously converted barn and the visual amenities of the area, and the proposal therefore conflicts with Wrexham UDP Policies H3, GDP1 and PS2 and the provisions set out within Local Planning Guidance Notes Nos. 3, 13 and 20.
-