

Susan Davies

From: planning
Sent: 15 March 2017 08:03
To: Susan Davies
Subject: FW: Comments regarding planning application P/2017/0034
Attachments: image.jpeg

Importance: High

Do you know what to do with this?

Ann Jones

Swyddog Cefnogi Busnes / Business Support Officer Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Wrexham / Wrexham County Borough Council

01978 298740

Wrexham County Borough Council, Guildhall, Wrexham LL11 1AY
Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Wrexham, Neuadd y Dref, Wrexham LL11 1AY
wrexham.gov.uk | wrecsam.gov.uk
twitter.com/wrexhamcbc | twitter.com/cbswrecsam
facebook.com/wrexhamcouncil | facebook.com/cyngorwrecsam

-----Original Message-----

From: Richard Picking [mailto:r.picking@glyndwr.ac.uk]
Sent: 14 March 2017 17:46
To: planning
Subject: Comments regarding planning application P/2017/0034
Importance: High

Dear Sir/Madam

Please consider my comments below regarding the above 'APPEAL PENDING' planning application, which was originally rejected last month, and can you please forward this to the appropriate planning officer. I am unable to submit this on the website, as the 'Comment' link is not visible. I would appreciate an acknowledgement of this email.

My name and address is:

Richard Picking
4 Holly Court
Gresford LL12 8YH
01978 851625

I would like to comment on the planning application appeal for extensions at 17 Yew Tree Court, Gresford, Wrexham (P/2017/0034). Having read the appeal in detail, I can see no amelioration to my original concerns that planning permission should be turned down.

The Grounds of Appeal document, submitted by LSPlanning, makes a number of claims to support the appeal that the original decision is 'an incorrect assessment'. I would like to respond to those claims now:

a. Planning History: The appeal states that previous planning applications were granted in 2014. Although those applications had similar architectural features to the current application, they are not the same, so cannot be

considered as any form of precedent. The current application is different, being larger in scale, and therefore renders any comparison to previous applications irrelevant.

b. Planning Policy: The appeal cites policy GDP1, and complains that no clause of that policy is breached by the proposed plans. In particular, adherence to clause (a) of GDP1 is defended, although there is no inclusion of the cited Delegated Tick Sheet to provide evidence that the original assessment was satisfied with this. I am in the same position as the appellants as being unsure of which clause of GDP1 is of issue in the original application, so whether clause (a) is misinterpreted or whether another clause is of issue is unclear. However, I disagree that all other clauses are satisfied. In particular, I refer to clause (k), which states:

"Secure the development of sustainable communities, through the promotion of the economic, social and environmental well-being of the area."

I argue that the proposed extension will incur a negative effect on the social and environmental well-being of the area, by being over-dominant and over-looking, especially to the property at 18 Yew Tree Court. The extension will be anti-social and cause environmental stress to the occupier of no. 18, as the original rejection states:

"The development would have a significant detrimental impact upon the occupiers of the adjacent property by way of significant loss of daylight to, and outlook from, habitable rooms. To allow the development would leave the affected rooms feeling dark and claustrophobic and therefore conflicts with policy GDP1 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan ..."

The appeal continues by claiming that there is no suggestion that:

"... the size and scale of the resulting extension should not over-dominate the existing dwelling" (LPGN20)

On the contrary, there is EVERY suggestion that it does so.

The appeal then continues to refute the applicability of LPGN21 to the rejection of the original proposal. It cites the building of a 2m wall around the whole of the property, and that this installation is fundamental to the success of the application, although this is not yet fully in place. The appeal however, fails to show photographs of the boundary wall with number 5 Holly Court, behind the property. This wall is a character feature, being very attractive, and of historical significance for the community. It extends along the 6 properties of 17, 18, and 19 Yew Tree Court, and 1, 4, and 5 Holly Court. The substantive height of this wall is less than the 2m required (horizontal peak is 1.8m) as a condition of application 2014/0353, and which is cited in the present appeal as a condition that will be adhered to. To alter or compromise this wall in any way would contravene the planning issue of "Impact of the development on the character and appearance of an area". I attach a photograph of said wall, with 17 Yew Tree Court in background with scaffolding.

The appeal continues to question the application of LPGN21 by arguing that the screening requirements (between 17 and 18 Yew Tree Court) are only slightly outside the standards required, and therefore should be considered sympathetically. Given all my other concerns related to this application, I counter that the strength of opposition does not warrant a sympathetic response.

The appeal then goes on to compare the extension at no. 19 to the proposed extension. There is no comparison. The extension at no. 19 is of a much smaller scale, and it is crystal clear to any observer that the proposed 2 storey extension is of another order of magnitude. Indeed, the height of the pitched roof garage extension at no. 19 cited to attempt a case of precedent is not even comparable to the CURRENT garage pitched roof height at no. 17.

The appeal criticizes the original rejection's use of a 'pejorative adjective' that is not included in the guidance document. This criticism seems rather tenuous, as my understanding is that 'dark' and 'loss of light' are intrinsically synonymous.

The appeal concludes by boasting that the current proposal lifts the roof height of the earlier application, and that this provides further grounds for planning acceptance. I argue the opposite. I refer you to my previous comment

that this application is larger in scale and therefore is more over-dominant, and propose that the appeal should be rejected on the original grounds:

"The development would have a significant detrimental impact upon the occupiers of the adjacent property by way of significant loss of daylight to, and outlook from, habitable rooms. To allow the development would leave the affected rooms feeling dark and claustrophobic and therefore conflicts with policy GDP1 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan and Local Planning Policy Guidance Notes No 20 'House Extensions' and No. 21 'Space around Dwellings'."

=====
Richard Picking PhD MSc BSc FBCS
Professor of Human-Computer Interaction
Wrexham Glyndwr University
Mold Road
Wrexham LL11 2AW
WALES, UK

email: r.picking@glyndwr.ac.uk
tel: +44 (0)1978 293066
=====