



Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Appeal Decision

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 07/01/13

Site visit made on 07/01/13

gan A D Poulter BA BArch RIBA

by A D Poulter BA BArch RIBA

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Dyddiad: 01/03/13

Date: 01/03/13

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/A/12/2186446

Site address: 2 Briar Close, Cross Lanes, Wrexham LL13 0BQ.

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 T Greenhalgh against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/2012/0473, dated 28 June 2012, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2012.
- The development proposed is a self contained granny annex.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

2. These are the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area, and on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is part of a small estate of houses which vary in size and type, but which are pleasingly unified by consistent detailing including bands of contrasting brickwork, windows with a vertical emphasis, and decorative gables.
4. The proposed 'granny annex' extension would be linked internally to the existing building, but it would also have its own front door. From the street it would therefore appear to be an independent semi-detached dwelling. Nevertheless, the separation distance between it and neighbouring buildings would be such that it would not appear unduly cramped, and there would be sufficient variety in the type and sizes of other buildings within the estate for an extension of the proposed type and size not to look out of place. The separation distance, orientation and fenestration would also be such that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the occupiers of nearby properties, by reason of visual over-dominance or loss of privacy.
5. However, the application drawings do not show the bands of brickwork on the existing building, accurately reflect its window proportions, or fully detail the existing or proposed gables. I accept that it is indicated that materials and details would match those of the existing building. Nevertheless, appendix 2 of *Technical Advice Note 12: Design* (TAN 12) advises that elevations should include details of materials and

external appearance. The drawings that accompanied the application do not contain sufficient details for me to be able to determine that the appearance of the proposed development would be acceptable. Nor do they provide sufficient information to enable the local planning authority to exercise proper development control. In these circumstances there is a substantial risk that the proposed development would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. This would bring the proposal into conflict with Policy GDP1 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and the Council's *Local Planning Guidance Note No 20 – House Extensions*.

6. Conditions could be imposed that would ensure that the proposed extension could not be lawfully occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the existing dwelling. Subject to such a condition, I do not consider that the proposed development would in effect be a separate independent dwelling, or that more parking spaces ought to be provided than for any other similarly-sized individual dwelling in a similar locality.
7. However, the proposed development would result in the loss of an existing double garage. Although the appellant has stated that there are three existing parking spaces, from what I saw only two cars could be conveniently parked on the existing on-plot parking area, as a third car would be blocked in. I have not been provided with a copy of the parking standards referred to in UDP Policy T8, but in view of the size of the proposed scheme, the location, and the layout of nearby streets I consider that it would be reasonable to require more than two convenient on-plot parking spaces to be provided in this instance, and that the existing on-plot parking provision would be unlikely to meet the likely needs of future occupants. No alternative has been proposed. There are few dedicated safe and convenient on-street parking spaces in the vicinity. The proposed development would therefore be likely to lead to dangerous or obstructive parking. I conclude that it would have a harmful effect on highway safety. It would conflict in this respect with the objectives of UDP Policy T8, which seeks to ensure that the appropriate amount of parking spaces would be provided to serve any development requiring planning permission, and with criterion (d) of UDP Policy GDP1.
8. I have considered whether conditions could be used to allow the proposed development to proceed in the light of Welsh Office Circular 35/95: *The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions*. However, I do not have any basis on which to draft conditions of sufficient precision to overcome my concerns about the lack of detailed design information. Nor do I have a proposal before me on which I could base a condition requiring additional on-plot parking.
9. I have taken into account that the appellant has an aging relative, for whom the proposed extension is intended, and all other matters that have been raised. However, I find no material considerations that would turn me from the conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed, in part because of insufficient design information, and also because of conflict with development plan policies relating to parking provision.

A D Poulter

INSPECTOR