



Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Appeal Decision

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 06/09/12

Site visit made on 06/09/12

gan Siân Worden BA DipLH MCD
MRTPI

by Siân Worden BA DipLH MCD MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru
Dyddiad: 18/09/12

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers
Date: 18/09/12

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/A/12/2177065

Site address: Poppyfields, 16 Oakwood Park, Penley, Wrexham LL13 0NE

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 Ms Val Morris against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
- The application Ref MAE P/2011/0802, dated 31 October 2011, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2011.
- The development proposed is a conservatory to the right elevation of the property.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern bungalow on a residential estate and the proposed development is a conservatory. This would be in a central position on the southern elevation from which it would project by about 2.4m. It would be approximately 3.5m wide with its roof just below eaves level of the main dwelling. In my view the almost flat roof, panelled lower walls and proportions proposed would be out of keeping with the main dwelling, including the existing conservatory whose hipped roof is clearly apparent above the garden fence.
4. The existing dwelling is in a prominent, corner location and the proposed conservatory would be located on an outward facing elevation. It would encroach into the attractive garden around the bungalow and, in extending considerably closer to the boundary, would be a conspicuous and intrusive element in the street scene. The boundary hedge would not screen the proposed development sufficient for it to be acceptable, neither at present nor with a few years growth.
5. Overall my conclusion is that the scale, design and layout of the proposed development would not accord with the character of the site or make a positive contribution to the appearance of the nearby locality contrary to Policy GDP1 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, adopted 2005.

6. I consider that the distance and relationship between the proposed conservatory and surrounding dwellings would be such as to ensure no significant overlooking or loss of privacy, either for neighbouring occupiers or the appellant. I appreciate the benefits that that proposed conservatory would bring in respect of light and heat conservation as well as additional space and have noted the appellant's comments regarding second conservatories. I am also aware that an external glass door will be fitted in any case.
7. I saw the nearby property at No. 7 during my visit but the type of dwelling and its position differ significantly from the appeal case such that I can draw no useful comparisons with it. In any event the presence of an extension there is not a compelling reason to allow a proposal which would be detrimental. I have taken all the matters raised into consideration but not found any which would outweigh the harm caused. Although the appellant challenges that she was required to seek planning permission for the proposal that is not a matter for me to determine here; my role is to make a decision on the scheme before me. No amendments or conditions which might make the scheme acceptable have been suggested.
8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Siân Worden

Inspector