



Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Appeal Decision

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 09/01/12

Site visit made on 09/01/12

gan Gareth A. Rennie BSc (Hons) DipTP

by Gareth A. Rennie BSc (Hons) DipTP

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Dyddiad: 02/03/12

Date: 02/03/12

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/A/11/2163438

Site address: Ffridd Fach, Llanarmon Dyffryn Ceiriog, Llangollen, LL20 7LG

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 Arthur Bradburn against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
- The application Ref CEI P/2011/0380, dated 1 June 2011, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2011.
- The development proposed is an extension to garage and new front porch.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension to garage and new front porch at Ffridd Fach, Llanarmon Dyffryn Ceiriog, Llangollen, LL20 7LG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CEI P/2011/0380, dated 1 June 2011, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than five years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. In this case I have used the Local Planning Authority's description of the development as it appears on their decision notice which I consider more accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

Reasons

4. Ffridd Fach is an extended two storey house with a distinctive hipped roof with dormer windows. It is sited within a reasonably large garden and occupies an elevated position above the Ceiriog Valley to the east of the village of Llanarmon Dyffryn Ceiriog.

5. The existing house has been extended twice, including a rear flat roofed extension housing a double garage. The current proposal is to erect a first floor to this extension within the same footprint and to install a pitched hipped roof.
6. The house has already been extended and the Council has made reference to aims of Local Planning Guidance Note LPG13 – ‘Housing in the Countryside’ (LPG13) or LPG20 – ‘House Extensions’ (LPG20). I recognise the thrust of this guidance is to ensure that extensions are subsidiary and limit the size of extensions to one third of the floor area of the original dwelling. This property has already been extended to that limit proposed by the guidance. Nonetheless, I consider that the extension would not appear to be large by comparison with the appeal building, and is based on the existing ground floor extension. The extension would not unbalance the existing house or appear to have a significantly greater mass than the existing extension, and indeed would, overall appear subservient to the original house.
7. The extension would also reflect the design of the existing building and would improve the appearance and balance of the appeal property. The principal features of the hipped roof and dormers would be complimented and enhanced. Overall, it would not appear as a disproportionate addition to the existing house or out of character with it.
8. Because of a good deal of natural screening, the house is only immediately visible from a small part of the adjacent road close to the entrance to property. However, longer distance views from surrounding countryside and a section of the A884 do exist. A lack of public views in to the site should not be a reason to ignore an overall harmful effect. Even so, in this case the lack of public views adds weight to my previous conclusions.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the scale, mass, form and proportions and design of the proposed extension would not be out of keeping with, or seriously harmful to, the character and appearance of the existing house. The proposed development would therefore not conflict with the thrust of policy GDP1 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan or the aims of the guidance contained within LPG13 and LPG20.
10. Consequently for the reasons given above, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gareth A. Rennie

Inspector