Penderfyniadau Cynllunio ac Amgylchedd Cymru
Planning & Environment Decisions Wales

Appeal Decision

by Declan K Beggan BSc (Hons) MSc DipTP DipMan MRTPI an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 17/12/2025

Appeal reference: CAS-04616-Z3K9S9

Site address: 2 Mareilian Avenue, Marford, Wrexham LL12 8LL

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 Dr Nigel Hudson against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/2025/0583, dated 27 July 2025, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2025.
- The development proposed is the 'extension to garage and conversion to annexe'.
- A site visit was made on 7 November 2025.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for an "extension to garage and conversion to annexe' in accordance with the application Ref P/2025/0583, dated 27 July 2025, and subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used the description of the development as it appears on the Council's decision notice, as it is more concise than that used on the planning application form.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

7. The appeal dwelling occupies a generously sized corner plot at the junction of Stancliffe Avenue with Mareilian Avenue within the village of Marford. Properties fronting onto Mareilian Avenue have long mature rear gardens and benefit from significant landscape screening in the form of tree/hedge cover. The character of the area is suburban in nature and varies considerably with a mix of property types and associated domestic curtilages. Due to the spacious gardens associated with properties along Mareilian Avenue, there is a generally more open feel to the street scene, albeit it punctuated by mature tree planting.
8. The proposed development would be single storey and be set marginally back from the front elevation of the existing garage structure with a slightly lower roofline; materials would match those existing. Contrary to the opinion of the Council and others, in footprint and overall scale, the proposed extension would result in a relatively modest addition to the existing garage and the fact that its set back from the front elevation of the existing structure with a lower roof, reinforces its subordinate nature. Whilst I appreciate the rear

gardens along Mareilian Avenue generally lack built development, nonetheless, the existing structure on the appeal site has a muted unobtrusive visual appearance as it is set back from the road and the proposed development due to its modest scale/footprint and subsidiary design, reflects that muted appearance. The proposed development would be well screened within the street scene due to the existing development and landscaping in the form of mature trees/hedging. Visually it would only be evident as the observer directly passes the site and even then, such views would be transitory in nature and glimpsing. For these reasons the proposed development would be neither visually obtrusive or dominant within the immediate street scene, nor appear out of character.

9. The Council draw attention to a minimal plot width, however the proposed development would make little difference to the appearance/layout of the plot, particularly so as the overall plot encompasses not only the proposed works but the wider site. In addition, due to the modest nature of the proposed development, I do not consider it would be perceived as a standalone dwelling, and the fact that it is functionally and physically linked to the overall house/plot underlines that interdependence.

10. For the above reasons, I consider the proposed development is considered acceptable and would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, nor run contrary to policies GDP1 and PS2 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan which seeks, inter alia, to safeguard visual amenity.

Other Matters

11. I note the concerns raised from neighbours due to the proposal's potential impact on residential amenity. However subject to the condition 4, I do not consider there would be any detriment to adjacent amenity. Bearing in mind the proposed development would form part and parcel of the existing residential use I don't consider the proximity of the proposed development would either be detrimental to the occupants of the proposed development, nor materially affect outlook/light to nearby dwellings due to boundary screening, landscaping or separation distance to main dwellings. I don't consider the proposed development would result in any activity that is materially over and beyond that which currently exists on the site.

12. The Council mention the existence of the side/rear access potentially taking away from the independency of the annex with the main house, however, based on the submitted details the annex would still be part and parcel of the existing dwelling. It is also worth noting that the existing property, whether that be accessed from Stancliffe or Mareilian Avenue, has ample space for parking to serve the proposed development.

13. In support of their case, the Council highlight that a bungalow on the site was dismissed. However, I have not been provided with the full details of that appeal and so cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same. In any event, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.

Conditions

14. In terms of the Council's suggested conditions, I find them for the most part reasonable and necessary for the reasons provided. I have reworded the Council's suggested biodiversity condition to reflect the standard condition stated on the appeal questionnaire. I have deleted the Council's proposed condition 4 because the proposed annex would form part and parcel of the existing dwellinghouse use i.e. the use of the extended annex would be physically and/or functionally connected to the use of the main house and a new planning unit would not be created. Furthermore, if following this grant of permission, if the structure is not built or used as proposed, or if there is a future material change of use to create a separate dwelling, then another grant of permission would be required, and the building or use would be at risk of enforcement action if such permission is not granted.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having taken all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

15. In reaching my decision I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. I consider this decision is in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Minister's wellbeing objectives as required by section 8 of the Act.

Declan K Beggan

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 5 years from the date of the original decision, that being 13 January 2022.

   Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

   • Site Location dated 27 July 2025

   • Site Plan 3697 – 2A

   • Existing and proposed floor plans and elevations 3697-25

   Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application.

3. No development shall take place until a scheme for biodiversity enhancement has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the development and thereafter retained.

   Reason: In the interests of biodiversity in accordance with Planning Policy Wales Edition 12 (PPW).

4. Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to occupation of the annex, a 1.8-metre-high close boarded fence encompassing the full extent of the annex along the northern boundary shall be erected and thereafter be retained.

   Reason: In the interests of the residential amenity in accordance with PPW.