
Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 26/03/18

gan Nicola Gulley MA MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 08/05/18

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26/03/18

by Nicola Gulley MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 08/05/18

Appeal Ref: APP/E6840/D/18/3197934

Site address: 2, Woodland View, Rogiet, Caldicot, Monmouthshire NP26 3SY

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 Lee Furmage against the decision of Monmouthshire County Council.
 - The application Ref DC/2017/01311, dated 3 November 2017, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2017.
 - The development proposed is a front extension and adjacent porch to front of building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Policy DES1 of the Monmouthshire Local Development Plan (LDP) (2014) seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that development is of a high standard of design and respects the local character and distinctiveness of the built and natural landscape of the area.
 4. The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential area in the Rogiet district of Caldicot. The site comprises a traditional semi-detached dwelling set in a substantial wedge shaped garden which is located at the junction of Woodland View and Grenville Terrace. The appeal property is one of 26 semi-detached dwellings located in a large enclosed cul-de-sac to the rear of Ifton Road. The properties adjacent to, and within this cul-de-sac are of a simple symmetrical design and set out to a uniform development pattern. Whilst there are exceptions to this design and layout, most notably along Grenville Terrace, this does not undermine the characteristic uniformity of these buildings.
 5. The development proposes the construction a single storey extension and porch in the front elevation of the appeal dwelling. The proposed single storey extension would
-

have a mono-pitched roof line, measure 2.8 metres wide by some 6.6 metres long and be sited in the front elevation of the appeal dwelling, whilst the porch, which would also have a mono-pitched roofline, would measure 2.3 metres wide by 3.5 metres long and be positioned to follow the line of the existing side extension.

6. Although not of a significant scale individually, I am mindful that the combination of the proposed extension and porch would occupy approximately three quarters of the ground floor front elevation of the host dwelling and would, because of their width, project forward of the established building line along Woodlands View. The proposal would in my view fail to respect the simple symmetrical form and layout of the adjoining dwelling and other properties in the cul-de-sac and would result in the creation of a visually discordant form of development. As such I consider that the proposed development would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area and would be contrary to the objectives of policy DES1 of the adopted LDP.
7. In support of the proposal the appellant has drawn my attention to a number of dwellings in the locality which it is suggested have front extensions similar to the proposed development. Whilst I note that there are some similarities, I am mindful that in a number of cases the structures are an integral part of design of the dwellings or they are not located within areas which have the same uniformity of design as that of the appeal site. As such I do not consider that these developments directly parallel the circumstances of this case. I have in any case, determined the appeal before me on its own merits.

Conclusions

8. 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 that this decision is in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards the Welsh Ministers' well-being objective of supporting safe, cohesive and resilient communities.
9. I have also had regard to all the matters raised in support of the scheme. However, none of these factors are sufficient to alter my overall conclusions that the proposed development would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Gulley

INSPECTOR