

---

## Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 04/11/15

**Gan Nicola Gulley MA MRTPI**

**Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru**

**Dyddiad: 10/12/2015**

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 04/11/15

**by Nicola Gulley MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers**

**Date: 10/12/2015**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E6840/A/15/3133005**

**Site address: Highway Barn, Mitchel Troy Common, Monmouthshire, NP25 4JB**

**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 Stuart Maidment against the decision of Monmouthshire County Council.
  - The application Ref DC/2015/00064, dated 20 January 2015, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2015.
  - The development proposed is the surrender of extant permission of extension and propose new extension with basement in new location.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. This is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

### Preliminary Matters

3. The development proposes the surrender of the extant planning permission for a single storey side extension, approved in June 2007 and the construction of a single storey extension in the front elevation of the existing building and a basement extension.
4. The Development Plan for the area is the adopted Monmouthshire Local Development Plan (LDP) (2014). Policies relevant to the appeal include S1, S13, S17, H4, LC4, EP1 and DES1 which seek to ensure that development conserves and enhances the landscape of the Wye Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), is of a high standard of design and respects the rural character and distinctiveness of the area.

### Reasons

5. The appeal site is situated on a small raised plateau above the rural settlement of Mitchel Troy Common, in the Wye Valley AONB. The site comprises a traditional stone built agricultural building that has been converted to a dwelling. Whilst the form of the building has been subject to some alteration it retains much of its original rural
-

character and appearance. Vehicular access to the site is via a private drive and there are a number of designated public rights of way within close proximity of the appeal site.

6. In order to protect the special qualities of the countryside Policy H4 requires that only modest extensions should be allowed to rural properties and that development should respect the character and appearance of the host building. In this instance, the development proposes the addition of a single storey ground floor extension and a basement extension. Whilst the single storey ground floor extension is of a scale that is subordinate to the existing dwelling, the curved design of the extension and its siting, projecting forward of the front elevation, would have the appearance of being a discordant addition to the structure which would not respect the simple, traditional, linear form of the host dwelling. Moreover, the addition of a basement extension of the scale proposed would double the footprint of the host dwelling and effectively result in the creation of a two storey dwelling. In doing so, the proposed basement extension would, by virtue of its scale, overwhelm the host dwelling and would result in the loss of the traditional character and appearance of the former agricultural building.
7. In addition, whilst the location of the host building means that the proposed development would not occupy a prominent position in the landscape, it would nevertheless, be visible from vantage points along public rights of way and as a result would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In these circumstances, I consider that the proposed development would be discordant and would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the existing rural building or the AONB and as such would not comply with the objectives of LDP Policies S1, S13, S17, H4, LC4, DES1 and EP1.
8. Further concerns have been raised about the impact of the proposed development on trees. There are a number of mature trees within the curtilage of the appeal site including two Oaks which are protected by tree preservation orders. These trees which are located to the south (T1) and west (T2) of the existing dwelling are prominent in the landscape and make an important contribution to the rural character and appearance of the area. Tree T1 is located some distance away from the property and I am satisfied would not be unacceptably effected by the proposal. However, tree T2 is located close to the existing dwelling and its canopy overhangs the roof of the property. I am mindful that no detailed arboricultural information has been submitted however, on the basis of the limited information that has been provided and my observations at the site visit I consider that the construction of the basement extension would have an adverse effect on tree T2 further detracting from the character and appearance of the area and reinforce my main conclusion. As such I consider that the proposed development would not comply with the objectives of LDP Policies S13, LC4 and EP1.

### **Other Matters**

9. By way of mitigation, the appellant is proposing to surrender the planning permission for construction of a single storey side extension granted under application reference DC/2007/00563 in June 2007. I noted at the time of my site visit that the extension was under construction and therefore would appear to benefit from an extant consent. Notwithstanding this, I consider that the extension is of a modest scale and its removal would not provide mitigation for the proposed substantial increase in the footprint of the host dwelling.

## **Conclusions**

10. In reaching my decision I have had regard to all the matters raised. However, none of these factors are sufficient to alter my overall conclusions. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Nicola Gulley*

INSPECTOR