



Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 03/02/20

gan H C Davies BA (Hons) Dip UP
MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 12.03.2020

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 03/02/20

by H C Davies BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 12.03.2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E6840/D/19/3244033

Site address: 10 Yew Tree Wood, Bayfield, Chepstow NP16 6AZ

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 Stephanie Balboa against the decision of Monmouthshire County Council.
 - The application Ref DM/2019/01613, dated 01 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as single storey side and rear extension, proposed raised timber deck and new access gate.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on: the character and appearance of the surrounding area; the living conditions of the occupiers of No.11 Yew Tree Wood; and on pedestrian and highway safety with regard to the proposed parking layout.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling, forming part of a short terrace of 3 dwellings situated within a residential estate. Notwithstanding the diversity to the dwelling types and design in the estate as a whole, the appeal property is part of a terrace with a uniform appearance and style. Neither the appeal property nor the adjoining dwellings within this row have been materially altered and they currently appear as a consistent and regular form of development.
 4. It is proposed to erect a single-storey extension on the side elevation, the proposal will also incorporate the detached garage to the rear which will be extended and part converted to create additional habitable accommodation. The single-storey extension will comprise a hipped roof, windows to the side (northern) elevation and a large
-

French door opening in the front elevation. A raised timber deck at the rear of the garage is also proposed.

5. I recognise that given its height and set back from the front elevation the proposed extension would appear as a subservient addition to the existing house. Nevertheless, the hipped roof would be an insensitive roof form that would be out of character with the pitched roofs seen on the surrounding properties. The contrasting pitch would fail to effectively harmonise with the roof of the host property and would disrupt the uniform appearance of the terrace. Furthermore, the proposal would involve a substantial wide glazed opening in the front elevation along with high level windows incorporating horizontal proportions in the side elevation, contrary to the vertical context set by the fenestration of the host property. In doing so, the proposed windows fail to respect the balanced and proportionate appearance of the existing dwelling.
6. I conclude that the appeal scheme would fail to be appropriate to its local context and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This would be contrary to the design objectives of Policy DES1 of the Monmouthshire County Council Local Development Plan (LDP), which amongst other things, seeks to ensure that new development respects the existing form and layout of its setting.

Living Conditions

7. The proposal includes a fenced enclosure at the rear of the property which would be comprised of timber and measure approximately 2.4 metres in height. Whilst it would not be prominent from the public highway, it would be visible from the rear garden of No.11. I accept in some circumstances such a fence could be imposing on an adjoining property, however, in this instance it adjoins a garden with a similar ground level. As a consequence, I find that the proposed fence would not have an unacceptable overbearing or oppressive impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 11. In this respect the proposal would accord with the amenity objectives of LDP Policy DES1.

Parking provision

8. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Monmouthshire Parking Standards 2013' stipulates that the parking standard for houses is 1 space per bedroom. The appeal property is a new build and it is clear that the proposal extension would have an effect on the existing off street parking provision for the appeal property. Whilst the appeal proposal includes alternative provision for a parking area at the front of the property the space would be constrained with cars likely to be parked up close to the front elevation of the house and obstructing one another. This would potentially result in cars overhanging the footway or alternatively parking on the highway. Nonetheless, at the time of my visit, I observed that there were on-street parking spaces available, furthermore, the Council has provided little substantive evidence of any problems associated with parking in the immediate locality. I accept that the proposal would lead to an increase in on-street parking, nevertheless, it has not been demonstrated that this increase would be so significant that it would result in a serious risk to the free flow of traffic or highway and pedestrian safety.
9. In the context of the above, I do not find conflict with Policy MV 1 of the LDP. Whilst the proposal would not technically accord with the parking standards, I do not consider that it would conflict with the overarching aim to ensure that new development is acceptable in highway safety terms.

Conclusion

10. 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.
11. Whilst I have found elements of the proposal to be acceptable in terms of its impact on highway safety and residents' living conditions, its visual harm is an overriding consideration. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

H C Davies

INSPECTOR