
Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 14/12/16

**gan Paul Selby BEng (Hons) MSc
MRTPI**

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru
Dyddiad: 20.12.2016

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14/12/16

by Paul Selby BEng (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers
Date: 20.12.2016

Appeal Ref: APP/E6840/D/16/3161437

Site address: 109A Chapel Road, Abergavenny NP7 7DR

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 Eric Evans against the decision of Monmouthshire County Council.
 - The application Ref DC/2016/00701, dated 14 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is Erection of a free-standing car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character of appearance of the Abergavenny Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a site occupied by a dormer bungalow and attached garage at the junction of Chapel Road and North Street within the Abergavenny CA. In the vicinity of the appeal site the CA accommodates mainly two storey residential dwellings of various ages and designs, but those which date from the original expansion of the town are predominantly of stone or brick construction, finished with render or sandstone, framed by generous front gardens and low stone walls and interspersed with substantial areas of foliage. The consistent appearance of these properties and later, sensitive residential insertions contribute positively to the character and appearance of the CA.
 4. The shallow, hipped roofs of the house and attached garage are materially different in appearance to the taller pitched and gabled roofs of the adjacent residential properties. The wooden fence marking the boundary of the corner plot further emphasises the atypical visual appearance of the appeal site and, despite the low height of the dwelling, affords it a somewhat prominent appearance within the immediate street scene.
-

5. The southern elevation of the car port would abut the boundary of 109 Chapel Road, encroaching on the otherwise spacious setting of the adjacent two storey property, a building of significant architectural merit which contributes positively to the CA. Whilst it would share a consistent building line with the east elevation of the house, the pitched roof of the structure would relate awkwardly to the hipped roof of the dwelling and would obscure a chimney on the flank elevation of the dwelling, the stone finish of which reflects the predominant building material of the older properties nearby. The wood construction, whilst reflective of various nearby boundary treatments, would relate poorly to the predominantly render and slate exteriors of the dwelling. The singular use of wood would reinforce the overtly rural appearance of the car port which, despite the substantial mature trees and foliage nearby, would conflict with the prevailing 'town in country' architectural style of the immediate vicinity.
6. Public views of the appeal structure would be limited only to Chapel Road. Nevertheless, this is an important thoroughfare within this part of the CA, from which the proposed car port would appear as an incongruous and unsympathetic addition to the host property that would draw the eye. Its impact on the appeal site and immediate vicinity would be substantially adverse.
7. Other examples of wooden structures in the CA have been referred to, which I saw during my site visit. I am not aware of the full circumstances of the other cases being referred to, though it may be that some were built without planning permission or benefitted from permitted development rights when constructed. Whilst I accept that the nearby structure at Crossways is more prominently located than that proposed, this in itself does not justify the appeal proposal as each application must be considered on its individual merits at the time of the decision. Consequently I have attached limited weight to these other examples.
8. I acknowledge that the limited size of the existing single garage limits its use for vehicle storage. I also note that the Town Council has not raised any objections. However, these matters do not outweigh the identified harm.
9. I have considered the duty to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales, in accordance with the sustainable development principle, under section 3 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 (the WBFG Act). In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the ways of working set out at section 5 of the WBFG Act and I consider that this decision is in accordance with the sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives set out in section 8 of the WBFG Act.
10. Having regard to the duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I conclude that the appeal proposal would appear as a discordant and visually intrusive feature that would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA, and would be contrary to the conservation and design objectives of policies HE1 and DES1 of the Monmouthshire Local Development Plan.
11. For the given reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Selby

INSPECTOR