
Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 06/08/21

gan A L McCooey, BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 19/8/21

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 06/08/21

by A L McCooey, BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 19/8/21

Appeal Ref: APP/U6925/D/21/3278544

Site address: Lyndhurst, 23 Hanover Street, Merthyr Tydfil, CF47 8SW

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 & Mrs C Jones against the decision of Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: P/21/0031 dated 30 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is Rear extensions to ground and first floor above existing lower ground floor annexe.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The description of development has been changed from that used on the application form (contrary to the information supplied on the appeal form). I consider the revised description to be more accurate and as it is used by both the Local Planning Authority and the appellant, I adopt the revised description in this decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The land to the rear of the site is at a lower level where there is a rear lane leading to a row of garages. There is open land with some trees behind the garages. A path and steps traverse this land, linking to Hanover Street. Dane Street is perpendicular to the east with a terrace of 5 dwellings at right angles to the properties in Hanover Street. The appeal property is a terrace house with three storeys to the rear. It is proposed to construct a full width flat roof extension on top of the existing lower ground floor extension. A smaller first floor extension with a ridged roof is proposed on top.
-

5. Policy SW11 of the Merthyr Tydfil Local Development Plan (LDP) requires new development to be appropriate in design and materials to its local context without detriment to local amenity. Advice for this type of development is contained in the Design Guide for Householder Development Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). The design principles in the SPG for rear extensions require a matching roof design in terms of its style, form and pitch.
6. The dwelling is at a higher level which increases its prominence. The proposal consisting of a two-storey flat roofed extension with a smaller ridged roof extension on top would result in a mix of extensions to the rear of the property. The flat roof design would not match that of the roof of the main house. The combination of flat roof and ridged roof designs would present an incongruous appearance in the rear streetscene. There would also be a lack of consistency in the proposed window designs. The roof design would not comply with the design principles in the SPG. The elevated position means that the proposal would be seen from the rear lane and from adjoining properties. It would also be visible from the path and steps despite some screening from the adjoining trees. For these reasons, I consider that the design of the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and the dwelling itself.
7. There are 3 existing flat roof extensions to the nearby properties in Dane Street. However, the majority of existing extensions in the local area have ridged roofs. Flat roofed extensions are not characteristic of the area and the 3 existing ones do not justify the approval of a poor design such as the appeal proposal. The appellant outlines some construction difficulties in terms of impact on existing windows and providing a shallow roof pitch. These issues could be addressed by adopting a comprehensive review of the design approach to extending this property. The Council considers that the impacts on the occupiers of adjoining properties would be acceptable and I agree with this reasoning.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and the dwelling itself and would be contrary to Policy SW11 and advice in the accompanying SPG. Having taken all relevant matters into consideration I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.
9. 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 (the Act). 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 as required by section 8 of the Act. I consider that this decision is in accordance with the guidance on the Act in Planning Policy Wales regarding the principles of good design and placemaking.

A L McCooey

Inspector