

---

## Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 30/08/17

gan **Richard Duggan BSc (Hons)**  
**DipTP MRTPI**

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 05.09.2017

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30/08/17

by **Richard Duggan BSc (Hons) DipTP**  
**MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 05.09.2017

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T6850/D/17/3181096**

**Site address: Frondirion, Penegoes, Machynlleth SY20 8NH**

**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 Anthony Roberts against the decision of Powys County Council.
  - The application Ref P/2017/0275, dated 2 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2017.
  - The development proposed is described as 'removal of garage and construction of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension, re-roofing of existing conservatory, installation of energy saving measures and improvements to access visibility'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues in this case to be the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on highway safety.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The Council's Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 'The Powys Residential Design Guide' (2004) advises that extensions can have a pronounced effect on the appearance of a dwelling through the balance and proportions of the property, and that attention should be paid to the height, proportion, scale, roof pitches, gable features, materials and fenestration. Although the SPG provides guidance only, it goes on to state that side extensions should be subordinate to the original dwelling in terms of scale and positioning, and they should ideally be set back from the main building line. The front elevation of the proposed side extension would project out from the existing front elevation of the host dwelling and the ridge line would have the same ridge height, thus conflicting with the advice contained within the SPG.
  4. The proposed side extension would be a significant addition to the appeal property and would unbalance the simple form of the existing dwelling. The scale and mass of the side extension would be out of proportion with the existing house and it would not seem subordinate to it as a result, despite the attempt to set part of the extension
-

down from the existing roofline. In my judgement, the dwelling would be overwhelmed by the proposal, and its identity and composition lost in particular when seen from the main road.

5. The proposal also includes a single-storey rear extension. The Council has not put forward any objections to the proposed rear extension, and I agree with this assessment. However, as the rear extension would be connected to the rear of the proposed side extension it would not be possible to separate them.
6. In the context that I have described, and by reason of its design, scale and siting forward of the front elevation, the proposed side extension would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling contrary to Policies GP1 and HP16 of the Adopted Powys County Council Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2010 and the advice contained within the SPG.

#### *Highway safety*

7. Due to the alignment of the current access it is proposed to make alterations to it to improve visibility for vehicles. However, the Welsh Government (WG) Highways Directorate objects to the proposal as the submitted information does not adequately demonstrate compliance with the standards contained within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).
8. As the Appellant has not addressed the concerns of WG the Council objects to the proposed works to the access. Having regard to the evidence, I have no reason to reach a different conclusion on this issue and that it would have a harmful impact on highway safety contrary to Policy GP4 of the UDP.
9. The Appellant's grounds of appeal requests that the proposed improvements to the access can be removed from the appeal development to avoid refusal. Irrespective of whether this part of the development is removed from the appeal proposal, this does not negate or outweigh my concerns regarding the harmful effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

#### **Conclusions**

10. My attention has been drawn to a similar development in Machynlleth. However, I do not have the full details of this scheme and so cannot be sure that it represents a direct comparison to the appeal proposal. In any case, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own planning merits.
11. I appreciate that the extension would provide the additional living accommodation required by the Appellant and his family. However, this does not carry sufficient weight to overcome the concerns already identified in respect of the appeal.
12. 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.
13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Richard Duggan*

INSPECTOR