
Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 27/02/20

gan H C Davies BA (Hons) Dip UP
MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 08.04.2020

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27/02/20

by H C Davies BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 08.04.2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T6850/A/19/3243827

Site address: 24 Palleg Road, Lower Cwmtwrch, Swansea SA9 2QE

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 Gareth Thomas against the decision of Powys County Council.
 - The application Ref 19/1187/FUL, dated 22 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2019.
 - The development is proposed demolition of existing property and construction of new dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is occupied by a traditional double frontage detached dwelling on the eastern side of Palleg Road. It is of relatively simple appearance with its hipped roof and external rendered walls. Whilst the general area is characterised by dwellings of varying design and appearance, the appeal property forms part of a row of houses, which despite having different roof forms, in the main are of a similar scale and have a largely uniform appearance with a common rhythm and pattern of fenestration to the front elevations. Furthermore, the houses generally occupy a central location within the plot and the gaps in built form allow a spacious and pleasant residential character. The modest and consistent character of this group is a distinct feature of this part of the street scene and provide the primary setting in which the proposal would be seen.
 4. Policy H9 of the Powys Local Development Plan (LDP) permits a replacement dwelling provided, amongst other things, that it is located within or adjacent to the footprint of the former habitable dwelling and reflects the form, size and scale of the former habitable dwelling unless there are demonstrable planning advantages to be gained from deviating from the former dwelling's orientation, position or size. It also states
-

that a replacement dwelling should respect or enhance the design of the original dwelling and those of surrounding properties and the locality. Policy DM13 requires, amongst other things, that proposals demonstrate good design and have regard to the qualities and amenity of the surrounding area.

5. Whilst the principle of a replacement dwelling in this location is acceptable and the proposal would lie in part on the footprint of the existing dwelling, the proposed replacement dwelling would be substantially larger than the original dwelling. The ridge height of the proposed dwelling would be taller than the existing dwelling and the dwelling would also be far wider. This substantial bulk would be readily apparent in views from Palleg Road and compared to the modest scale of the adjacent properties, the resultant dwelling would be overbearing in scale. Furthermore, its elevated position would afford it a prominence that would draw the eye of people using the road which would exacerbate the identified harm. Given that the dwelling would be sited within a spacious plot, it would not represent over development of the site and being set back in the plot is not of any particular concern to me. However, the dwelling would extend across most of the width of the plot, considerably reducing the space between No.24 and No.22 and contribute towards eroding the spacing and separation between the properties that is a key attribute of the character of this group of dwellings.
6. The appeal proposal differs from the existing property in design and appearance. Its front elevation, in particular, would be completely at odds with neighbouring residential properties. I noted that houses in Palleg Road consist of a range of finishes, however, in the main these have stayed consistently within a limited palette of finishes and colour. This proposal, however, would fundamentally alter the appearance of the street scene as it is proposed to finish the front elevation in natural stone cladding panels. Furthermore, the proposal involves wide glazed openings incorporating horizontal proportions, contrary to the vertical context set by the fenestration of the host and adjacent properties, and a half-hipped roof, which, by virtue of its scale and design, would be an insensitive roof form that would be out of character with the prevailing roofs seen on the surrounding properties. Overall, the front elevation is not reflective of the scale, proportion and articulation of the original dwelling as required by policy and this elevation is prominent to the roadside and would be at odds with the traditional form of building it replaced. The consequence would be that the continuity of the traditional character of this row of houses would not be reflected in the proposal and although these effects would be localised to a small part of the overall street scene, they would nevertheless result in significant visual harm.
7. I conclude that the proposal would not reflect the form, size or scale of the dwelling it would replace and by reason of its scale and design would harm the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that there are planning advantages to be gained from deviating from the former dwelling's position or size. It therefore conflicts with Policies H9 and DM13 of the LDP.

Other Matters

8. Having regard to the appellant's reference to the development opposite the Cwmpbil Road-Palleg Road junction, which I viewed on my site visit, it is sited within a row of dwellings of varying design and appearance, which differentiates it from the case before me and has not therefore had any significant influence on the area's character or the individual context of the appeal property to warrant the identified harm.

9. I have also taken into account the appellant's contention that a substantial amount of development could be carried out as permitted development and which represents a fall-back position. However, I have no substantive evidence before me that there is a high probability that this would occur in this instance or that it would have a similar or greater impact on the character of the area than the proposal for a large independent detached house. As such I give this consideration limited weight.

Conclusion

10. 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 objectives set out in section 8 of the WCFG Act.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

H C Davies

INSPECTOR