

SECTION B – MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

APPEALS DETERMINED

a) Planning Appeals

Appeal Ref: A2018/0014 **Planning Ref:** P2018/0498

PINS Ref: APP/Y6930/D/18/3213634

Applicant: Mr John Jenkins

Proposal: Two storey side extension, alterations to roof and retaining walls

Site Address: 5 Ty Segur, Neath

Appeal Method: Written Representations

Decision Date: 10th August 2018

Decision Code: Appeal allowed

The Inspector considered that the main issues were whether the proposed extension would undermine the architectural quality, distinctive character and proportions of the dwelling and in turn adversely affect the character of the area.

The application was refused consent on the grounds that the proposal would extend the dwelling to create a frontage which would appear too long with no break or set back to differentiate the extension from the dwelling.

The Inspector considered that the dwelling is a detached house in extensive grounds and is therefore unrelated to any others in the area and that its setting and location allowed for a less restrictive approach in terms of design parameters.

The Inspector acknowledged the personal circumstances of the appellant and the advice contained within TAN 12 regarding designing schemes to meet such needs by putting people at the heart of the design process.

The Inspector also gave consideration to whether the council would have approached this differently if it was a new dwelling rather than an extension to an existing dwelling. He concluded that had it been a new dwelling the design concerns would fall away especially given that the scale and massing was necessary to meet the special needs of the appellant. It was acknowledged that the omission of the chimneys which over simplified the roofscape was an error on the appellant's part which could be corrected by condition. Subject to the imposition of this condition and others the Inspector resolved to allow the appeal.

Members should note that when dealing with the planning application for this property, the personal needs of the applicant at that time were indeed taken into account and suggestions were put forward to provide the accommodation required for the occupiers without diluting the character of the property. These suggestions were not acceptable to the applicant hence the submission of this appeal.