

SECTION B – MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

APPEAL DECISIONS

a) Planning Appeals

Appeal Ref: A2019/5005 **Planning Ref:** P2019/5292

PINS Ref: APP/Y6930/D/19/3239260

Applicant: Mr Robin Addams

Proposal: Single-storey storeroom extension

Site Address: 5 Queen Street, Glyncothwng, SA13 3BL

Start Date: 25th October 2019

Appeal Method: Written Reps

[Appeal Decision Letter](#)

The main issue was the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

The Inspector noted that the storeroom would extend approximately 9.0 metres out to the side of the dwelling and to a depth of 3.6 metres, and would protrude approximately 1.8 metres beyond the front elevation of the host property. The elevation on which the extension would be built was clearly the principal front elevation of the house - as seen from the front garden area and from views from the main road below – and he noted that neither the appeal property nor the adjoining dwelling had been extended or altered on their front elevations. Accordingly they currently appear as a relatively uniform and aesthetically pleasing pair of semi-detached stone cottages.

Stating that good design should be applied to all development including alterations to individual buildings, he found the appearance of the development fails to meet this objective as the proposed extension would be a significant addition to the front and side of the appeal property. The development would also be out of

proportion with the existing house and would not seem subordinate to it as a result, and would undermine the identity and composition of the dwelling because it would be overly dominant and disproportionate in scale and bulk. In his judgement, he considered “the dwelling would be overwhelmed by the proposal, and its identity and composition lost in particular when seen from public viewpoints below”.

For the above reasons he considered the proposed storeroom extension would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. As a result, the appeal proposal conflicted with Policy BE1 of the Adopted Local Development Plan and the Council’s Design SPG.