



Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Appeal Decision

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 01/05/12

Site visit made on 01/05/12

gan Gareth A. Rennie BSc (Hons) DipTP
Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru
Dyddiad: 01/06/12

by Gareth A. Rennie BSc (Hons) DipTP
an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers
Date: 01/06/12

Appeal Ref: APP/L9503/A/12/2170030

Site address: Ffynnon Faiddog, Whitesands, St Davids, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6PT

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 Jacki Sime against the decision of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/11/510, dated 20 November 2011, was refused by notice dated 26 January 2012.
 - The development proposed is a single storey glazed rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey glazed rear extension at Ffynnon Faiddog, Whitesands, St Davids, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6PT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref NP/11/510, dated 20 November 2011, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than five years from the date of this decision.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding countryside, and the effect of the proposal on the objectives of policies designed to control development and protect the character of the National Park.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a former agricultural building that has been converted and extended. Despite this it retains some of its original characteristics and sits well within the small group of buildings that make up Ffynnon Faiddog.
4. When seen from the road it has a mainly utilitarian form emphasised by the traditional rendered roof and relative sparsity and small size of the window and door openings. However, the rear elevation is dominated by the wood and glass extension and from this direction it has a more domestic character.
5. The proposed extension would be seen within the context of the rear elevation and would be dwarfed by the existing extension. It would be seen as a part of this more contemporary face of the building and would not undermine the remaining agricultural

or utilitarian elements of the building. The rear elevation has undergone considerable change and the proposed small additional extension would be a relatively minor further development. Its glazed nature would allow views into the former fabric of the building and would maintain its legibility whilst allowing further sympathetic development. The link would also allow a more rational use of space and the overall impact would be a relatively minor one.

6. The lean-to roof would be different from the existing roofscape in form and pitch. Nevertheless, lean-to roofs are a traditional part of agricultural buildings in the area, often utilising different materials from the main building, and numerous examples can be seen locally. The use of wood and glass has already been established on the appeal building and the form of the link would be seen as a more modern interpretation of the way in which such traditional buildings evolved. It would also reflect the current use of the building and complement the existing extension and would not be seen as an incongruous addition to it.
7. Furthermore, the site is well screened and the limited views into it from the road would not change. There are views from the elevated area the north and north-west but these are largely long distance. Overall, the existing extension would dominate and the current proposal would be seen as part of that overall development.
8. For these reasons I consider that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the existing building, or the surrounding area; nor would it undermine the special qualities of the National Park. It does not therefore conflict with Policies 15 and 30 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Adopted Local Development Plan.
9. Consequently for the reasons given above, and having considered all other matters raised I consider that the appeal should be allowed.

Gareth A. Rennie

Inspector