

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

REPORT TO: **PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

DATE: **11TH DECEMBER 2013**

REPORT BY: **HEAD OF PLANNING**

SUBJECT: **APPEAL BY MR. STEPHEN DALE AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR A PROPOSED LOFT CONVERSION WITH SIDE DORMER AT 50 HIGHLAND AVENUE, QUEENSFERRY – DISMISSED.**

1.00 APPLICATION NUMBER

1.01 050542

2.00 APPLICANT

2.01 MR STEPHEN DALE

3.00 SITE

3.01 50 HIGHLAND AVENUE
QUEENSFERRY
DEESIDE

4.00 APPLICATION VALID DATE

4.01 22nd February 2013

5.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

5.01 To inform Members of the Inspectors decision in relation to an appeal into the refusal of planning permission for the proposed loft conversion with side at 50 Highland Avenue, Queensferry, Deeside by the Head of Planning under delegated powers. The appeal was held by way of Written Representation and a site visit. The Appeal was DISMISSED.

6.00 REPORT

6.01 Introduction

The inspector considered that the main issue in the case was the effect the proposal would have on the street scene along Highland

Avenue.

6.02 Appeal Site and Surrounding Area

The Inspector noted that the proposal related to a bungalow in a residential area characterised predominantly by bungalows of varying design. Some of the bungalows have dormer extensions that extend above the original ridge line. The extensions vary in scale and design with some being on a single roof plane and others on both sides.

6.03 He considered that extending the dormers above the ridge line unbalances the scale and simple design of the parent building and in his opinion results in an incongruous and unbalanced development. He considered the dormers disrupt the simple roofscape in the area and are visually harmful to the street scene.

6.04 The planning permissions that he had been referred to as part of the appeal process were granted before the Flintshire Unitary Development Plan (UDP) was adopted in September 2011. Whilst He acknowledge that the appellant wanted to reflect what has already occurred on other similar buildings, He considered those extensions were on a minority of the dwellings in the area and it would not be appropriate to exacerbate this harm to the street scene with further development of a similar nature.

6.05 Policy

For this reasons He concluded that the scale, design and appearance of the proposed extension would not be in harmony with its surroundings as required by Unitary Development Plan Policy GEN1. General Requirements for Development. Further more he considered the poor design would be contrary to UDP Policies D1 Design Quality, Location and Layout and HSG12 House Extensions and Alterations.

6.06 He acknowledged the appellant's reasons for wanting to enlarge the dwelling, but did not consider they justified the proposal that was before him.

7.00 CONCLUSION

7.01 Consequently and having regard to all other matters raised, including the representations made by the occupiers of a neighbouring dwelling the Inspector concluded that the appeal should be DISMISSED.

Contact Officer: Kathryn Y Taylor
Telephone: 01352 703274
Email: Kathryn_y_taylor@flintshire.gov.uk