

**FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

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

**DATE:** **21<sup>ST</sup> JANUARY 2015**

**REPORT BY:** **CHIEF OFFICER (PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT)**

**SUBJECT:** **APPEAL BY MS A. WYNN AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING GARAGE AND ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY EXTENSION WITH GARAGE ON GROUND FLOOR AT 1 GORDON TERRACE, KING STREET, MOLD – DISMISSED.**

**1.00 APPLICATION NUMBER**

1.01 051885

**2.00 APPLICANT**

2.01 MS A WYNN

**3.00 SITE**

3.01 1 GORDON TERRACE,  
KING STREET, MOLD.

**4.00 APPLICATION VALID DATE**

4.01 12/03/2014

**5.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

5.01 To inform members of an appeal decision in respect of the refusal of demolition of an existing garage and erection of a two storey extension with garage on ground floor at 1 Gordon Terrace, King Street, Mold.

5.02 The application subject to the appeal was refused under delegated powers on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2014. The subsequent appeal was dealt with under the Householder Appeal Service and was DISMISSED on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2014.

## **6.00 REPORT**

- 6.01 The Inspector considered that the main issues of the case were the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene, and residents' living conditions with regard to outlook and the provision of private amenity space.
- 6.02 The Inspector noted that whilst the extension proposed would be set back from the front elevation and below the existing ridge level, introducing an element of subservience, the angle of the hipped roof would differ and be at odds with the angle of the roof of 1 Gordon Terrace. The difference in the design and angle of the roof, combined with the tapering of the side elevation of the extension towards the rear of the property, would make the extension appear contrived and fail to reflect the form and style of the host property. The scale of the extension would also substantially increase the apparent bulk of the appeal property and obscure the original form.
- 6.03 He noted that the appeal property forms part of a terrace which displays distinct uniformity. Many of the terraced properties have been extended to the rear changing the appearance of the rear elevations however when viewed from King Street the terrace appears largely unaltered in terms of character and architectural style. The proposed extension would stand out as a discordant element at one end of the terrace and would harmfully disrupt and unbalance the uniform qualities of Gordon Terrace as a whole.
- 6.04 There is currently a sense of space between No. 1 Gordon Terrace and No. 2 King Street, achieved primarily as a result of the gap that exists above the existing single storey-storey garage. The extension would significantly reduce this gap, and its additional height and massing above the garage would be brought unacceptably close to the boundary, having an imposing and oppressive effect on the occupants of the adjacent dwelling Hyfrydle. The outlook from the front habitable rooms of the property which directly face the extension would be unduly harmed. The living conditions of no. 2 King Street however would not be affected by the proposal.
- 6.05 The inspector notes that the appeal property already benefits from a rear extension which has left a modest amount of amenity space to the side of the property. The proposed extension would remove a significant portion of the amenity space left for the occupiers to enjoy and the Inspector considers that the level of private amenity space that would remain would be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of the host dwelling.

## **7.00 CONCLUSION**

- 7.01 Having regard to the above, the Inspector concludes that the

proposed extension would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene. It would also have a damaging impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling with regard to outlook, and would not provide acceptable living conditions to the occupiers of the host dwelling with regard to the provision of private amenity space. As a result, the appeal proposal would conflict with Policies GEN 1, D1, D2 and HSG 12 of the Adopted Flintshire Unitary Development Plan.

**LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Planning Application & Supporting Documents

National & Local Planning Policy

Responses to Consultation

Responses to Publicity

**Contact Officer:** Jenni Faire  
**Telephone:** (01352) 703327  
**Email:** [jenni.faire@flintshire.gov.uk](mailto:jenni.faire@flintshire.gov.uk)