

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

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

DATE: **16TH DECEMBER 2015**

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

SUBJECT: **APPEAL BY MR. MARK ALLEN AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE REMOVAL OF EXISTING ROOF, DEMOLITION OF EXISTING FLAT-ROOFED GARAGE AND ERECTION OF NEW GARAGE, ERECTION OF EXTENSION TO REAR OF GARAGE, CONSTRUCTION OF NEW HIGHER-PITCHED ROOF OVER THE WHOLE STRUCTURE TO CREATE NEW ROOMS IN THE ROOF SPACE AT 28 SUMMERDALE ROAD, QUEENSFERRY - DISMISSED**

1.00 APPLICATION NUMBER

1.01 053329

2.00 APPLICANT

2.01 MR. MARK ALLEN

3.00 SITE

3.01 28 SUMMERDALE ROAD,
QUEENSFERRY.

4.00 APPLICATION VALID DATE

4.01 24/ 2/2015

5.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

5.01 To inform Members of the decision made in the appeal against the refusal by the Planning Committee of planning permission for the removal of existing roof, demolition of existing flat-roofed garage and erection of new garage, erection of extension to rear of garage construction of new higher pitched roof over the whole structure to create new rooms in the roof space at Summerdale Road, Queensferry. The appeal was considered by written representations and was DISMISSED.

6.00 REPORT

- 6.01 The application was refused at planning committee on 24th June 2015 for the following reason:-

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposal, due to its scale and massing, and increase in roof height would introduce a discordant note into the streetscene which would be visually harmful to its character and appearance. As such the proposal conflicts with Policy GEN 1 (a) and Policy HSG 12 of the Flintshire Unitary Development Plan.

- 6.02 In determining the appeal, the Inspector considered that the main issue in this case was the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the streetscene. The Inspector noted that the site is located within an estate comprising bungalows, some of which have gables facing the road whilst others have ridges parallel to the road and others have hipped roofs presenting a varied roofscape. Although some have had various alterations and extensions the general roof height of dwellings is consistent.

- 6.03 It was noted upon the site visit that no. 25 Summerdale Road had had its roof raised in height but the span had not been significantly increased.

- 6.04 The Inspector found that the proposal would result in the scale, mass and height of the property being at odds with other properties in the street, and the combined effect of raising the roof and increasing the span to incorporate the new extension would result in a scale, mass and height that would be a prominent and discordant feature within the street scene, harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal was concluded therefore to be contrary to Policies GEN and HSG 12.

- 6.05 The Inspector has also given regard to the previous appeal decision relating to a similar proposal on this site, and acknowledges that the current proposal has attempted to overcome the initial concerns. Nonetheless, the proposals would provide a roof that would be higher and wider than others in the street resulting in a scale and mass which would be harmful for the reason identified above.

7.00 CONCLUSION

- 7.01 For the reasons given above the Inspector concluded the appeal should be dismissed.

LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Planning Application & Supporting Documents

National & Local Planning Policy

Responses to Consultation

Responses to Publicity

Contact Officer: Jenni Perkins
Telephone: 01352 703327
Email: jenni.perkins@flintshire.gov.uk