

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

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

DATE: **22ND JUNE 2016**

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

SUBJECT: **APPEAL BY MR. & MRS S. PARKER AGAINST THE NON-DETERMINATION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL FOR THE ERECTION OF A REPLACEMENT DWELLING AND ANCILLARY WORKS AT GELLI FARM, GELLI ROAD, PEN YR ALLT, TRELOGAN – DISMISSED**

1.00 APPLICATION NUMBER

1.01 054273

2.00 APPLICANT

2.01 MR. & MRS S. PARKER

3.00 SITE

3.01 GELLI FARM,
GELLI ROAD,
PEN YR ALLT, TRELOGAN

4.00 APPLICATION VALID DATE

4.01 11 September 2015

5.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

5.01 To inform Members of an appeal decision in respect of the non-determination of planning permission for the erection of a replacement dwelling and ancillary works at Gelli Farm , Gelli, Pen y Allt , Trelogan.

5.02 The subsequent appeal was considered under the written representation procedure and was Dismissed on 11 May 2016.

6.00 REPORT

- 6.01 The Inspector considered the main issue in the consideration of this appeal to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
- 6.02 The Inspector noted the stripped out nature of the existing traditional farmhouse as a Building of Local Interest, and accepted that the principle of a replacement dwelling was acceptable, but that the form and scale of the replacement dwelling was the main matter in dispute.
- 6.03 The Inspector noted policy HE4 which indicates that the design of the replacement dwelling should match or exceed that which is demolished and Policy HSG6 indicates that the new dwelling should be of a similar scale to the existing dwelling and should reflect the character and traditional building style of the locality in terms of scale, design, form and materials used.
- 6.04 It was noted that the replacement dwelling would be taller and wider than the original dwelling and the wall plate would be higher. The proposed windows at first floor level to the front elevation would be wider casements than the existing traditional dormers and the new windows would sit below the eaves.
- 6.05 The ground floor windows would be taller than the existing openings, whilst the shippon is largely to be unchanged. The Inspector considered that the proposed front elevation was not reflective of the original farmhouse due to the proportion of the proposed building being different and the articulation of the design is not traditional or reflective of that design nor is it a contemporary take on the contextual qualities of the old building. The scale, form and the windows design make up the simple vernacular character of the existing and that would be lost on the proposed front elevation.
- 6.06 The Inspector further considered that the proposal would not match or exceed the original dwellings design and would therefore fail to comply with policies HE4 and HSG6. Whilst he noted that the replacement dwelling should not replicate the existing dwelling, he noted the policy clearly outlines the approach required, especially in relation to Buildings of Local Interest. The proposal has not achieved these and in particular on the proposed front elevation, with the loss of the intimate scale and width of the original building and the original window openings, which he considered to be more reflective of a modern house. The vertical alignment of the front widows in the existing frontage provide balance and symmetry, whilst the proposal fails to reflect this in terms of proportion, rhythm and detail.

- 6.07 The proposed south elevation is reflective of the traditional layout of farmsteads and the linked wing is set low in to the ground and this was considered to make for an interesting contemporary design to the traditional range, however the proposed chimney was considered to lacking in interest and design. The Inspector had no significant objection to the size of the replacement dwelling, however the historic character of the area would not be reflected in the proposal and would thereby harm the character and appearance of the area.
- 6.08 The Inspector noted the personal circumstances cited, but by dismissing this appeal considered that the extant permission granted in 2012 would meet the wellbeing objectives in relation to Mr Goddard.

7.00 CONCLUSION

- 7.01 Having regard to the above, the Inspector concluded that the current proposal would not comply with the relevant policies of the Unitary Development Plan and that the proposal would adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the area and dismissed the appeal.

LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Planning Application & Supporting Documents
National & Local Planning Policy
Responses to Consultation
Responses to Publicity

Contact Officer: Barbara Kinnear
Telephone: (01352) 703260
Email: Barbara.kinnear@flintshire.gov.uk