

**FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

**REPORT TO:** **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** **6<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2019**

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

**SUBJECT:** **APPEAL BY MR. & MRS C. PATRICK AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE FORMATION OF DORMER EXTENSIONS TO FRONT AND REAR OF DWELLING AT 13 MOORCROFT, NEW BRIGHTON – DISMISSED.**

**1.00 APPLICATION NUMBER**

1.01 058147

**2.00 SITE**

2.01 13 Moorcroft, New Brighton

**3.00 APPLICATION VALID DATE**

3.01 28<sup>th</sup> February 2018

**4.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

4.01 To inform Members of a decision in respect of an appeal, following the decision of the Local Planning Authority, under delegated powers, to refuse to grant planning permission for the formation of dormer extensions to front and rear of dwelling at 13 Moorcroft, New Brighton.

The appointed Planning Inspector was Mr Iwan Lloyd. The appeal was determined via the Written Representations method and was DISMISSED

**5.00 REPORT**

**Main Issues**

5.01 The Inspector considered the main issues to be, the effect of the proposal on the street scene, and the effect on the living conditions of nearby residents in relation to privacy.

## **Street scene**

- 5.02 The Inspector noted the context of the site and its surroundings. He notes the combination of these features, the dominant width of the dormer, its height and box-like appearance would be an uncharacteristic feature in the immediate area where no such feature is present. From the roadside the proposal would appear to cause imbalance to the pair of bungalows and would disrupt the horizontal design of the dwelling introducing an elongated flat roof feature high-up on the roof slope. As a result the proposal would appear incongruous and out of character with its immediate neighbours.
- 5.03 The Inspector notes the examples of other dormers put forward by the appellants as justification for the proposed development. However, he does not consider that these examples provide justification for the development which in itself is harmful to the character of the street scene immediately adjoining the appeal site, failing to harmonise with the site and surroundings.

## **Privacy**

- 5.04 The inspector notes that the rear dormer would be positioned near the common boundary of the other half of the pair of semi-detached bungalows and the proximity of the windows and their height would overlook the rear garden of next door No. 14 Moorcroft. Whilst there is already an element of overlooking from the properties to the side of the appeal site the proposed rear windows of the dormer would have clear views of the rear garden of No. 14.
- 5.05 The Inspector considered a rear dormer could be erected on the property under permitted development rights and could cause a similar concern in relation to privacy. However he concluded that exercising of permitted development rights as a fall-back relies on the intention to carry that development out in accordance with the parameters of the regulations, and he had no compelling evidence to indicate that this would take place.
- 5.06 He therefore consider that the proposal is not acceptable, and conflicts with UDP Policy HSG12(c) as it would harm the living conditions of nearby residents in relation to privacy.

## **6.00 CONCLUSION**

- 6.01 The Inspector considered the proposals failed to accord with the identified UDP policies and national guidance in respect of both issues. Accordingly he DISMISSED the appeal.

## **LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Planning Application & Supporting Documents  
National & Local Planning Policy

Responses to Consultation  
Responses to Publicity

**Contact Officer:** Mr D McVey  
**Telephone:** 01352 703266  
**Email:** Daniel.McVey@flintshire.gov.uk