

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

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

DATE: **9TH OCTOBER 2013**

REPORT BY: **HEAD OF PLANNING**

SUBJECT: **APPEAL BY MRS SUE ROBERTS AGAINST THE NON DETERMINATION OF A PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE PROPOSED EXTENSION TO FORM FIRST FLOOR OVER EXISTING SINGLE STOREY BUILDING FOR THE PROVISION OF 4 ADDITIONAL BEDROOMS AT BRYN BUNGALOW, ROCK LANE, RHYDDYN HILL, CAERGWRLE.**

1.00 APPLICATION NUMBER

1.01 049553

2.00 APPLICANT

2.01 MRS SUE ROBERTS

3.00 SITE

3.01 BRYN BUNGALOW,
ROCK LANE,
RHYDDYN HILL,
CAERGWRLE.

4.00 APPLICATION VALID DATE

4.01 14TH March 2013

5.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

5.01 To inform member of the Inspectors decisions in relation to an appeal into the non-determination of a planning application that was determined 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 issues in this case was the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

6.02 Appeal Site and Surrounding Area

The Inspector noted that Bryn Cottage was a single storey cottage within a development of mainly two storey dwellings facing Rock Lane. The existing property had a flat roof extension to the rear. The proposal was for a first floor extension over the existing single storey building and extension. He noted that amended plans had been submitted as part of the appeal which reflected discussions with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) and showed a reduced height to the rear extension element, the replacement of a dormer window with a roof light and the obscure glazing to dormers at the rear. The appeal was determined on that basis.

6.03 He notes that the LPA had not made a determination regarding the proposal but has indicated that it would have refused the application as they consider that the design was not subsidiary in scale and form to the original dwelling, would be unsympathetic to the character of the existing dwelling and would constitute an overdevelopment of the site. The LPA also considered that the proposal would result in an overbearing impact detrimental to the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers and neighbouring properties.

6.04 Policy

The Inspector noted that Policy HSG12 of the Flintshire Unitary Development Plan (UDP) states that extensions or alterations will be permitted provided the proposal satisfies a number of criteria including that it is subsidiary in scale and form to the existing dwelling, does not represent an overdevelopment of the site and respects the design and setting of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

6.05 Despite the rather unsympathetic existing flat roofed extension, the existing cottage has a rather simple linear form and is a well balanced and attractive building. In his opinion the proposed upward extension would alter that balance. It would draw the focus of the development away from the original building to the proposed new roof line which would dominate the whole of the building. Its height, scale and mass would give it an incongruous appearance. He was of the opinion that the proposed extension would severely harm the current simple form of the cottage and result in an incongruous, unattractive and dominating feature. The rear extension in particular would appear an overlarge and clunky addition.

6.06 He considered that the extension would increase the floor space by almost the same amount as the existing and would result in a building that would dominate the rather small plot. It would appear as an

overdevelopment of the site and would be of poor design that would be at odds with the existing building. It would appear as an adjunct, and as an incongruous addition based on a need for additional accommodation rather than considered approach to the character of the cottage or of suitable design solutions.

- 6.07 Overall the proposed extension would not be in scale with the existing building, would not appear subservient to it, and would harm the character and appearance of the existing building as a result. It would dominate its surroundings and appear as an overwhelming addition to the existing cottage.
- 6.08 He was therefore of the opinion that it was contrary to policy HSG12 of the Flintshire Unitary Development Plan and to guidance within Local Planning Guidance Note No.1 – *Extensions and alterations to Dwellings*. It was also contrary to national planning guidance contained within Technical Advice Note 12 – *Design*.
- 6.09 As a result of the proximity of adjacent dwellings He considered that it would also have a harmful impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents. It would tower over the mutual boundaries and have a dominating and overbearing appearance on adjacent properties including that to the rear. He didn't however consider that this was sufficient harm to warrant refusal in its own right but did add significant weight to his previous concerns.

7.00 CONCLUSION

- 7.01 Consequently and for the reasons given above, and having considered all other matters raised, the Inspector concluded that the appeal should be DISMISSED.

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