

**FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

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

**DATE:** **18<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2014**

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

**SUBJECT:** **APPEAL BY MR. MARK ALLEN AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION TO TAKE OFF THE ROOF OF THE EXISTING BUNGALOW, DEMOLISH THE EXISTING FLAT ROOFED GARAGE AND CONSTRUCT A NEW BRICK GARAGE, EXTEND AT THE BACK OF THE GARAGE TO CREATE A NEW BEDROOM AND CONSTRUCT A NEW HIGH PITCHED ROOF OVER THE WHOLE STRUCTURE TO CREATE NEW ROOMS IN THE ROOF SPACE LIT AND VENTILATED BY ROOF LIGHTS ONLY AT 28 SUMMERDALE ROAD, QUEENSFERRY – DISMISSED.**

**1.00 APPLICATION NUMBER**

1.01 051592

**2.00 APPLICANT**

2.01 MR. MARK ALLEN

**3.00 SITE**

3.01 28 SUMMERDALE ROAD, QUEENSFERRY, DEESIDE

**4.00 APPLICATION VALID DATE**

4.01 30<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER, 2013

**5.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

5.01 To inform Members of the decision made in the appeal against the refusal under delegated powers of planning permission to take off the roof of the existing bungalow, demolish the existing flat roofed garage and construct a new brick garage, extend at the back of the garage to create a new bedroom over the whole structure and to create new rooms in the roof space lit and ventilated by roof lights at 28 Summerdale Road, Queensferry. The appeal was DISMISSED.

## **6.00    REPORT**

6.01    The application was refused under officer delegated powers on 13<sup>th</sup> February, 2014 for the following reason:-

'In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposal, due to its scale, design and increase in roof height would introduce a discordant note into the street scene which would be visually harmful to its character and appearance. As such the proposal conflicts with Policy GEN1 (a) and Policy HSG12 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 on the street scene in Summerdale Road. The Inspector noted that Summerdale Road is characterised by detached bungalows, some of which have gables facing the road whilst others have ridges parallel to the road, and some have hipped roofs. Whilst this presents a varied roofscape in the street scene, overall heights are generally broadly comparable. The proposal would see the ridge height of number 28 increased by approximately 2.1 metres and the span of the pitched roof increasing from around 7.4 metres to some 10.745 metres. The Inspector took the view that the height, scale and mass of the resulting structure would give it an obtrusive and discordant visual appearance that would feature prominently in views from the road. As a result the proposal would be harmful to the street scene in Summerdale Road and, as such, would conflict with planning policy.

## **7.00    CONCLUSION**

7.01    Taking the above and all other matters into consideration the Inspector concluded that the proposal would conflict with policies GEN1 and HSG12 of the Flintshire Unitary Development Plan and the appeal was **DISMISSED**.

**Contact Officer:**    Pam Roberts  
**Telephone:**        (01352) 703239  
**Email:**                pam.roberts@flintshire.gov.uk