

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

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

DATE: **25TH FEBRUARY 2015**

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

SUBJECT: **APPEAL BY MR. S. HADFIELD AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR A RETAIL EXTENSION TO CREATE A NEW CONVENIENCE STORE AND BACK OF HOUSE FACILITIES AT GLADSTONE HOUSE, MAIN ROAD, BROUGHTON – ALLOWED.**

1.00 APPLICATION NUMBER

1.01 052209

2.00 APPLICANT

2.01 Rowlands Executive Pension Scheme

3.00 SITE

3.01 Gladstone House,
Main Road, Broughton

4.00 APPLICATION VALID DATE

4.01 30.5.14

5.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

5.01 To inform Members of the appeal decision in respect of the appeal against Flintshire County Council for refusal of planning application for a retail extension to create new convenience store and back of house facilities at Gladstone House, Main Road, Broughton. The application was refused by Members at Planning Committee on 23rd July, 2015, contrary to officer recommendation, for the following reason:-

“In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed development does not provide for sufficient vehicular parking spaces to serve the dual retail and office use and, as such, if allowed, would lead to an increase in on-street parking detrimental to highway and

pedestrian safety. As such, the proposal conflicts with policy GEN1 (e), (f) and AC18 of the Flintshire Unitary Development Plan and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 11 Parking Standards". The appeal is ALLOWED.

6.00 REPORT

6.01 The Planning Inspector considered that the main issue when considering the appeal was the effect on the highway network. The Inspector noted that the scheme provided 13 car parking spaces to serve the development. However, consideration was given to the provision of additional public parking both at the local shopping centre and the free public car park 150m to the South on Broughton Hall Road. The Inspector recognised that, under the Council's Policy AC18 of the Unitary Development Plan, maximum parking provision for the development would equate to 23 spaces. However, he also notes that's the policy indicates that this is a maximum figure and reduced requirements may be applied for sites within 300m of existing public car parks.

6.02 The Inspector also took into consideration the traffic flow surveys submitted with the application which compared a similarly sized store in Chester to the proposed development and which were not disputed or challenged by the Council's Highways Development Control Manager. Having regard to these the Inspector took the view that the proposed car parking provision is acceptable and a reduced requirement is justified in accordance with the provisions of the Council's car parking standards and UDP Policy AC18. Although the Council indicated that the junction is very busy and queuing is a common problem due to the volume of traffic on Main Road, the Inspector took the view that the technical evidence in this case states that there is adequate provision for parking within the site to cater for the demand from the proposed retail unit without parking spilling onto adjacent roads.

7.00 CONCLUSION

7.01 In conclusion, and taking all other matters into account, the Inspector concluded that in the absence of evidence to indicate that the proposal would cause harm to highway safety, the proposal does not conflict with UDP Policy. The appeal was therefore ALLOWED subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Planning Appeal decision dated 20th January, 2015

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