

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

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

DATE: **25TH MARCH 2015**

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

SUBJECT: **APPEAL BY MR. A. EVANS AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE ERECTION OF A STABLE AND AGRICULTURAL STORAGE BUILDING (PART RETROSPECTIVE) AT FRON HAUL, BRYNSANNAN, BRYNFORD – DISMISSED.**

1.00 APPLICATION NUMBER

1.01 051810

2.00 APPLICANT

2.01 MR. A. EVANS

3.00 SITE

3.01 FRON HAUL,
BRYNSANNAN, BRYNFORD.

4.00 APPLICATION VALID DATE

4.01 18/02/14

5.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

5.01 To inform Members of an appeal decision in respect of the refusal of a stable and agricultural storage building to the rear of Fron Haul, Brynsannan, Brynford.

5.02 The application the subject of the appeal was refused by Members at Planning Committee 03.09.14. The subsequent appeal was dealt with under the written representations and site visit procedure and was DISMISSED on 25.02.15.

6.00 REPORT

6.01 The Inspector considered the main issue of the case to be the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

- 6.02 The Inspector noted that the stable block was partly located within the former residential curtilage of Fron Haul. However the steel framed storage building, partly clad in profiled steel cladding and a steel sheet roof is located entirely in the open countryside, outside the settlement boundary of Brynford as defined in the adopted Flintshire Unitary Development Plan.
- 6.03 The stable and storage building can be readily seen from the rear of the adjoining dwellings and can be viewed from the adjacent main road running through Brynford. Although the appeal site is flat, the land slopes away to the west, as such he considered that the appeal buildings were elevated and apparent from other properties and view points in the area.
- 6.04 The Inspector considered that whilst the stable on its own could be seen as being a suitable size for its domestic context, but taken together, the scale and design of the two buildings and associated hard standing sited close to the other properties was considered to be a visual, obtrusive and discordant feature in the residential area.
- 6.05 In addition the Inspector considered that the plain agricultural appearance, harsh functional nature and excessive proportions of the store building was not considered to harmonise with its residential surroundings, as such it was considered that the development was detrimental to the character and appearance of the area contrary to policies GEN1, RE2 and GEN3 .
- 6.06 The Inspector noted that his attention had been drawn to the fact that similar developments had been approved in the area, and the appellant's stated intention that the building would not be for commercial use but for storage of hay , implements and machinery. Never the less none of these considerations outweighed the main issue of the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the residential area.

7.00 CONCLUSION

- 7.01 Having regard of the above, the Inspector considered that the stable and storage building would have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area.
- 7.02 As a result he concluded that the appeal proposal would conflict with Policies GEN1, GEN3 and RE2 of the adopted Flintshire Unitary Development Plan.

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