

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
25 MARCH 2015

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Development Control Committee of the Flintshire County Council held at County Hall, Mold on Wednesday, 25 March 2015

PRESENT: Councillor David Wisinger (Chairman)

Councillors: Marion Bateman, Chris Bithell, David Cox, Ian Dunbar, Carol Ellis, Veronica Gay, Alison Halford, Ray Hughes, Christine Jones, Richard Lloyd, Mike Peers, Neville Phillips, Mike Reece, Gareth Roberts and David Roney

SUBSTITUTIONS:

Councillor: Carolyn Thomas for Derek Butler, Mike Lowe for Billy Mullin and Jim Falshaw for Owen Thomas

ALSO PRESENT:

The following Councillor attended as local Members:-
Councillor Colin Legg - agenda item 6.1.

The following Councillors attended as observers:
Councillors: Haydn Bateman and Owen Thomas

APOLOGY:

Councillor Richard Jones

IN ATTENDANCE:

Chief Officer (Planning and Environment), Development Manager, Interim Team Leader Policy, Senior Engineer - Highways Development Control, Team Leader, Senior Planners, Planning Support Officer, Housing & Planning Solicitor and Committee Officer

155. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Carolyn Thomas declared a personal interest in the following application because she was the Interim Chair of the AONB Partnership-

Agenda item 6.1 – Single wind turbine of maximum tip height 86.5m and ancillary development, including a crane hard-standing pad, substation, equipment housing cabinet and access road at Lygan Uchaf Farm, Wern Road, Rhosesmor (052344)

Councillors Ian Dunbar, Carol Ellis and Mike Peers declared a personal interest in the following application because a family member worked for Airbus:-

Agenda item 6.7 – Erection of a radar mast and associated development (to include micro-siting) at Airbus, Chester Road, Broughton (053219)

In line with the Planning Code of Practice:-

Councillor Alison Halford declared that she had been contacted on more than three occasions on the following application:-

Agenda item 6.5 – Full application – Conversion of and extension to existing building to provide fishery sales office and canteen, conversion of and extension to building to provide a dwelling with B&B letting, construction of 2 no. fishing pools and a mitigation wildlife pool, demolition of existing outbuilding on roadside, landscaping, installation of non-mains drainage, formation of parking area and creation of a new access (closure of existing access) at Stamford Way Farm, Stamford Way, Ewloe (052759)

156. LATE OBSERVATIONS

The Chairman allowed Members an opportunity to read the late observations which had been circulated at the meeting.

157. MINUTES

The draft minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 12 February 2015 and 25 February 2015 had been circulated to Members with the agenda.

Accuracy – 12 February 2015

Councillor Chris Bithell referred to the first paragraph on page 9 and suggested that the words 'particularly with the delays being caused by roadworks in the area' be replaced with 'because of the regular delays caused by movement of traffic on the A548 this was a particular concern'. The proposal was seconded and on being put to the vote was CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

That subject to the suggested amendment, the minutes be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

158. ITEMS TO BE DEFERRED

The Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) advised that none of the items on the agenda were recommended for deferral by officers.

159. FULL APPLICATION – SINGLE WIND TURBINE OF MAXIMUM TIP HEIGHT 86.5M AND ANCILLARY DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING A CRANE HARD-STANDING PAD, SUBSTATION, EQUIPMENT HOUSING CABINET AND ACCESS ROAD AT LYGAN UCHAF FARM, WERN ROAD, RHOESMOR (052344)

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) in respect of this application. The usual consultations had been undertaken and the responses received detailed in the report. An amendment to and additional comments received since the preparation of the report were circulated at the meeting.

The officer detailed the background to the report and highlighted the main planning considerations that were reported in paragraph 7.06. The applicant had had the opportunity to withdraw the application but had decided to continue with the application. Five reasons for refusal were reported with the first two relating to the detrimental impact on the character of the landscape and the height of the turbine having an impact on the safe operation of the radar at John Lennon Airport. He also referred Members to the late observations where an additional letter of objection was reported.

Mr. G. Royles spoke against the application on behalf of concerned residents. He spoke of the visual and health impact of the turbine and explained that it was four times as high as the turbine at Rhosesmor school and was nearly as tall as the chimney at Castle Cement in Padeswood. It was proposed to erect the turbine in the Alyn Wheeler Valley which was in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and near to the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The Unitary Development Plan stated that development should maintain and enhance the landscape but he felt this proposal would be out of context and be a blot on the landscape. Mr. Royles felt that approval of the application would set a precedent and he referred to setback distance of 2km from properties which was required in Scotland; this proposal would have a setback distance of 0.5km. He referred to injury and fatalities caused by wind turbines and the negative impact that it would have on the health of residents. He felt that the turbine was too big and too close to neighbouring properties.

Councillor John Thomas from Halkyn Community Council also spoke against the application. He said that he was not against renewable energy but not at the expense of the community and added that noise pollution would have a detrimental impact on people and wildlife. He raised concern that three footpaths were close to the proposed site and suggested that the inclusion of the footpaths on the plans available on the Council's website would have been helpful. He raised significant concern about the effect on the landscape, the AONB and the neighbouring SSSI.

Councillor Chris Bithell proposed the recommendation for refusal which was duly seconded. He spoke of the significant height of the turbine which would be twice the height of the flats in Flint and of the significant impact on the AONB. He felt that the proposal would cause environmental harm and affect health and should be rejected.

Councillor Carolyn Thomas said that the area had been designated an AONB because of the views and the sense of tranquillity which would be lost if the application was approved. She felt that it would be an alien structure in the landscape.

The Local Member, Councillor Colin Legg, spoke against the proposal. He felt that the turbine would be grossly intrusive on the landscape and approval would set a precedent which was a significant concern. He stressed the overwhelming objection to the proposal and referred to official guidance that indicated that the 2020 targets for onshore wind farms had been met and that other forms of power could be explored. Councillor Legg said that the proposal would be of no benefit to Flintshire or its residents and would cause harm to the area, and set a precedent, if it was approved. He felt that the AONB would suffer and the Alyn Wheeler valley would be disfigured.

Councillor Mike Peers commented that the applicant had chosen not to speak in support of the application. He felt that the main concern was the effect on the landscape and the AONB and highlighted paragraphs 7.17 and 7.18 on the assessment undertaken by an independent Landscape Consultant with considerable experience in dealing with applications for wind turbines. He felt that this turbine had no place in this area and highlighted the concerns raised by Liverpool John Lennon Airport.

Councillor Gareth Roberts felt that the refusal reasons were sound and that an application that could endanger aircraft safety should be refused. Councillor Ian Dunbar concurred that the proposal would be detrimental to the area and that the height of the turbine was a significant concern. It would also have an impact on the landscape and the views of the Clwydian Range. He also referred to the ecological impact on the wildlife.

In response to the comments made, the officer said that the areas of concern had been identified and reasons for refusal identified.

In summing up, Councillor Bithell spoke of the comments of the third party speakers and concurred that the proposal would not benefit anyone. It would be a blot on the landscape and would be detrimental to local residents and tourists and would destroy the view of the AONB.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be refused for the reasons detailed in the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment).

160. OUTLINE APPLICATION – ERECTION OF 2 NO. DWELLINGS ON LAND TO THE REAR OF 6 WELSH ROAD, GARDEN CITY (052875)

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) in respect of this application. The usual consultations had been undertaken and the responses received detailed in the report. Additional comments received since the preparation of the report were circulated at the meeting.

The officer detailed the background to the report and drew attention to the planning history where refusal of the application, and subsequent

dismissal of the appeal, was reported. The appeal had been dismissed due to concerns that the site was in a C1 flood zone and that the consequences could not be managed. The Inspector had considered the impact on the area and the impact on highway safety and felt that these were acceptable but had still raised concerns of the significant risk of flooding and the ambiguity over the depth of the garden areas of the proposed dwelling nearest the site boundary with 8 Welsh Road. The application had been resubmitted with a proposed indicative site layout. A revised Flood Consequences Assessment (FCA) had been submitted and the views of Natural Resources Wales and the Council's Emergency Planner had been sought and were reported in paragraph 7.17. The officer referred Members to the late observations where an addition to paragraph 7.12 was reported.

Mr. D.A. Jones spoke against the application on behalf of some of the residents on the grounds of overlooking, loss of privacy, access and highway safety. He spoke of recent drainage problems following heavy rain and said that if the application was approved, the problems would increase as an estimated 80% of the land would be covered by the proposal. He indicated that the ownership of numbers 8 and 10 Welsh Road had recently changed and improvements had been made but 6 Welsh Road had fallen into a state of disrepair as it had been vacant since 2006. Mr. Jones felt that this indicated that there was no demand for two further dwellings in this location. He urged the Council to compel the owner of the property to make it habitable.

Ms. R. Ellis, the agent for the applicant, spoke in support of the application. She said that a detailed flood risk assessment had been undertaken. The main issues for consideration were reported in paragraph 7.06 and further details on issues 1 to 4, and how they had been addressed, were reported in paragraphs 7.08 to 7.13. In referring to the FCA which had been submitted as part of the application in accordance with Technical Advice Note 15, Natural Resources Wales (NRW) had confirmed that the finished floor levels being set at 5.78 m AOD would be acceptable. She commented on the Northern Gateway site which had been granted outline planning permission in 2012 and added that extensive consultation had been undertaken on the flood risk. An application to discharge condition 6 on the same application had been approved in November 2013 and had included the requirement for defence strengthening works, which were currently being undertaken. These works would alleviate flooding to the Northern Gateway site and this application site. On the issue of surface water drainage, Ms. Ellis indicated that Welsh Water had been consulted and there were no records of problems with surface water in the area and the Council's drainage engineer had also not objected to the proposal.

Councillor Christine Jones moved refusal of the application, against officer recommendation, which was duly seconded. She said that this was a resubmitted application and that the original application had been dismissed at appeal. The site was in a C1 flood zone and she said that Natural Resources Wales had indicated that in the event of flooding, the dwellings would be left as a dry island and that access and egress could not be achieved. Councillor Jones queried what had changed on this application and

sought clarification on the required finished floor levels as the criteria stated 6.24 m AOD compared to 5.78 m AOD referred to in the report. She also expressed her significant concern about the access to the site which was dangerous and would become busier as a result of the Northern Gateway site access. The proposal would have a visual impact on the neighbouring properties and would increase the surface water problems that were already in place. Councillor Jones felt that the application should be refused on the grounds of safety and the risk of flooding. Councillor Dave Cox concurred that the siting of the proposal was not suitable.

In referring to the decision to dismiss the appeal, Councillor Mike Peers asked if the Inspector had provided an indication of what would be acceptable. He also asked whether the issue of the depth and positioning of the garden area had been overcome.

Councillor Chris Bithell referred to the comments of the third party speakers and the local Member and spoke of the decision to dismiss the appeal because of concerns about flooding and space around dwellings. On this application, NRW had indicated that the problem of flooding could be overcome and the policy for space around dwellings had been complied with. He felt that it would therefore be difficult to defend either reason at appeal. Garden City was classed as a Category B settlement and had a growth band of 8 to 15% over the plan period. As at April 2014, Garden City had experienced growth of approximately 9.4% so this would also be difficult to defend on appeal as the Council did not have a five year land supply.

In response to the comments made, the officer said that the Inspector had not provided details of what floor levels would be acceptable. The FCA had been updated and had been expanded to take account of a 1 in 1,000 year flood event and provided additional modelling information to what had been considered by the Planning Committee and the Inspector. Consultation had been undertaken following the submission of the amended FCA and subject to conditions, no objections had been received from the consultees. On the issue of layout, an indicative layout had been submitted and the proposals complied with the guidance in Local Planning Guidance Note 2 on Space Around Dwellings. It was therefore considered acceptable based on the comments of the Inspector which also included consideration of the access issues, to which no objections had been received.

In summing up, Councillor Jones raised concern at the comments of NRW as the site was still in a high flood risk area. She felt that sewerage remained a problem and added that the drains in the area could not cope with the inclusion of more properties. On the issue of access, she said that Welsh Road was extremely dangerous and this would worsen when the Northern Gateway proposal commenced. She reiterated her reasons for refusal as risk of flooding, drainage and access.

On being put to the vote, the proposal to refuse the application, against officer recommendation, was LOST.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) and subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Obligation, Unilateral Undertaking or advance payment of £1,100 per dwelling in lieu of on-site recreational provision.

161. FULL APPLICATION – 72 NO. SELF CONTAINED 1 & 2 BED APARTMENTS WITH SUPPORTING COMMUNAL FACILITIES AT COLESHILL STREET, FLINT (053076)

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) in respect of this application. The usual consultations had been undertaken and the responses received detailed in the report. Additional comments received since the preparation of the report were circulated at the meeting.

The officer detailed the background to the report and highlighted the main considerations which were reported in paragraph 1.02. He drew attention to the late observations where an extra condition had been requested by Highways.

Councillor Dave Cox proposed the recommendation for approval which was duly seconded. He welcomed the proposal which was a part of the Masterplan for the major development of Flint and fully supported the application for the provision of the extra care and elderly support scheme. Councillor Christine Jones also welcomed the scheme which was positive for elderly people.

In referring to consultations, Councillor Mike Peers commented that Flint Town Council had not submitted a response to the scheme. He also queried where bins for the 72 apartments would be stored as the issue of refuse and recycling was not reported. Councillor Chris Bithell welcomed the development of the site for the third extra care facility in Flintshire. He was pleased that archaeological investigations had taken place and that a further programme of works was to be submitted and agreed before any other works were undertaken. He thanked the officer for the considerations on this issue.

Councillor Veronica Gay felt that 24 car parking spaces was inadequate and even though it was reported that residents could use the town centre car parks, she raised concern at this suggestion because car parking charges were to be introduced. Councillor Carol Ellis also welcomed the proposal which would enable elderly people to maintain their independence and reduce the need for them to enter a nursing home. On the issue of parking, she stated that when she had visited the two other extra care facilities, there had been sufficient parking for residents, staff and visitors. She added that some residents in the facilities were not able to drive. On the issue of waste, she explained that waste was collected in a communal area

where it was collected by the refuse lorries and would therefore not result in 72 individual bins for the apartments.

In response to the comments made, the officer explained that 24 parking spaces was fully compliant with the Council's policies and he reiterated the closeness of the facility to the town centre. He confirmed that the waste was collected from a central area and was not a kerbside collection. He added that no development should commence until an archaeological investigation scheme had been submitted and agreed.

In summing up, Councillor Cox indicated that Flint Town Council were fully supportive of the proposal.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) and subject to the additional condition requested in the late observations.

162. FULL APPLICATION – ERECTION OF 8 NO. DWELLINGS AT FORMER CHURCH HALL SITE, WELL STREET, HOLYWELL (052679)

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) in respect of this application. The usual consultations had been undertaken and the responses received detailed in the report.

Councillor Gareth Roberts proposed the recommendation for approval which was duly seconded. He welcomed the scheme which he felt would benefit the area.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) and subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Obligation/Unilateral Undertaking to provide the following:-

- a. Ensure the payment of a contribution of £8,800 to the Council in lieu of on site play and recreation provision. Such sum to be paid to the Council prior to the occupation of any dwelling hereby approved and to be used to upgrade existing facilities within the community.
- b. Secure a scheme detailing the measures and means of ensuring the future management and maintenance of the proposed estate highway. Such measures to be agreed prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved.

If the obligation pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is not completed within six months of the date of the committee

resolution, the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) be given delegated authority to REFUSE the application.

163. FULL APPLICATION – CONVERSION OF AND EXTENSION TO EXISTING BUILDING TO PROVIDE FISHERY SALES OFFICE AND CANTEEN, CONVERSION OF AND EXTENSION TO BUILDING TO PROVIDE A DWELLING WITH B&B LETTING, CONSTRUCTION OF 2 NO. FISHING POOLS AND A MITIGATION WILDLIFE POOL, DEMOLITION OF EXISTING OUTBUILDING ON ROADSIDE, LANDSCAPING, INSTALLATION OF NON-MAINS DRAINAGE, FORMATION OF PARKING AREA AND CREATION OF A NEW ACCESS (CLOSURE OF EXISTING ACCESS) AT STAMFORD WAY FARM, STAMFORD WAY, EWLOE (052759)

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) in respect of this application. The usual consultations had been undertaken and the responses received detailed in the report.

The officer detailed the background to the report and explained that the application was a resubmission but had been amended to delete the siting of touring caravans. However, the reference to caravans was reported in paragraph 7.18 and the officer asked Members to disregard this. Also the word 'no' should be included in the penultimate sentence in paragraph 7.31 between the words 'there is' and 'ecological objection'.

Mr T. Rimmer spoke against the application and said that a similar application had been refused and dismissed on appeal. He commented on the inclusion of the reference to caravans in paragraph 7.18. He said that the site was located in the green barrier in open countryside and all of the neighbouring land was farmland. Mr. Rimmer felt that the application would have an impact on the hydrology of the area and he spoke of nitrate vulnerable zones. He felt that policy GEN4 Green Barrier was important in considering this application and that the Inspector had found the application to be inappropriate and intrusive. Mr. Rimmer commented on the construction of the ponds and said that the report did not include information on hydrology and a business case for the proposals had not been made. The report made reference to the importance of landscape and Mr. Rimmer felt that the application should be refused because of this. He also felt that the fishing ponds would harm the green barrier and the open character of the area and were not essential. In response to a query from Councillor Chris Bithell, Mr. Rimmer indicated that he was speaking on behalf of the neighbouring land owner.

Mr. J. Woodcock, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. He explained that he had purchased the land in 2009 and had undertaken discussions with officers prior to purchasing the land and had followed their guidance. He had noted the local objections and he explained that a drilling assessment had been undertaken. He currently ran a small family business in Ewloe and it was hoped that the business could achieve a David Bellamy ecology award. This revised application had a recommendation of approval

and would enhance the landscape, was sustainable and would make use of redundant buildings.

The Local Member, Councillor Alison Halford, proposed the recommendation for approval which was duly seconded. She indicated that there were policies in place to permit development in the open countryside and green barrier and she added that the proposal would not damage water in the area.

In welcoming the application, Councillor Chris Bithell said that diversification was essential. The proposal would encourage tourism and would create employment and would provide a facility for fishing which was a popular pastime. He felt that it was a commendable proposal which would bring buildings back into use and met all of the requirements of the Council's policies.

Councillor Ian Dunbar complimented the applicant on having complied with everything that had been asked of him. Councillor Mike Peers sought clarification on the sustainability of the bore hole to supply water to the development. He also asked for further information on how the foul sewage would be dealt with via a bio-disc treatment plant and discharged into an existing ditch. Councillor Peers highlighted paragraph 7.14 where the comments of the Inspector on the harm that the caravan park would have on the openness of the green barrier and queried what impact other vehicles such as vans would have. He raised concern at the proposal to remove 160m of roadside hedge to create the appropriate sight lines and asked for an explanation about new building in the countryside and the visual impact of any such building. Councillor Carol Ellis also raised concern about the removal of the hedgerow and asked whether a condition could be imposed to prevent the applicant from submitting a further application for the provision of touring caravans on the site. Councillor Christine Jones welcomed the proposal as a leisure activity.

In response to the comments made, the officer said that caravans did not form part of this proposal and if an application was submitted in the future, it would be considered on its merits. The difference between the impact of caravans and vans was the nature of the permanence as caravans would be on site for 24 hours a day whereas cars and vans would only be on site for the duration of the visit to the fishery. It was reported that the vehicles would have an impact but that it would be acceptable. On the issue of the hedge removal, it was necessary to provide visibility but it was proposed that a replacement hedge would be planted outside the sight lines. The officer indicated that condition 8 could be modified to specify the grubbing-up and moving of the hedgerow but that a fallback would need to be considered if this was not successful. The bore hole would provide clean water for the site and had been the subject of consultation with no objections. The discharge into the existing ditch would be of clean water following treatment. Existing buildings would be converted and the form and scale were considered to be acceptable and did not detract from the architectural quality of the building.

Councillor Ray Hughes requested that re-grubbing of the hedge be tried first.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) with condition 8 being amended to require grubbing-up and moving the hedge to the rear of the visibility splay and a new hedge to be planted if this fails.

164. FULL APPLICATION – RETENTION OF 2 NO. CLIMBING POLES AT FIELDS NORTH EAST OF CROSSWAYS ROAD, PEN Y CEFN, CAERWYS (052956)

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) in respect of this application. The usual consultations had been undertaken and the responses received detailed in the report.

The officer detailed the background to the report and explained that one letter of objection had been received. The poles were already in place and a temporary five year permission was proposed.

Mr. S. Belfield, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. He explained that 'Woodfest' had started 14 years ago and that the poles, which were secure, were an integral part of the event. He explained what was involved in constructing these, stating that there were only two other sets in Wales. He felt that the poles did not overshadow or overlook neighbouring properties and they did not result in loss of privacy. The location of the site was ideal for the festival which provided an overwhelming benefit to the tourism of the area. Mr. Belfield added that 'Woodfest' supported 10 charities and employed a number of local people.

Councillor Jim Falshaw proposed the recommendation for approval which was duly seconded. He welcomed the proposal and added that the festival attracted contestants from all over Europe and created a vibrant atmosphere in Caerwys.

Councillor Chris Bithell welcomed the proposal but queried whether the applicant would have to remove the poles and reapply for permission at the end of the five year temporary period. The officer confirmed that the applicant would have to reapply when the temporary permission expired and that the application would be reassessed at that time.

RESOLVED:

That temporary planning permission for five years be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment).

165. FULL APPLICATION – ERECTION OF A RADAR MAST AND ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT AT AIRBUS, CHESTER ROAD, BROUGHTON (053219)

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) in respect of this application. The usual consultations had been undertaken and the responses received detailed in the report.

The officer detailed the background to the report and explained that the figure in paragraph 1.01 should read 25 metres and not 24 as reported. The officer confirmed that this was a typographical error and that consultation had been undertaken for a 25 metre high mast. The proposal was not out of character with the site and the radar mast would be a back-up due to concerns that wind turbines in other areas could cause problems for aircraft safety.

Councillor Alison Halford proposed the recommendation for approval which was duly seconded.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment).

166. APPEAL BY MRS MCKAY AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION TO RETAIN TIMBER STABLING AND STORAGE, ADDITIONAL STOREROOM AND HARDSTANDING AT 25 RHYDDYN HILL, CAERGWRLE (051753)

The Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) advised that the applicant had undertaken the work to comply with the requirements of the appeal decision.

RESOLVED:

That the decision of the Inspector to allow this appeal be noted.

167. 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 (051810)

The Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) advised that the application which had been partly retrospective, was not an enforcement issue.

Councillor Chris Bithell indicated that concern had been expressed when the Committee had visited the site about the area of agricultural land in the vicinity that had been lawned. He had asked officers to establish whether the areas were being used as gardens and whether residents therefore had permitted development rights for the area. The Officer advised that the lawned areas were not being used as gardens but that the issue of whether a change of use had occurred would be raised with the Enforcement Team to monitor the situation.

RESOLVED:

That the decision of the Inspector to dismiss this appeal be noted.

168. **APPEAL BY MR. ANDREW ROBERTS AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR OUTLINE ERECTION OF 4 NO. SEMI-DETACHED THREE BEDROOM DWELLINGS AND DEMOLITION OF 2 NO. EXISTING DWELLINGS AT THE HAVEN, KNOWLE LANE, BUCKLEY (052054)**

RESOLVED:

That the decision of the Inspector to dismiss this appeal be noted.

169. **APPEAL BY MR. STEPHEN CARGILL AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE ERECTION OF A DETACHED GARAGE TO REPLACE EXISTING GARAGE AND OUTBUILDINGS AT 1 LINDSAY COTTAGES, STATION ROAD, SANDYCROFT (052186)**

RESOLVED:

That the decision of the Inspector to dismiss this appeal be noted.

170. **APPEAL BY MR. TOM PARRY AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE ERECTION OF A CONSERVATORY EXTENSION AT 9 PARK CRESCENT, CARMEL (052603)**

RESOLVED:

That the decision of the Inspector to dismiss this appeal be noted.

171. **MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS IN ATTENDANCE**

There were 50 members of the public and 1 member of the press in attendance.

(The meeting started at 1.00 pm and ended at 3.01 pm)

.....

Chairman