

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

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

DATE: **20TH MAY 2015**

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

SUBJECT: **APPEAL BY MR. B. THOMAS AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR REGULARISATION OF EXISTING EQUIPMENT STORE AT MOUNTAIN PARK HOTEL, NORTHOP ROAD, FLINT MOUNTAIN – DISMISSED.**

1.00 APPLICATION NUMBER

1.01 **050965**

2.00 APPLICANT

2.01 **MR. B. THOMAS**

3.00 SITE

3.01 **MOUNTAIN PARK HOTEL,
NORTHOP ROAD, FLINT MOUNTAIN.**

4.00 APPLICATION VALID DATE

4.01 **28th JUNE 2015**

5.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

5.01 To inform Members of the Inspector's decision in respect of the appeal against Flintshire County Council for refusal of planning application for the retention of an equipment store at Mountain Park Hotel, Flint. The application was refused by Members at Planning Committee on 14th March 2015, contrary to officer recommendation, for the following reason:-

“By virtue of its scale and siting, the building has a significant unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring residents, contrary to Policy GEN1 of the adopted Flintshire Unitary

Development Plan”.

The appeal is DISMISSED.

6.00 REPORT

- 6.01 The Inspector considered that the main issues in respect of this appeal was the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.
- 6.02 The Inspector noted that the equipment store abuts the rear boundary of the garden of The Bungalow, which is the nearest dwelling to the hotel. The rear garden of this dwelling is relatively shallow and the result is a wall of development along the majority of the rear shared boundary.
- 6.03 He considered that the building is considerably higher than any of the adjacent containers and any container it purports to replace.
- 6.04 The inspector found that the proximity of the development to the dwelling, its proximity to the boundary and the overall relative scale causes harm. Furthermore, there would undoubtedly be additional noise and disturbance and the windows, although not causing any actual overlooking, would add to the perception of overlooking into the garden area.

7.00 CONCLUSION

- 7.01 In conclusion, the Inspector found that the development has a significant adverse effect on the amenity of the nearby residents, contrary to policy GEN1 of the FUDP. The appeal is DISMISSED.

LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Planning Application & Supporting Documents
National & Local Planning Policy
Responses to Consultation
Responses to Publicity

Contact Officer: alex.walker@flintshire.gov.uk
Telephone: (01352) 703235
Email: alex.walker@flintshire.gov.uk