

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

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

DATE: **7TH SEPTEMBER 2016**

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

SUBJECT: **APPEAL BY MR. & MRS GLYN GRIFFITHS AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE ERECTION OF 4 NO. DWELLINGS (STARTER HOMES) AT RHYDDYN FARM, BRIDGE END, CAERGWRLE – DISMISSED.**

1.00 APPLICATION NUMBER

1.01 054615

2.00 APPLICANT

2.01 Mr. & Mrs Glyn Griffiths

3.00 SITE

3.01 Rhyddyn Farm,
Bridge End, Caergwrle.

4.00 APPLICATION VALID DATE

4.01 25.11.15

5.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

5.01 To inform Members of the Inspectors decision in relation to an appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the above development by Planning and Development Control Committee on 23rd March 2016, contrary to officers' recommendation. The appeal was considered through an Informal Hearing and was DISMISSED. No application for costs was made.

6.00 REPORT

6.01 The Inspector considered that the main issues were;

- The suitability of the site and location for housing development having regard to its relationship to existing development and to the open countryside;
- The proposals impact on the setting of Wat's Dyke scheduled ancient monument (SAM); and
- Whether any harm in these terms and resulting conflict with the development plan is outweighed by the lack of a 5 year supply of housing land.

6.02 Suitability of the site and location

The Inspector noted the sites location outside the settlement boundary comprising part of a small field and commented that the proposed development would be an addition to the existing built form beyond the present settlement limit, extending part way into the adjacent open field.

6.03 The Inspector noted the strategic policies which govern the location of new housing development namely, STR1, GEN2 and GEN3. The Inspector noted that the proposed development does not fall within any of the exceptions set out in policy GEN3 or comprise small scale infill in terms of policy HSG5.

6.04 He notes that the scale of the extension of development beyond the settlement boundary and into the surrounding countryside would be comparatively small, however there is a clearly defined edge to the limit of development in this location and a sharp distinction between the built up area and the adjacent countryside which forms an attractive backdrop to the settlement. The development would relate poorly to the existing settlement form being tacked on in a contrived manner behind the Queensway development and creating an awkward staggered layout of development projecting into the field. The poor relationship to the existing settlement form would be reinforced by the site's isolation from the highway network, requiring the use of an unadopted track leading some 75 metres from the A550 in order to provide access to the proposed dwellings.

6.05 Although the medical centre has extended the limit of development beyond the settlement boundary in this locality, the dwellings now proposed would lie further back from the A550 than the medical centre and would create a clear incursion into the open land lying further to the east. The Inspector recognised that the site is located on the edge of a sizeable settlement with a range of facilities and is a sustainable location for housing in accessibility terms but would fail to integrate with the existing built form. While the Inspector noted the proposed housing would not be particularly visible from the A550, it would be evident from the footpath forming part of the Wat's Dyke Way Heritage Trail. Although the sight of the new houses would be

broken to some extent by trees, the resulting seemingly random intrusion of built form into the open field would be apparent from the trail.

6.06 Impact on the setting of Wat's Dyke (SAM's)

The Inspector noted that the proposed development would lie some 30 m to west of SAM FL119 (Wat's Dyke). The scheduled area encompasses a significant section of the surviving dyke structure. It runs roughly north-south and broadly parallel to the staggered line of the proposed dwellings. He noted the comments of CPAT and CADW. While he accepted that CADW's response does not amount to outright objection to the proposal, its concerns about infill of the surviving open ground to the west of the monument and encroachment into key views were confirmed by the Inspectors site visit. Notwithstanding CADW's view that the development would not have a significant adverse impact on the setting of this part of the dyke, the Inspector concluded that the development would nevertheless cause harm to the setting of the SAM and that this renders the proposal contrary to UDP policy HE6.

6.07 Housing land supply

The proposed development would make a contribution towards addressing the current shortfall in housing land supply in Flintshire. The need to ensure an adequate housing land supply is an important consideration which significant weight should be given to as advised by paragraph 6.2 of TAN1. However the Inspector considered that the harm arising and conflict with the development plan in respect of the other two issues set out above does not outweigh this in the planning balance.

7.00 CONCLUSION

- 7.01 The Inspector concluded that the proposal would relate poorly to the existing settlement form, consequently appearing to be awkwardly attached to the settlement edge and protruding randomly into the surrounding countryside. This would be contrary to design principles set down in UDP policy GEN1. The resulting harm to the character and appearance of the area and erosion of the open countryside weighs the proposals. The appeal was **DISMISSED**.

LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

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

Contact Officer: Emma Hancock
Telephone: (01352) 703254
Email: emma.hancock@flintshire.gov.uk

