

**FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

**REPORT TO:** **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** **24<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2019**

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

**SUBJECT:** **APPEAL BY MR. I. PARRY AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE/REAR EXTENSION WITH EXTENSION OVER GARAGE AT 16 SPRINGFIELD CLOSE, CONNAH'S QUAY – DISMSED.**

**1.00 APPLICATION NUMBER**

1.01 059344

**2.00 SITE**

2.01 16 Springfield Close, Connah's Quay

**3.00 APPLICATION VALID DATE**

3.01 11<sup>th</sup> December 2018

**4.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

4.01 To inform Members of a decision in respect of an appeal, following the decision of the Local Planning Authority, under delegated powers, to refuse to grant planning permission for the erection of a two storey side/rear extension with extension over garage at 16 Springfield Close, Connah's Quay .

The appointed Planning Inspector was Mr Iwan Lloyd. The appeal was determined via the Written Representations method and was DISMISSED.

**5.00 REPORT**

### **Main Issues**

- 5.01 The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 14 Springfield Close in relation to outlook.

### **Outlook**

- 5.02 The Inspector noted the context of the site and its surroundings. He notes that No. 14 Springfield Close is positioned at a lower level than No. 16. The corner of the single storey garage of No.16 is positioned close to the two storey projecting bay of No.14. The corners of the properties are therefore within a metre of each side of the boundary. The combination of the difference in levels and the juxtaposition of the buildings result in the eaves of the garage of No. 16 aligning above the mid-point of No.14s two-storey projecting bay and just below the first floor window sill.
- 5.03 The Inspector notes that in this case the proposed extension due to its height, proximity and bulk would be unreasonably close to the ground and first floor windows of No. 14s two-storey bay. He further notes that the proposed windows in relation to No. 14s aspect from these windows would be diminished by this overbearing development and would be injurious to the living conditions of the occupiers of this dwelling. He adds that the proposed extension due to the difference in levels and height and proximity would loom over the ground floor window of No. 14s bay and the outlook from this property would appear oppressive.
- 5.04 The Inspector further noted that the appellant had sought to change the proposal from the preceding application by reducing the size of the first-floor front window. However, he noted that the main concern in this appeal was the impact of the development in relation to No. 14's outlook due to the size, height and bulk of the proposed extension. He concluded that for the reasons outlined above this particular proposal would not overcome this concern.
- 5.05 The Inspector consider that the proposal would conflict with Flintshire Unitary Development Plan Policies GEN1(d) and HSG12(c) because it would have an unacceptable impact on people living nearby.

### **6.00 CONCLUSION**

- 6.01 The Inspector considered the proposal failed to accord with the identified UDP policies and national guidance in respect of the main issue. Accordingly he DISMISSED the appeal

### **LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Planning Application & Supporting Documents  
National & Local Planning Policy

Responses to Consultation  
Responses to Publicity

**Contact Officer: Claire Morter**

**Telephone: 01352 703299**

**Email: [claire.e.morter@flintshire.gov.uk](mailto:claire.e.morter@flintshire.gov.uk)**