

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

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

DATE: **20th JUNE 2012**

REPORT BY: **HEAD OF PLANNING**

SUBJECT: **Appeal by Mr R Broughton against the decision of Flintshire County Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a first floor extension to dwelling with single storey extensions to the northwest and southwest elevations, demolition of existing garage and various outbuildings and erection of a new detached double garage at Delfryn, Axton, Holywell, CH8 9DH**

1.00 APPLICATION NUMBER

1.01 **048431**

2.00 APPLICANT

2.01 **MR R BROUGHTON**

3.00 SITE

3.01 Delfryn, Axton, Holywell, CH8 9DH

4.00 APPLICATION VALID DATE

4.01 **17/ 3/2011**

5.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

5.01 To inform Members of the appeal decision, following the refusal of planning permission under delegated powers on 27/ 6/2011 for a first floor extension to dwelling with single storey extensions to the northwest and southwest elevations, demolition of existing garage and various outbuildings and erection of a new detached double garage. The appeal was considered by Written Representations and was DISMISSED.

6.00 REPORT

6.01 The Inspector considered the main issue in this case to be the effect of

the proposed alterations on the street scene and the rural character of the area.

- 6.02 Having described the existing dwelling and site the Inspector goes on to detail the proposed extensions. He notes that while there are some small-scale ground floor extensions proposed, the principle changes in the character of the dwelling would be to the elevations, as a complete first floor is proposed, resulting in an increase in roof pitch.
- 6.03 The Inspector comments on planning permission 049178 for a replacement dwelling which was granted permission on 9th March 2012 and concludes that this is a material consideration in relation to the appeal. The Inspector notes that the approved building would be in part on the same footprint as the existing dwelling, although it would be turned through roughly 45 degrees, so that it would not longer offer an elevation close and parallel to the lane. The Inspector also notes this application was assessed against policy HSG6 of the Flintshire Unitary Development Plan.
- 6.04 The Inspector accepted that what has been approved is more modest in scale and is a simpler design to what would result from the appeal scheme. The Inspector states that this is not a reason for rejecting the scheme, but constitutes a “fall back” position to which he attached considerable weight.
- 6.05 The Inspector notes that the Council refused permission as they considered the extension would not respect the character of the original building and are not subsidiary to it. The Council also state that they represent an increase of 150% which exceed the 50% guidelines set out in policy HSG12. The Inspector notes that no calculations were given to substantiate this; however, it was not challenged by the appellant.
- 6.06 In the Inspectors opinion and increase in floorspace of anything up to 50% of a dwelling such as this may difficult to achieve in such a way both as to maintain a sense of subsidiarity and to respect the original design. For this reason, the Inspector takes the view that the present proposal should be decided primarily on its individual merits, especially since the application of policy HSG[^] has lead to the approval which, although not as substantial, is still significantly different in scale and character to the original ‘vernacular’ building.

7.00 CONCLUSION

- 7.01 The Inspector states that an increase of the scale proposed in this application is clearly far in excess of the guideline figure, irrespective of any other consideration, effectively creating a new dwelling in the open countryside. It would be seen as a significant, urban-type dwelling which fails to respect its rural location, having a much greater impact In that sense than the recently approved replacement. The Inspector expressed

concerns regarding the design in its own terms, which is dealt with under policy D2; when seen from the north-west the first floor dormers and the large porch would introduce over complex and bulky elements into the street scene bringing the scheme into conflict with general policy. As such the Inspector DISMISSED the appeal.

Contact Officer: Celeste Ringrose
Telephone: 01352 703235
Email: celeste_ringrose@flintshire.gov.uk