

**FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

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

**DATE:** **4<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2017**

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

**SUBJECT:** **FULL APPLICATION - ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO SIDE AND REAR OF DWELLING AT 18 MOORFIELD ROAD, HAWARDEN**

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** **057070**

**APPLICANT:** **MR R PLATT**

**SITE:** **18 MOORFIELD ROAD, HAWADEN, CH5 3EZ**

**APPLICATION VALID DATE:** **2<sup>ND</sup> JUNE 2017**

**LOCAL MEMBERS:** **CLLR H BROWN**  
**CLLR G HARDCASTLE**

**TOWN/COMMUNITY COUNCIL:** **HAWARDEN COMUNNITY COUNCIL**

**REASON FOR COMMITTEE:** **LOCAL MEMBER REQUEST – IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY AND HIGHWAY**

**SITE VISIT:** **YES**

**1.00 SUMMARY**

1.01 Members will recall this item was deferred at the September 2017 meeting to enable a second site visit to be carried out.

1.02 This is a full application for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension at 18 Parkfield Road, Broughton. The proposal is considered to comply with Policies GEN1, D2, AC18 and HSG12 of the Flintshire Unitary Development Plan. And Local Planning Guidance Notes 1, 2, and 11.

**2.00 RECOMMENDATION: TO GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION,**

## **SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:-**

- 2.01
1. Time limit.
  2. In accordance with plans.
  3. Facilities to be provided and retained within the site for parking.

### **3.00 CONSULTATIONS**

- 3.01 Cllr H Brown  
Has formally requested Committee determination and a Committee site visit be made.

Cllr G Hardcastle  
No response at time of writing.

Hawarden Town Council  
Objects to the proposal on the basis of overlooking windows and inadequate parking.

Highways Development Management  
No objection subject to conditions.

Head of Public Protection  
No objection.

Welsh Water/Dwr Cymru  
No objection subject to an informative note.

Airbus  
No Objection

### **4.00 PUBLICITY**

- 4.01 Neighbour Notification

8 Letters of objection were received which raised the following objection to the proposal:

- The plans do not accurately show the proposal.
- Existing parking is not adequate.
- Proposed parking is out of keeping with the street.
- Proposal is out of character with surrounding properties.
- Garden room is unnecessary.
- Deeds restricted the owner from using the property of a business use.
- Erection of a kennel will cause an increase in noise, smell and vermin.
- All bedrooms do not require en-suites.
- Construction traffic for kennels causing a highway danger.

- Proposed extension will cause loss of light and view to neighbouring bedroom window.
- Proposed extension will affect the outlook from the neighbouring garden.
- Proposal will devalue neighbouring property.
- Increase in the number of visitors and children.
- Loss of privacy due to sky lights facing a bedroom window.

## **5.00 SITE HISTORY**

5.01 None relevant

## **6.00 PLANNING POLICIES**

6.01 Flintshire Unitary Development Plan

STR1 – New Development

STR8 – Built Environment

GEN1 – General Requirements for Development

D1 – Design Quality, Location and Layout

D2 – Design

HSG12 – House Extension and Alternations

AC18 Parking Provision and New Development.

6.02 National Planning Guidance

Technical Advice Note 12 Design

6.03 Local Planning Guidance

Local Planning Guidance Note No. 1 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings

Local Planning Guidance Note No. 2 Space Around Dwellings.

Local Planning Guidance Note No. 11 Parking Standards.

## **7.00 PLANNING APPRAISAL**

7.01 The application site is located within Hawarden as defined in the Flintshire Unitary Development plan. The property consists of a detached bungalow constructed of brick under a tiled roof with a flat roof garage to the side.

7.02 The application is for a single storey side extension, indicating a family room, kitchen extension and garden room on the ground floor and a bedroom on the first floor in the loft space. The proposal also includes a number of windows on the front and rear of the existing dwelling, however these are permitted development and do not require planning permission. The application also includes an amended parking layout which shows 3no car parking spaces to the front of the dwelling.

7.03 Scale

In terms of scale the extension measures 3.7 metres wide to the front

widening to 5 metres at the rear being approximately 0.5 metres off the boundary line. The extension measures 12 metres in length extending from the rear elevation 5 meters.

7.04 The area at ground floor level is approximately 51m square metres while the first floor having an area of 13 square metres giving an overall total for the extension of 64 square metres additional floor area.

7.05 The original dwelling had an approximate floor area of 97.5 square metres with the additional permitted development alterations to the first floor bringing the overall dwelling to 152 square metres.. The proposed extension would add a further area of 64 square metres which is an increase of approximately 41%. The proposed extension in terms of scale is therefore in compliance with LPG 1 House Extensions to Dwellings which states that houses should not be more than 50% of the original floor space. Furthermore, the proposal complies with the first principle of Policy HSG12 as the extension is subsidiary in scale and form.

7.06 Design

The proposed extension is modest and replaces an existing detached garage. A number of objections have been received which state that the proposed extension is out of keeping with the area as none of the surrounding dwellings have been extended in this manner. The objections also state that the number of velux windows is out of keeping. The proposed design is considered to harmonise and respects the host dwelling, appearing subservient. The lack of a similar extension on surrounding dwellings does it itself create a reason for refusal with the surrounding dwellings having a mix of differing alterations. The design of the proposed extension therefore complies with the second principle of Policy HSG12.

7.07 Separation Distances and impact on people living nearby

The neighbouring occupier at No 16 has objected to the distance which would be created between his existing first floor habitable bedroom windows and the proposed extension. At present the bedroom window of the objectors house looks out onto gable end of the application site and its parking/garden area and in its current form is substantially less than the interface distance of 12m recommended between blank gable walls and habitable room windows. This is an unusual arrangement which this is not a common practice with present day developments with only secondary windows usually now found on side elevation i.e. bathrooms etc. The proposed extension would still result in a flank wall being presented to the neighbouring occupier at No 16. The fundamental difference would be the flank wall would be 3.7 metres closer, however the separation distance between the window and the flank wall will be 3m. Whilst the proposed extension may reduce the outlook from the neighbouring habitable room, this is not considered to be materially more harmful than the

current arrangement and would not outweigh in the planning balance the positive attributes of the proposal. The arrangement is not dissimilar to application number 055618 which Planning Committee visited in November 2016

7.08 Due to the south-easterly orientation of the proposed extension which is a dormer style construction, the effect of the proposal would not significantly alter the existing light levels within the room which is at first floor level and any minor reduction would be confined mainly to the evening. It is considered that this would have a limited impact on the reasonable enjoyment of that room by any occupier. In terms of overshadowing, it is expected that for a limited period of time during the evening there might be overshadowing in a small part of the garden area between the two properties. It is considered that the proposal would have a negligible effect of the main, useable area of the garden lying towards the rear of the dwelling. Overall the proposed extension would not cause any greater harm to the occupier's reasonable enjoyment of that first floor bedroom at No 18 than is already created by the existing arrangement.

7.09 Therefore the proposal complies with the third principle of Policy HSG12 as it would not have an unacceptable impact on people living nearby.

7.10 Highways

A number of objections have been received in relation to highway safety and parking requirements for the proposed development. Following the receipt of an amended plan showing the creation of 3 spaces off the highway which meets the requirement of the LPG guidance note, the Highways Officer has raised no objection to the proposal subject to the conditions outlined above.

7.11 Other Matters

A number of objections have been raised in relation to construction traffic, potential business use, devaluation of property, increase in vermin and the necessity of development. With regards to the scale and nature of the development proposed, to the extent to which any of these concerns are material considerations, it is considered that very little weight should be attached to these concerns.

**8.00 CONCLUSION**

It is considered that the proposed development is compliant with the relevant policies and guidance. The harm which would arise by the increase in proximity of the flank wall of No 18 towards No 16 is not considered materially more harmful than the existing arrangement. The development proposed will not adversely impact upon highway safety nor will it unacceptably impact on the living conditions of the occupants of the adjoining residential property or the character of the area in a manner that would warrant refusal of the application

## 8.01 Other Considerations

The Council has had due regard to its duty under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and considered that there would be no significant or unacceptable increase in crime and disorder as a result of the recommended decision.

The Council has acted in accordance with the Human Rights Act 1998 including Article 8 of the Convention and in a manner which is necessary in a democratic society in furtherance of the legitimate aims of the Act and the Convention.

The Council has had due regard to its public sector equality duty under the Equality Act 2010.

The Council has had due regard to its duty under Section 3 of the Wellbeing of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 and considered that there would be no significant or unacceptable impact upon the achievement of wellbeing objectives as a result of the recommended decision.

### **LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

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

**Contact Officer:** Mr Dan McVey  
**Telephone:** 01352 703266  
**Email:** Daniel.McVey@flintshire.gov.uk