

**FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

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

**DATE:** **2<sup>ND</sup> OCTOBER 2019**

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

**SUBJECT:** **APPEAL BY MR. S. LLOYD AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND ERECTION OF 3 NO. TOWN HOUSES AND GARAGE AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS AT PARKFIELD, LLANASA ROAD, GRONANT – ALLOWED.**

**1.00 APPLICATION NUMBER**

1.01 059124

**2.00 SITE**

2.01 Parkfield  
Llanasa Road  
Gronant

**3.00 APPLICATION VALID DATE**

3.01 17<sup>th</sup> October 2018

**4.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

4.01 To inform Members of a decision in respect of an appeal, against the refusal planning permission for the demolition of existing dwellings and erection of 3no. town house including the erection of garages and construction of a new vehicular access.

The application was referred to the April 2019 Planning Committee with a recommendation of approval, subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement. Members resolved to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed terraced row of two storey dwellings would not harmonise with the site or the surroundings. The proposed use of space and layout of the dwellings, garages and parking areas will dominate the site and have an adverse impact on the

character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore in conflict with Policy GEN 1 (a) of the UDP.

2. The proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the highway network due to the volume of traffic which would be generated from the development using a restricted access onto a busy road. The proposal is therefore in conflict with Policy GEN 1 (f).
3. The proposed development would not have appropriate or convenient access to public transport as there are no bus stops which can be safely accessed on foot from the proposed development. The proposal is therefore in conflict with Policy GEN 1 (g).

The appointed Planning Inspector was Claire MacFarlane. The appeal was determined via written representations and was ALLOWED, subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement.

## **5.00 REPORT**

### Main Issues

5.01 The Inspector the considered main issues to be the Councils reasons for refusal, which are:

- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
- The effect on highway safety; and
- Whether the proposal makes provision for suitable access to public transport for pedestrians.

5.02 Character and appearance

The proposed development would result in a higher density of development within the plot than currently exists and would be more visible due to the increased height of the proposed dwellings. However, the Inspector considered that due to the variety of dwelling types and plot sizes in the surrounding area, there is no overall dominant pattern of development or density. Two-storey dwellings are also prevalent within the surrounding area and the introduction of three small dwellings would not be out of place within this context. The Inspector considered that the position of the appeal site below road level would also limit the visual impact from the increased height of the proposed dwellings when viewed from the road. She states that the proposed development would not be unduly prominent, particularly when viewed in the context of the elevated dwellings to the south.

- 5.03 The inspector considered that due to the ground level of the site falling away from Llanasa Road and the orientation of the proposed dwellings and garages, the area of hardstanding, garages and parking spaces would not dominate the site's frontage along the road. The parking and turning provision proposed would therefore not be out of keeping with the surrounding area.
- 5.04 The Inspector concluded that the development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and complies with Policy GEN1 of the UDP, which seeks to ensure developments harmonise with the site and surroundings.
- 5.05 Highway safety
- The Inspector considered that the proposed arrangements would represent an improvement upon the existing site access with regard to visibility for vehicles entering and exiting the site, and also for those travelling along Llanasa Road. Although the proposed development may give rise to an increased number of vehicle movements to and from the site, due to the improved visibility, access arrangements and low levels of traffic, this would not significantly prejudice highway safety.
- 5.06 The Inspector also considered that there was no evidence to suggest that parking provided would be insufficient to meet the needs of this particular development and that a higher parking standard should be applied. Also, at the time the appeal site visit there was no evidence of on-street parking in the immediate area, which suggests it is not an area of particularly high parking stress at present. Therefore, the potential for on-street parking, and the extent to which this would occur, is limited and would not represent a significant risk to highway safety.
- 5.07 The Inspector concluded that the development would not be harmful to highway safety and complies with Policy GEN1 of the UDP, which seeks to prevent unacceptable effects on the highway network.

#### Public transport

- 5.08 The appeal site is located within the settlement boundary of a Category B settlement, as defined in the UDP. The principle of development being acceptable has therefore been established at both the appeal site and within Gronant, on the basis that it is a sustainable location with access to public transport and facilities. The proposed development would therefore accord with the settlement strategy of the UDP.
- 5.09 The nearest bus stop is located approximately 250m from the site, with a footway available on at least one side of Llanasa Road for approximately half of this distance. Pedestrians would be required to

walk in the road for the remaining distance. Due to the traffic conditions described above, the width of the road allowing for vehicles to pass pedestrians, the limited increase in pedestrian movements likely to arise from an additional two dwellings and the relatively short distance involved, this would not represent an unacceptable risk to pedestrian safety.

- 5.10 The Inspector concluded conclude that the development does not conflict with Policy GEN1 of the UDP, which seeks to ensure developments have convenient and appropriate access to public transport.

#### Other Matters

- 5.11 The inspector also considered a number of other matters which were raised by third parties during the course of the appeal.
- 5.12 The Inspector considered that given the separation distances between the nearest dwelling, and the existing high boundary hedges of both, there would not be unacceptable harm to the outlook from Glas-for as a result of the proposed development. With regard to the potential for increased noise and disturbance, whilst there may be increased activity within and around the site, it is unlikely that an additional two dwellings would give rise to such a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers that a refusal of planning permission would be warranted. The Inspector considered the proposed development would therefore not be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring residents.
- 5.13 Due to the small number of dwellings proposed, the Inspector considered that any additional demand on local services and infrastructure would be limited and there is no evidence before me to suggest such demands could not be accommodated. She therefore give this little weight in reaching my decision. The Inspector noted the comments from residents regarding previous mining operations on the site, the adequacy of the details provided regarding drainage and the effect of the proposed development on wildlife. However, conditions are imposed regarding these matters. She also note comments regarding the loss of property value as a result of the proposed development, however it is a well-founded principle that the planning system does not exist to protect private interests such as value of land or property.

#### **6.00 CONCLUSION**

- 6.01 The Inspector considered the proposal accorded with the identified UDP policies and national guidance in respect of the main issues. Accordingly he ALLOWED the appeal subject to a number of conditions and a Section 106 agreement in relation to public open space contributions.

**LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Planning Application & Supporting Documents

National & Local Planning Policy

Responses to Consultation

Responses to Publicity

**Contact Officer: Mr D McVey**

**Telephone: 01352 703266**

**Email: [daniel.mcvey@flintshire.gov.uk](mailto:daniel.mcvey@flintshire.gov.uk)**