

PLANNING (SITE VISITS) SUB COMMITTEE

(Civic Centre, Neath)

Members Present:

11th December, 2012

2nd January 2013

Chairman: Councillor A.N.Woolcock

Vice Chair: Councillor J.Warman

Councillors: Mrs.P.Bebell, D.W.Davies, S.K.Hunt, Mrs.D.Jones,
Mrs.S.M.Penry and I.D.Williams

Officers in Attendance: B.Thorne, G.White, D.Adlam, M.Fury and
Miss.C.Grocutt

1. **PLANNING APPLICATION NO. P/2010/455**
CONSTRUCTION OF 2 NO. DETACHED DORMER
BUNGALOWS AT PLOT 1 (FORMERLY KNOWN AS THE
BEECHES), THE OAKS, CIMLA, NEATH

The Sub Committee visited the above mentioned location. A copy of the report had been circulated for Members' consideration.

Following the site visit, the Sub Committee discussed the application and took into account the views expressed by the Local Member. Issues were raised regarding the boundary wall of the planning application. Accordingly, Members requested further clarification on this issue.

The Planning Officer confirmed that following the site visit, the Officer's original recommendation of approval, remained unchanged.

RECOMMENDED: that consideration of the above mentioned application be adjourned to 2nd January, 2013 to enable clarification regarding the exact location of the boundary of the proposed development and of the boundary treatment.

**(The Chairman then reconvened the meeting in
Port Talbot Civic Centre on the 2nd January 2013)**

(Note: An amendment sheet – attached and agreed - was circulated at the commencement of the meeting, as detailed in Appendix A hereto, which the Head of Planning verbally amended condition no. 5 at the meeting).

Members were given a brief resume of the earlier meeting held on the 11th December 2012, as contained in the circulated report. Details of the proposed boundary of the application outlined on the map circulated at the meeting, were clarified by the Head of Planning. In accordance with the above, the Committee discussed the application and took into consideration the additional information and the local Members' concerns in relation to the boundary and highway safety of the application.

Following discussion, Members requested that a note be added to the recommendation outlining that the Authority had received representations disputing land ownership.

(Note: with regard to the amendment sheet referred to above and attached as Appendix A, on which the Chair had allowed sufficient time for Members to read, in respect of application items on the published agenda, the Chairman had permitted urgent circulation/consideration thereof at today's meeting, the particular reasons and the circumstances being not to further delay the planning process, unless the Committee itself wanted to defer any applications and to ensure that the Members take all extra relevant information into account before coming to any decision at the meeting).

RECOMMENDED: that following consideration of the additional information the Officers recommendation be approved, subject to a verbal amendment at the meeting by the Head of Planning, to Condition no. 5 contained in the circulated report, together with an additional note indicating that the Authority had received representations disputing the southern boundary of the application site with the adjoining lane.

CHAIRMAN

APPENDIX 1

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
2ND JANUARY 2013**

ENVIRONMENT

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING – G.WHITE

AMENDMENT SHEET

<u>ITEM 1.1</u>	
<u>APPLICATION NO:</u> P/2010/455	<u>DATE:</u> 09/03/2011
PROPOSAL:	Construction of 2no. detached dormer bungalows
LOCATION:	Plot 1 (Formerly Known As The Beeches), The Oaks, Cimla, Neath, Sa11 3rr
APPLICANT:	Mr S Rogers
TYPE:	Full Plans
WARD:	Cimla

Two letters of objection have been received from a solicitor acting on behalf of the occupants of Cefn Crynallt Farm. The first letter takes the opportunity to contest the land ownership of the application site, primarily the boundary adjacent to the access road leading to Cefn Crynnalt Farm. The objector describes how the proposed wall as indicated on the submitted plans will encroach upon their land and will severely limit the vision splay from the access road. The second letter respectfully requests that the issues raised in the first letter are taken into account during determination before going on to question the accuracy of the application plans in terms of the measurements shown and once again disputes the issue of boundaries and land ownership.

In reference to these concerns, the issue of land ownership is not a material planning consideration; it is a civil matter between the objector and the applicant. The plans submitted on behalf of the objector to argue their case show the same land ownership boundary as the applicants and any dispute relates to the thickness of the line on the plan. For the purposes of the application there is no reason to doubt the land ownership certificate that

accompanies the planning application and in any event the adjacent landowner is clearly aware of the planning application. Furthermore the plans have all been produced to a scale recognisable by the Local Planning Authority and following a site visit undertaken by the Case Officer, they appear to be a true reflection of what is present on site.

The planning issues in this case relate to whether the position of the proposed boundary wall is acceptable in terms of residential and visual amenity as well as highway and pedestrian safety. The proposed wall is not considered to negatively affect the visibility of the existing lane, the plans show the wall will be set in a minimum 300mm from the boundary and the width of the access lane will be unaltered. Therefore the proposed boundary wall will not adversely affect highway and pedestrian safety. In terms of visual and residential amenity, these issues have already been discussed at length in the appraisal.

Two separate letters from neighbouring properties were submitted which focused primarily on; plot position, loss of light, overlooking of windows, the width of the access road to Cefn-Crynallt Farm and the position of existing utilities. The letters then describe how the proposed position of the boundary wall will be located outside of where a hedge once stood. All of these concerns have been addressed in the officer report and above. Finally the letter describes how a natural spring runs across the site where plot 1 is to be constructed. There are no records within the highway department showing a spring nor has the Environment Agency any details of a spring existing.