

Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council
Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Castell-nedd

Democratic Services
Gwasanaethau Democrataidd

Chief Executive: Steven Phillips

Date: 27 February 2018

Dear Member,

PLANNING COMMITTEE - TUESDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 2018

Please find attached the following addendum reports/urgent items for consideration at the next meeting of the **Planning Committee - Tuesday, 27th February, 2018.**

Item

4. **Amendment Sheet for:**
Application No: P2017/1055 (Pages 3 - 8)

Two storey side extension plus alteration to ground levels and extended hardstanding to facilitate off street car parking, at 9 Maes Rhosyn, Rhos, Pontardawe, Swansea, SA8 3HT.

Yours sincerely

Tammie Davies

p.p Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE

27TH FEBRUARY 2018

AMENDMENT SHEET

ITEM 4

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u> P2017/1055	<u>DATE:</u> 16/01/2018
PROPOSAL: Two storey side extension	
LOCATION: 9 Maes Rhosyn, Rhos Pontardawe, Swansea SA8 3HT	
APPLICANT: Mr Aled Phillips	
TYPE: Householder	
WARD: Rhos	

Amended Scheme

Following publication of the Committee report, the Highway Officer raised some concern in respect of the additional space being proposed to the site frontage. While the creation of this space (provided the raised hardstanding is less than 30cm high and permeable) would not require the benefit of planning permission, it was nevertheless included in the original application.

Due to the Highway Officer's concerns, following a request the applicant's agent has confirmed that the scheme should proceed without the proposed ground alterations and additional space being provided. The development description (above) has therefore been amended to exclude this additional space.

Accordingly, Members are requested to assess the application based on the following amended highways section of the published report (with the original to be disregarded): -

Parking and Access Requirements and Impact on Highway Safety.

The original plans included the creation of a widened vehicular access and provision of an additional parking space to the site frontage. While this would numerically have provided betterment to the existing situation, nevertheless the Highway Officer has raised concerns over the safety of such additional space. As a

consequence, the scheme has been amended to exclude the additional space, with the plans also increasing the width of the existing space to 3.6m to accord with the Highway officer's request.

Having regard to the above, it is necessary to consider whether the proposed development would have any unacceptable impact on highway safety. In this regard, it is noted that the existing property is served, at best, by one parking space (the existing garage, while able to accommodate a vehicle, is nevertheless below expected standards at 5.6m x 2.5m, and the existing space to the front is substandard length at 3.8m, which results in vehicles overhanging the public footway).

The proposed development seeks to remove the existing garage and construct a two-storey extension to the side. As a consequence, the front parking space would be increased in depth to 5m (and widened to 3.6m as above). While we would ideally seek such a space to be 5.5m – 6m deep, 5m is nevertheless an improvement and would be sufficient for a single vehicle to rest clear of the highway. The development would, therefore, cause no additional detriment to existing off-street parking provision and, given that the existing garage is itself unlikely to be utilised for vehicular parking due to its size, could also be argued to nominally improve existing provision.

Within the above context, while the extension would increase the size of the property, it is nevertheless considered that there would be reasonable grounds to object to the extension on grounds relating to parking or any consequential impact on highway safety. Accordingly, it is considered that the development will not result in any detrimental impacts upon pedestrian and highway safety.

Amendment to Recommendation

As a consequence of the above, condition 2 within the original report is to be amended to refer to the amended plans to be submitted on 27th February 2018 (excluding those relating to the new space/ raised ground levels), such drawing numbers to be confirmed in the formal Committee Minutes.

In addition, recommended condition 5 requiring the completion of the additional parking prior to the first use of the extension hereby approved, and for their retention on site is deleted and replaced by the following condition:-

5. Prior to the first beneficial use of the proposed extension, the existing driveway / parking space shall be increased in depth to 5m and in width to 3.6m, with such enlarged car parking space retained thereafter.

Reason

In the interest of highway and pedestrian safety.

ITEM 5

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u> P2017/1145	<u>DATE:</u>
PROPOSAL:	4 x self-contained flats with associated car parking and engineering operations (Amended plans received 09/02/18)
LOCATION:	Land at Park Row, Cwmavon, Port Talbot SA12 9PW
APPLICANT:	First Choice Housing Association
TYPE:	Full Plans
WARD:	Bryn & Cwmavon

Members are advised that an additional objection letter was received after the report was finalised, the contents of which are summarised below (with Officers response in *italics* below): -

- Concerns regarding the complex history of the site in terms of historic mine workings, including legal action with the Authority. This resulted in the sale of land to existing residents at Park Row, but with legal restrictions limiting its use to garden land. Are these restrictions still in place?

The history of the site has been addressed in the main report.

Matters relating to covenants on this (or any other) land are legal matters, and are not a material planning consideration.

- Concerns regarding the visual appearance of the flats, which would be out of character with the houses in the area. Notes that during the late 1980s an application for a dormer bungalow was refused as it was not in accordance with the surrounding properties. As such, the Authority has set in motion criteria that only houses can be developed on the site.

The visual impacts have been addressed in the main report. It should be noted that the previous refusal for a bungalow would not set a precedent for any future application, as each application is dealt with on its individual merits.

- The application does not identify whether the flats will be sold off or whether the developer will be a Social Landlord. The applicant (First Choice Housing Association) currently own Number 9, so may seek to extend their Social Landlord properties.
- If the development will be for Social Housing, how and who will maintain the property?

The main report has addressed the above issues, while it should be noted that the future maintenance of the property would not be a material planning consideration, so cannot be considered as part of the determination process.

- Concerns regarding potential overlooking from the first-floor rear windows, exacerbated by main living accommodation being to the rear.

Turning to potential overlooking issues, this has also been dealt with in the main report.

- No disabled parking spaces are indicated, even though the ground-floor flats are designed for disabled occupiers, and no provision has been made for visitors parking.

There is no specific requirement for a disabled bay to be provided for this residential development. Nevertheless a standard disabled parking space would measure 3.6m wide by 4.8m in length, and the approved SPG confirms that where there is sufficient surface to the side of the space (such as that proposed in the layout), the 'standard' parking bay can be utilised. With regards to the concerns regarding visitors to the property this has been addressed in the main report.

- Staff at Number 9 (next-door) currently parking on the pavement at the entrance into Park Row, which is dangerous in terms of highway and pedestrian safety.

These matters are not related to the current application.

- Concerns regarding the sewers in the area. Reassurance must be given that any damages to these caused by the new development would be rectified at the developers cost, and not existing residents.

As stated in the main report, the layout has been amended to address the location of the existing sewers to the western boundary of the site. As Welsh Water has offered no objection to the submitted scheme, it is considered acceptable in terms of drainage. It should be noted that any damage to Welsh Water's apparatus would need to be rectified to their satisfaction, and is not a material planning consideration.

This page is intentionally left blank