

PLANNING COMMITTEE

7th JULY 2015

AMENDMENT SHEET

ITEM 6

| | |
|--|---|
| <u>APPLICATION NO:</u> P2014/0468 | <u>DATE:</u> 20/02/2015 |
| PROPOSAL: | One detached three bed single storey bungalow with associated parking (Amended plans received 20/02/15) |
| LOCATION: | Land adjacent to Fairview Bungalow, Main Road, Aberdulais, Neath SA10 8LE |
| APPLICANT: | Mr David Morgan |
| TYPE: | Full Plans |
| WARD: | Aberdulais |

Further representations have been received from an agent on behalf of the objector regarding the above proposal, which in summary express the following concerns: -.

- that the committee report does not respond to comments made in the Independent Planning and Urban Design Assessment completed by the objector's consultant.
- That the proposal represents an unacceptably cramped and over intensive form of backland development which fails to provide for adequate separation distances between itself and the neighbouring properties resulting in an unacceptable loss of outlook and amenity to those properties and which fails to provide for adequate private amenity space and general standards of residential amenity for future occupiers of the property by virtue of overlooking from the existing properties and their physical and visual impact.
- The report does not mention that obscure glazing would have to be installed in the sole window serving a habitable room in the side elevation of the new house facing Sunnybank to prevent direct overlooking of that property.
- That the report fails to properly address the issue of 'character' or consider the fundamental change in the nature and intensity of the use of the site and the way in which that it would unacceptably adversely impact on the amenity of all the neighbouring properties.

- Concern over the inference in the report that if an alternative means of access were provided the development could be considered acceptable.
- The planning officer has not viewed the application site from the objector's garden, and as a consequence it is difficult to have confidence that Officers have objectively considered the impact of the development on that property, and requests that Members visit to see for themselves

Accordingly, while they endorse the Officer's recommendation, they request an additional reason for refusal as follows: -

'The proposal represents an unacceptably cramped and over intensive form of back land development which fails to provide for adequate separation distances between itself and the neighbouring properties resulting in an unacceptable loss of outlook and amenity to those properties and which fails to provide for adequate private amenity space and general standards of residential amenity for future occupiers of the property by virtue of overlooking from the existing properties and their physical and visual impact'.

In response to the above, the following comments are made: -

- While the report does not specifically refer to the agents 'Independent Planning and Urban Design Assessment', the committee report has summarised the objections from the neighbouring property as a whole, and responded to such concerns both within the main part of the report and in the section addressing the objections raised.
- Officers visited the site and were content that the impacts on the neighbouring properties could be adequately assessed without the need to be viewed from the objectors property.
- Officers are satisfied that the report makes an appropriate assessment of the impact on local character, having regard to the local context and pattern of development, and that the conclusions reached, namely that the impact of the development on character or amenity would be restricted to the access to the property, remain sound.
- In the event that permission was granted, then a condition would have been required in respect of obscure glazing the window facing 'Sunnybank' (due to the levels on the site meaning that a boundary enclosure would not restrict such views). While it is accepted that it is not ideal to require a bedroom window to be obscurely glazed, this is not considered to amount to a reason for refusal of planning permission, or an indication that the development is unacceptable as a cramped form of development.