

PLANNING COMMITTEE

7TH JULY 2020

AMENDMENT SHEET

ITEM 4

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u> P2020/0406	<u>DATE:</u> 14/05/2020
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	Proposed part change of use of shop (Use Class A1) and first floor flat (Use Class C3) to a five-person House of Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class C4), together with alterations to fenestration to main building and outbuilding
<u>LOCATION:</u>	50 Commercial Road, Taibach SA13 1LG
<u>APPLICANT:</u>	Mr Job Gutteling
<u>TYPE:</u>	Full Plans
<u>WARD:</u>	Taibach

Clarification

On page 37 the report states that “...a number of objections were received” when actually only one representation was received. Instead, this paragraph should have stated that a number of issues were raised by the single representation.

Councillor Questions

To assist the smooth running of the remote Planning Committee meeting, Cllr. Arwyn Woolcock has submitted the following questions in advance, with an officer response provided below each in turn.

Q1. Page 36 states that parking space is restricted to only 1 within the existing garage. The Head of Transport (Highways Section) states that there are no objections as there are existing Traffic Regulation Orders in place. However, in the event of a number of the residents of this proposed HMO being car owners, will that not encourage them to park their vehicles elsewhere, to the annoyance of residents of those neighbouring streets?

Response: As detailed in the main report the existing property would generate a parking requirement of 5 spaces, and the proposed use would also generate a requirement of 5 spaces. Whilst it is noted that the occupiers of the HMO could be car owners, experience of other HMOs suggests that car ownership tends to be lower. It is also noted that the application site is in a relatively sustainable location on a bus route and close to facilities, such as shops, which would also hopefully limit potential car ownership. The TRO restrictions on the laybys outside the application site mean that if residents do have cars they would need to park in an area with no such restrictions. Whilst this may potentially impact upon the residents in neighbouring streets, provided they are road legal and there are no such TRO restrictions in those areas, it would be difficult to prevent such parking, and would not be a reason to refuse the application on highway safety grounds.

Q2. Page 35 – Impact on Residential Amenity states “In respect of potential overlooking, it is noted that the only additional (new) window would serve the first floor shower-room.” As this is a shower-room, should there be a condition that the proposed window be fitted with opaque glass?

Response: Whilst a condition is perhaps not ‘strictly’ necessary for the first-floor shower-room window to be obscurely glazed (as it looks onto the blank side elevation of Number 48 and is likely to be obscured due to its use), a suitably worded condition has nevertheless been added in this instance to ensure that the amenity of the occupiers and neighbouring properties is protected moving forward. This is now Condition Number 7 (as follows), with the former Condition 7 being re-numbered to Condition 8.

7. Notwithstanding the details submitted, prior to the first beneficial use of the HMO hereby approved, the window on the side elevation serving the first-floor shower-room shall be fitted with obscured glazing, and any part of the window that is less than 1.7m above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be non-opening. The windows shall be permanently retained as such thereafter,

Reason: In the interest of the amenities of the adjoining property and host property, and to ensure accordance with Policy BE1 of the adopted Neath Port Talbot Local Development Plan.