



County Hall  
Cardiff  
CF10 4UW  
Tel: (029) 2087 2000

Neuadd y Sir  
Caerdydd  
CF10 4UW  
Ffôn: (029) 2087 2000

## LATE REPRESENTATIONS

**Committee** PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Date and Time of Meeting** WEDNESDAY, 20 APRIL 2016, 2.30 PM

Please see attached Late Representation Schedule received in respect of applications to be determined at this Planning Committee

8 **Late Reps** (*Pages 1 - 10*)

This page is intentionally left blank

**LATE REPRESENTATIONS SCHEDULE**  
**PLANNING COMMITTEE – 20<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2016**

<b>PAGE NO. 14</b>	<b>APPLICATION NO. 16/00007/MNR</b>
<b>ADDRESS</b>	<b>149 HEATHWOOD ROAD</b>
<b>FROM:</b>	J Panahei
<b>SUMMARY:</b>	<p>I would like to object to the above planning application on the following grounds:</p> <p>Planning uncharacteristic with buildings in the area and approval encouraging similar projects to go ahead</p> <p>Increased congestion in an already busy area, where parking is a major problems.</p>
<b>REMARKS:</b>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The issues raised are addressed in the report to Planning Committee.</p>

<b>PAGE NO. 14</b>	<b>APPLICATION NO. 16/00007/MNR</b>
<b>ADDRESS</b>	<b>149 HEATHWOOD ROAD</b>
<b>FROM:</b>	Councillor L Hudson
<b>SUMMARY:</b>	<p>Please submit the following to the planning committee of 20<sup>th</sup> April, as I am unfortunately unable to attend.</p> <p>I object most strongly to the above application. Nothing has changed since the last application with regard to the intrusion into the lives of the neighbours, one of the reasons why the appeal was turned down last time. Also, the proposed development in Heathwood Road is a house of character typical of the area, and if this goes ahead it will cause a precedent to be set in changing the character of the road from one of residential bungalows and houses to one of smaller flats. This is totally against the Planning Inspectorate guidelines of changing the landscape of an area, and was an important consideration when the appeal was rejected by the Inspectorate previously.</p> <p>The reasons given by officers previously were that in respect of layout, scale, context, &amp; overbearing character of the site, it would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity, and the siting, massing, and density of the scheme fails to respect the character of the surroundings. These reasons are still very valid. The development would be backing on to St Cadoc Road, so not only the immediate</p>

	<p>neighbours to the sides of the property would inconvenienced but also those at the back. The proposed site does not have the capacity to house 7 self-contained flats.</p> <p>So the proposed site will have a much greater infill if this development goes ahead, and would be something totally out of character with the suburb.</p> <p>I am therefore objecting to this planning application, and would ask committee to reject it.</p>
<b>REMARKS:</b>	The issues raised are noted and are considered in the report to Planning Committee.

<b>PAGE NO. 39</b>	<b>APPLICATION NO. 16/00022/MNR</b>
<b>ADDRESS</b>	<b>6 LUCAS STREET</b>
<b>FROM:</b>	Agent – Peter Legg
<b>SUMMARY:</b>	The application has been withdrawn at the request of the Agent.
<b>REMARKS:</b>	Noted

<b>PAGE NO. 78</b>	<b>APPLICATION NO. 15/00362/MJR</b>
<b>ADDRESS</b>	<b>599 NEWPORT ROAD, RUMNEY, CARDIFF</b>
<b>FROM:</b>	Councillor J Parry
<b>SUMMARY:</b>	I have very real concerns re this app. Including the entrance for almost Forty Flats to be on A narrow congested Rumney Bridge. We have always had hugely irate residents complaining on a daily basis as the queues of traffic are horrendous. , It is on a floodplain ., it is adjacent to A tidal Rumney River. And the number of flats are " too many".
<b>REMARKS:</b>	The comments are noted.  The issues raised are addressed in the report to Committee.

<b>PAGE NO. 172</b>	<b>APPLICATION NO. 15/03097/MJR</b>
<b>ADDRESS:</b>	<b>LAND AND BUILDINGS BOUND BY BRIDGE STREET, CHARLES STREET AND WESLEY LANE, CARDIFF</b>
<b>FROM:</b>	Head of Planning
<b>SUMMARY:</b>	Condition 8 (A3 opening hours) to be omitted as it replicates condition 24 and is therefore superfluous.
<b>REMARKS:</b>	None

<b>PAGE NO. 172</b>	<b>APPLICATION NO. 15/3097/MJR</b>
<b>ADDRESS:</b>	<b>LAND AND BUILDINGS BOUND BY BRIDGE STREET, CHARLES STREET AND WESLEY LANE, CARDIFF</b>
<b>FROM:</b>	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (NLP)
<b>SUMMARY:</b>	<p><b>Emails objecting to the development from a member of the Property and Finance Committee of the Quaker Meeting House at 43 Charles Street received on 14<sup>th</sup> April, and from the Clerk of the Quaker Meeting House at 43 Charles Street received on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2016.</b></p> <p>The emails object to the development on the same grounds, summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No representatives from the Quaker Meeting House were invited to the public engagement event undertaken for this scheme in October 2015. He also notes that the Quaker Meeting House was not notified of the planning application, which is not a matter for the applicant to comment upon.</li> <li>• Shading on the garden of the Quaker Meeting House.</li> <li>• Cycle parking is not provided at a rate of 50%, the access to the cycle parking is via a number of doors and in a location where servicing of the development occurs.</li> <li>• There is a reduction in space provided for the Alcohol Treatment Centre.</li> <li>• Questioning the need for student accommodation.</li> <li>• Questioning the effectiveness of the proposed move in and move out strategy.</li> <li>• Questioning whether this site should be developed for other uses.</li> </ul>
<b>REMARKS:</b>	<p>Responding to these points in turn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation: The developer confirms that an</li> </ul>

invitation letter to the public engagement event was sent and addressed specifically to the 'Cardiff Quaker Meeting House' at 43 Charles Street. It is not a statutory obligation for the applicant to undertake community consultation. The application was advertised by site and press notice in the usual way.

- **Sunlighting:** The Building Research Establishment Daylight and Sunlighting Guidance calls for an analysis of the before and after sunlight access of the analysed space to be undertaken. The analysis is used to determine the area of the garden receiving 2hrs or more sunlight access on the 21 March. The aim is for 50% of the analysed area to maintain this level of sunlight amenity on the test date.

An analysis carried out by the developer's consultant G.L.Hearn shows that the reduction in sunlighting to the garden will be minimal (72% of the garden area enjoying 2 hours or more sunlight on the equinox, reducing to 68%). The garden will therefore continue to comply with the British Research Establishment's report, in that in excess of 50% of its area will see two hours' or more sunlight on 21 March. It should be noted that this sunlight access will increase significantly during the summer months when the garden is most likely to be used.

The effect of the proposed development will be negligible on the current sunlight amenity.

- **Cycle Parking:** The maximum amount of internal cycle parking has been provided within this development, recognising also the desirability to maximise the amount of active frontage. The amount/ proportion of internal cycle parking is similar to precedents set by other student accommodation schemes in the city. Highways have no objection to the amount of cycle parking or the access arrangements to the cycle store, see paragraph 5.22 of the committee report.
- **Alcohol Treatment Centre:** The size and layout of the Alcohol Treatment Centre meets the contractual requirements of its operator/ occupier.
- **Number of Students:** The provision of student accommodation at the application site is in accordance with planning policy. Provision and demand for purpose-built student housing is

	<p>addressed in paras 8.6 and 8.7 of the cttee report.</p> <p>The application also demonstrates that the building could be easily converted to other uses (e.g. residential apartments, hotel) in the unlikely event the demand for student accommodation falls away. This would be subject to planning permission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Student changeover days:</i> The move in/ out of students from the development is outlined in the submitted Transport Statement and the Planning and Student Accommodation Statement. The approach is to undertake the move in and out of the development from local car parks.</li> </ul> <p>There are a number of car parks within the local area from which the move in/ out of the development can be undertaken. The nearest car park is on the opposite side of Bridge Street (adjacent to Ivor House/ MA Rapport and Co Ltd). This is a surface level, external car park and has crossing facilities to the side of Bridge Street upon which the development is located. This is likely to be the car park which students residing at the development will utilise.</p> <p>Furthermore a condition requires more details on this strategy, replicating the approach undertaken at other developments in the city.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Development of Other Uses at the Site:</i> PPW states that each planning application should be considered on its own merits. See para 8.6 of the cttee report.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>PAGE NO.</b>	<b>APPLICATION NO. 15/3097/MJR</b>
<b>ADDRESS:</b>	<b>LAND AND BUILDINGS BOUND BY BRIDGE STREET, CHARLES STREET AND WESLEY LANE, CARDIFF</b>
<b>FROM:</b>	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (NLP)
<b>SUMMARY:</b>	<p><b>Email received 18<sup>th</sup> April 2016.</b></p> <p>On behalf of The Saint Davids Partnership (SDP), owners of the SD2 Retail Mall, NLP reiterate their concern over the management of traffic at student changeovers.</p> <p>The substantive parts of their representation are reproduced in full below:</p> <p><i>'The precise arrangements for student change over days are</i></p>



	<p><i>of particular importance to SDP, as the applicant has identified in the submitted draft Travel Plan that both SDP's car park and the car park serving John Lewis department store would be used to facilitate student change over days.</i></p> <p><i>This will result in a considerable influx of vehicular movements to SDP's car park at a number of dates throughout each academic year. This not only assumes that the car parks will be able to accommodate this amount of extra activity but has the potential to significantly impact on parking logistics at our client's site and in turn affect the operation, the vitality and attractiveness of the city's main shopping centre, as well as surrounding streets.</i></p> <p><i>We therefore consider it essential that engagement with SDP takes place over the precise arrangements proposed, to ensure that the process is effective and disruption to SDP's existing operations and the surrounding road network can be minimised.</i></p> <p><i>As such, we feel it is necessary to either secure these details prior to the application being determined. At the very least we would want to ensure that the condition is amended to also require details of an appropriate strategy for engaging with our client, who, after all, is likely to bear the brunt of the influx of students and parents descending on the area on changeover days.</i></p> <p><i>There is clearly a danger that without such a co-ordinated approach to changeover days, the logistics of handling such operations could have a considerable impact upon what is already a congested area and on most weekends extremely busy. Not to do so would appear to be a missed opportunity to ensure that the area can accommodate the proposed development, which is clearly a legitimate planning concern.'</i></p>
<p><b>REMARKS:</b></p>	<p>The student changeover arrangements are addressed in para 8.63 of the committee report. It is likely that the Bridge Street surface car park will be used to accommodate most of the traffic on the pre-arranged changeover days.</p> <p>A condition requires submission of a detailed student travel plan. In the event that the SD2 or JLP car parks are to be used the exact arrangements will be a matter for the student housing management and SDP to agree.</p>

<b>PAGE NO. 244</b>	<b>APPLICATION NO. 15/3159/MJR</b>
<b>ADDRESS:</b>	<b>CARDIFF SIXTH FORM COLLEGE, 97-99 NEWPORT ROAD, ROATH, CARDIFF</b>
<b>FROM:</b>	Head of Planning – report clarification.
<b>SUMMARY:</b>	Para 7.1 of the cttee report should state that Letters of objection have been received from local members Cllrs. De’Ath, McGarry, Lent and Javed, AM Eluned Parrott, MP Jo Stevens, and 32 local residents.
<b>REMARKS:</b>	None.

<b>PAGE NO. 278</b>	<b>APPLICATION NO. 16/00194/MJR</b>
<b>ADDRESS</b>	<b>BUTE STREET 152-160, BUTE STREET, BUTETOWN</b>
<b>FROM:</b>	The applicant’s agent
<b>SUMMARY:</b>	<p>The applicant’s agent has submitted amended plans to better address the Waste Manager’s comments.</p> <p>The agent has confirmed that CCHA have been in touch with Waste Management and it has been agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The houses fronting Bute Street and Hannah Street will incorporate bin storage into their front gardens;</li> <li>- Bin storage for the house in the mews will be relocated to the communal bin store for the flats</li> </ul> <p>This has now been shown on an amended plan.</p>
<b>REMARKS:</b>	<p>Amend condition 2 to read.</p> <p>This approval is in respect of the following plans and documents:-  PI(90)001 and 003; PL(99)001C, 002C, 003F, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009D; all as amended by email and elevational illustrative plan dated 22/3/16; and Design and Access Statement.  Reason: To avoid any doubt and confusion as the approved plans.</p> <p>Add extra condition 25 to read.</p> <p>Prior to the occupation of any of the approved houses details of the screens to their front bin stores shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning</p>

	<p>Authority and then implemented in accordance with those details. Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area.</p>
--	---

<b>PAGE NO. 278</b>	<b>APPLICATION NO. 16/00194/MJR</b>
<b>ADDRESS</b>	<b>BUTE STREET 152-160, BUTE STREET, BUTETOWN</b>
<b>FROM:</b>	Vaughan Gething AM
<b>SUMMARY:</b>	<p>At this moment in time I would like to outline the following concerns and my objection to this proposal. I am fully supportive of the need for additional properties in the Butetown area to meet housing need. I would like to request a site visit by the Planning Committee so that they can see the problems I have outlined below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area. The development would be overlooking neighbouring properties and therefore would cause loss of privacy and considerable overshadowing.</li> <li>• The scale, height, massing and finish would be out of character with the area and contrary to national policies which seek good design to have regard to the character and context of the area.</li> <li>• I have concerns about the size of the development and the impact this will have on the local community.</li> <li>• I must draw attention to the parking issues currently being experienced by residents in this area. If this development were to be approved the additional impact on parking and overall traffic problems would have severe implications for residents in Bute Street, Hannah Street, Alice Street and neighbouring areas.</li> <li>• The present issue with two vacant retail units at Loudoun Square will have an impact on future retail developments at this site. I believe the current proposal for a retail unit would cause unacceptable harm to the attractiveness and viability of the retail units at Loudoun Square. This would have a detrimental impact on the current shopkeepers at the Loudoun Square retail units.</li> </ul>
<b>REMARKS:</b>	The issues of impact on neighbours, parking and

commercial competition have been addressed in the report. There are a variety of building sizes in this area and the proposed development is not out of character. The proposed design will contribute to an improvement of the appearance of the area and this site in particular.