



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

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

SYLWADAU HWYR

Pwyllgor PWYLLGOR CYNLLUNIO

Dyddiad ac amser y cyfarfod DYDD MERCHER, 17 HYDREF 2018, 1.30 PM

Os gwelwch yn dda gweler ynghlwm Cynrychiolaeth Atodlen hwyr a dderbyniwyd mewn perthynas â cheisiadau i gael ei benderfynu yn y Pwyllgor Cynllunio hwn

Sylwadau Hwyr 17.10.18 (*Tudalennau 1 - 12*)

Mae'r dudalen hon yn cael ei adael yn wag yn fwriadol

LATE REPRESENTATIONS SCHEDULE
PLANNING COMMITTEE – 17TH OCTOBER 2018

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| PAGE NO. 1 | APPLICATION NO. 18/00455/MJR |
| ADDRESS: | HOLIDAY INN EXPRESS, LONGUEIL CLOSE, ATLANTIC WHARF, CARDIFF |
| FROM: | A resident of Amity Court |
| SUMMARY: | <p>A letter of objection dated 15/10/2018</p> <p>The letter of objection is 14 pages long and contains numerous photographs of cars at the hotel being parked outside the designated spaces and buses being parked at the hotel. The objector states that:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The number of car parking spaces is currently insufficient 2. Buses are regularly in the Holiday Inn and are not considered 3. Hotel guests are regularly parking out of the hotel boundaries <p>The objector cites several examples from Tripadvisor, Google reviews and Booking.com where guests have provided reviews referencing various parking problems within the hotel car park. Photos of cars parked outside the designated spaces within the hotel have also been submitted.</p> <p>The objector states that Holiday Inn makes no existing or proposed provision for bus parking yet buses do park in the hotel's car park reducing the space available for cars to park. Photos of buses parked within the hotel have been submitted.</p> <p>The objector cites several examples from Tripadvisor where guests have provided reviews referencing parking outside the hotel car park and having to pay for on street parking.</p> <p>In summary, she implores Committee to reject the proposal on the grounds that the traffic proposals are completely unrealistic for the demands of the hotel. This will have a major negative impact on surrounding residents. She has provided a large amount of evidence to demonstrate this, which she says is critical that it is taken into account in Committee's decision.</p> <p>The objector's letter can be reproduced in full if Members require.</p> |
| REMARKS: | Objections on the grounds of inadequate parking has been described in Section 7 of the planning officer's report. The issue of car parking has been fully addressed within the |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>planning officer's report at paragraphs 8.8 – 8.11 and 8.13.</p> <p>The use of some five car parking spaces to accommodate a coach, that may transport some 50 guests at a time, may well reduce parking pressures rather than increase them should guest cars have been used instead of a coach. Delineating a specific coach parking space that would not be used on a daily basis would reduce the number of car parking spaces available for use on most days.</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| PAGE NO. 1 | APPLICATION NO. 18/00455/MJR |
| ADDRESS: | HOLIDAY INN EXPRESS, LONGUEIL CLOSE, ATLANTIC WHARF, CARDIFF |
| | |
| FROM: | Head of Planning |
| | |
| SUMMARY: | <p>Drawing 204A in proposed condition 2 should be omitted and a new condition added.</p> <p>Drawing 204A showed the proposed roof as originally submitted but has not yet been amended to reflect the amendment reducing the number of suites on the upper floor.</p> |
| REMARKS: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend proposed condition 2 to exclude reference to drawing 204A 2. Add additional condition. <p>Prior to any development commencing on site a revised "Proposed Roof Plan" shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority that complies with drawing 3971/203C, 205B, 206B and 208A. Reason: To avoid doubt and confusion as to the approved plans.</p> |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| PAGE NO. 1 | APPLICATION NO. 18/00455/MJR |
| ADDRESS: | HOLIDAY INN EXPRESS, LONGUEIL CLOSE, ATLANTIC WHARF, CARDIFF |
| | |
| FROM: | Tree Officer and Transport Officer |
| | |
| SUMMARY: | <p>The Tree Officer is satisfied with an updated landscaping plan submitted on 5 October.</p> <p>The Transport Officer states:</p> |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| | <p>Whilst little detail on cycle parking is provided, I consider that the matter could be conditioned. Please can you add the below two conditions.</p> <p>No development shall take place until details showing the provision of cycle parking spaces, and appropriate access to them, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, to include secure, covered, accessible facilities for the residents and staff. The approved details shall be implemented prior to the development being put into beneficial use. Thereafter the cycle parking spaces shall be maintained and shall not be used for any other purpose.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made for the sheltered and secure parking of cycles.</p> <p>No development shall take place until a Travel Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, to include details of how sustainable travel choices to the hotel will be communicated to staff and residents, and how the car park will be controlled, including the process that will be put in place when the car park is full.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that travel to the site is fully considered.</p> |
| <p>REMARKS:</p> | <p>The landscaping plan shows 6 of the 7 existing trees retained and 5 new trees to be planted. The tree to be removed has no outstanding value.</p> <p>In view of the comments of the Tree and Transport Officers the following revisions to the proposed conditions are required:-</p> <p>Amend condition 2 to read</p> <p>2. This approval is in respect of the following plans and documents, unless otherwise amended by any other condition attached to this consent: 3971-014A, 010A, 011, 012, 013, 201E, 202B, 203C, 204A, 205B, 206D, 207, 208A and 18/640/03D Reason: To avoid doubt and confusion as to the approved plans.</p> <p>Amend condition 11 to read</p> <p>11. All planting, seeding, turf-laying and paving shown on the approved plan 18/640/03D shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development, whichever is sooner. Reason: To maintain and improve the amenity and environmental value of the area.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Amend condition 16 to read</p> <p>16. No development shall take place until details showing the provision of cycle parking spaces, and appropriate access to them, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, to include secure, covered, accessible facilities for the residents and staff. The approved details shall be implemented prior to the development being put into beneficial use. Thereafter the cycle parking spaces shall be maintained and shall not be used for any other purpose. Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made for the sheltered and secure parking of cycles.</p> <p>Add additional condition 19</p> <p>19. No development shall take place until a Travel Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, to include details of how sustainable travel choices to the hotel will be communicated to staff and residents, and how the car park will be controlled, including the process that will be put in place when the car park is full. Reason: To ensure that travel to the site is fully considered.</p> <p>Add additional condition 20</p> <p>20. Prior to development commencing a Tree Protection Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and then implemented in accordance with the approved Tree Protection Plan, Reason: To protect those existing trees that are to be retained on site.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| PAGE NO. 40 | APPLICATION NO. 18/00576/MJR |
| ADDRESS: | YOUTH OFFENDING TEAM, THE RISE, PEN-HILL ROAD, PONTCANNA |
| | |
| FROM: | Mr Derek Lincoln, 35 Penhill Road |
| | |
| SUMMARY: | What are the arrangements for refuse collection? Will the refuse vehicle turn into the development site, turn around and exit, or will the refuse vehicle park on the busy corner of Penhill Road outside the site entrance (this option has obvious highway safety concerns)? The same applies to larger delivery vehicles. |

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| REMARKS: | <p>This has been assessed in para 8.24 of the committee report. Committee will also note that the Council's Waste Management and Highways sections raise no objection to the arrangement proposed. However, for ease of reference,</p> <p>It is proposed that each of the 8 dwellings would have their own refuse bins. The storage areas for the dwellings can be seen on plan ref: SP546 - Rev A - Proposed Site Plan. On collection days it would be the responsibility of the residents of the proposed dwellings to present their bins to the kerbside along Penhill Road, within the designated collection area. See plan ref: SP546 - Rev A - Proposed Site Plan. The refuse vehicle would pull in to the side of Penhill Road, beyond the site access towards Cathedral Road, for collection. This would therefore ensure that any refuse collection vehicle is sufficiently far away from the junction to reduce potential conflict with vehicles passing through the junction.</p> <p>Vehicle tracking diagrams have been submitted which demonstrate that vehicles up to 7.5 tonne in size can safely turn within the application site and therefore enter and leave in a forward gear. Whilst vehicle's larger than this may not be able to turn within the site, or would not easily be able to, the frequency at which such larger vehicles would be required to access the site would be limited. As such, it would be unreasonable to justify a refusal on this basis. It should also be noted that large vehicles such as fire engines or a Pantehnicon would have to park on street to serve many of the other properties in the area.</p> |
| | |

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| PAGE NO. 40 | APPLICATION NO. 18/00576/MJR |
| ADDRESS: | YOUTH OFFENDING TEAM, THE RISE, PEN-HILL ROAD, PONTCANNA |
| | |
| FROM: | Jane Williams, 15 Pontcanna Place |
| SUMMARY: | <p>I object to the eyesore that these houses will be. They are too high and will rise above the tree line in an ugly straight line.</p> <p>I would ask you to reconsider the aesthetics of this development.</p> |
| | |
| REMARKS: | Comments noted. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | The scale of the development has been considered under paragraph 8.5 – 8.8 of the committee report. |
| | |


| | |
|--------------------|---|
| PAGE NO. 40 | APPLICATION NO. 18/00576/MJR |
| ADDRESS: | YOUTH OFFENDING TEAM, THE RISE, PEN-HILL ROAD, PONTCANNA |
| | |
| FROM: | Nerys Lloyd-Pierce (Chair, Cardiff Civic Society) |
| | |
| SUMMARY: | <p>Cardiff Civic Society would like to object to the above planning application for 8 four-bedroom townhouses for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * At 1.5 metres taller than the highest point of the existing building, the proposed houses are far too high for their location. The planned development is unsympathetic in design and elevation, and will have a negative effect on the two adjoining Conservation Areas and Llandaff Fields, a Grade 2 listed park. <p>The proposed buildings form a single, unbroken line which towers above the tree line in a deeply unattractive manner. This too, is out of character with the architectural character of the neighbourhood. The ugly roof terraces which look out onto listed parkland are another catastrophic design concept.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Overcrowding. Eight houses of this size on the site is far too many, and is a classic example of overdevelopment for commercial gain without thought for the nearby community or the context of the development within the landscape. *Eight properties with the associated cars – at least two per household will be entering/exiting via a dangerous access point which was not constructed with current traffic levels in mind. The number of houses proposed means that a great deal of vehicular activity will take place on the site. *Removal of trees. The replacement of mature trees with new trees is spurious. Even the semi mature trees proposed are tiny in comparison to the existing mature trees, and will take half a century to reach maturity. The species proposed as replacements are unlikely to reach the height of the trees to be removed, which will make the development even more visible from Llandaff Fields, and neighbouring properties. |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| | This development fails to add to the character of the area, and should be refused unless the above points can be addressed. |
| REMARKS: | <p>The scale of the proposed development has been considered under paragraphs 8.5 – 8.8 of the committee report.</p> <p>The architectural approach proposed has been considered under paragraphs 8.10 & 8.11 of the committee report.</p> <p>The density of the proposed development has been considered under paragraph 8.4 of the committee report.</p> <p>The level of car parking provision proposed has been considered under paragraph 8.18 of the committee report.</p> <p>Matter relating to trees and landscaping have been considered under paragraphs 8.19 – 8.21 of the committee report.</p> |
| | |

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| PAGE NO. 40 | APPLICATION NO. 18/00576/MJR |
| ADDRESS: | YOUTH OFFENDING TEAM, THE RISE, PEN-HILL ROAD, PONTCANNA |
| | |
| FROM: | Sian Best, Conway Road |
| | |
| SUMMARY: | I wish to point out certain aspects of this proposed development, which I believe will have a negative impact on its immediate environment. The eight new houses will be 1.5m higher than the highest point of the existing structure, and will thus intrude unacceptably on the view from the neighbouring public park, Llandaff Fields, especially as the roofs of these properties form a displeasing single line, detracting from the aspect of the Fields as a whole. |
| | |
| REMARKS: | <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The scale of the development has been considered under paragraph 8.5 – 8.8 of the committee report. However, for ease of reference;</p> <p>The ridge of the central (tallest) dwelling would be 1.2m higher than the highest point of the existing building. It should be noted that The Councils Infill Sites SPG states that ‘some appropriate sites may be able to accommodate slightly taller buildings where they make a positive contribution to the street scene, such as corner sites, on primary routes and in higher density areas with variation in heights and massing. (Para 3.20, p.19)</p> <p>There would also be a small variation in the heights of the proposed dwellings with those located towards the centre of the</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | row being marginally taller than those at either end. Additionally, the dwellings would not follow a strict building line. As such, small differences in the positioning of the buildings combined with the variation in the buildings heights would aid in breaking up the massing of the development from longer views. |
| | |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| PAGE NO. | APPLICATION NO. 18/00576/MJR |
| ADDRESS: | Youth Offending Team, The Rise, Pen-Hill Road, Pontcanna |
| FROM: | Ms Kay S. Powell - for Llandaff Society |
| SUMMARY: | <p>The Llandaff Society is concerned that the proposed development will be 1.5 metres above the top of the chimneys of the current house (as made clear at the Site Meeting)</p> <p>We have already objected to the design proposed for this landmark site (5th April 2018) and now wish to add to that - because of its inappropriate scale, massing and modernism - this proposal would represent an alien and over-dominant element jarring with both this established residential area and listed parkland, and would further detract from the approach to the Cardiff Road Conservation Area.</p> |
| REMARKS: | <p>The scale of the proposed development has been considered under paragraphs 8.5 – 8.8 of the committee report.</p> <p>The architectural approach proposed has been considered under paragraphs 8.10 & 8.11 of the committee report.</p> <p>The density of the proposed development has been considered under paragraph 8.4 of the committee report.</p> <p>The application site is not located within a conservation area and therefore, the requirements to preserve or enhance do not apply. There are two conservation areas nearby, notably Cardiff Road and Conway Road. However, it is considered that given the separation distances involved (see below image) and the built form the proposal, when viewed from these areas, the proposed development would not result in demonstrable visual harm. This view is supported by the Conservation team.</p> |
| | |



| | |
|--------------------|--|
| PAGE NO. 92 | APPLICATION NO. 18/01114/MNR |
| ADDRESS: | Brodowel, Druidstone Road |
| FROM: | 'From local residents, some of whom were present at the site meeting on 8 th October,2018' |
| SUMMARY: | <p>The following representations have been submitted for the attention of committee members following the site meeting held on Monday,8th October,2018:</p> <p><i>You will be aware of the new Local Development Plan. Years of consultations, enquiries, examinations and recommendations took place to go into its making. Its production cost tax payers a considerable amount (millions) in a time of austerity.</i></p> <p><i>The NEW Local Development Plan Boundary was put in place on 28th January 2016 and is to run until 2026 In Old St Mellons this new boundary cuts straight across Druidstone Road near its beginning. The new BroDawel application is approximately ½ mile outside and away from the new boundary.</i></p> <p><i>Prior to 2016 the old LDP boundary ran along the outside of the gardens of properties in Druidstone Road, i.e. all gardens were within the boundary before 2016. All new houses built in Druidstone road, including the new large house you passed on your way to the site visit received their planning permission to build prior to 2016 -- before the new boundary was put in place in 2016.</i></p> |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| | <p><i>The planning application for the new build house and garages at BroDawel was submitted in May, 2018. A new boundary was put in place for many reasons. To stop infills in gardens and ribbon development along a semi-rural road.</i></p> <p><i>The infrastructure is poor and struggling to meet the demands of new large properties (9 built in the last few years using planning permission granted before the new LDP boundary was in place). The infrastructure cannot sustain more of these speculative developments. Druidstone Road now floods on a regular basis when heavy rain. Last occurrence 10th, 11th, 12th October, the drains are old and unable to cope with the added pressure of new builds.</i></p> <p><i>Power cuts are more frequent, electricity is still supplied via cables slung from poles</i> <i>The property Brodawel was bought in March/April 2018 by the Smith Brothers. Their application to build was submitted in May,2018 This is 2 years after the old LDP boundary was changed.</i></p> <p><i>Approval for this application will set a new precedent for building in Druidstone Road and will make a nonsense of any legitimate rules that are made via public and transparent consultations, for the benefit of the public and the city of Cardiff.</i></p> |
| REMARKS: | <p>The acceptability of the proposed development on land use policy grounds having regard to the location of the site outside the settlement boundary is considered in the analysis section of the Officer's report.</p> <p>No objections have been raised by technical consultees to support refusal of the application on infrastructure grounds.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| PAGE NO. 92 | APPLICATION NO. 18/01114/MNR |
| ADDRESS: | Brodowel, Druidstone Road |
| | |
| FROM: | Occupier, Pwll Coch House |
| | |
| SUMMARY: | <p>The occupier wishes to reiterate the following:</p> <p><i>As Committee members will now be aware having visited the site, this is a large new build project to be located within a small existing garden plot where no dwelling previously existed. It does not replace an existing property.</i></p> |

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| | <p><i>The proposed new dwelling is totally unsuited to its surroundings by way of size and location. In simple terms, the site is too small.</i></p> <p><i>I have again carefully considered all aspects of this proposed development at Brodowel. In my view, If successful, I cannot see that this would be in the best interest of Druidstone Road.</i></p> |
| REMARKS: | Refer to analysis section of officer report |