



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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY PAPERS

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 9 SEPTEMBER 2015

With reference to Item 5 of the Agenda for the meeting of 9 September 2015
(Development Control Applications) attached are the **Late Representations** (*Pages 1 – 8*)

This page is intentionally left blank

LATE REPRESENTATIONS SCHEDULE
PLANNING COMMITTEE – 9TH SEPTEMBER 2015

PAGE NO. 21	APPLICATION NO. 15/01015/MNR
FROM:	Welsh Water/ Dwr Cymru
SUMMARY:	Requests conditions to ensure no detriment to the environment or to the Company's assets. The developer is advised to contact Dwr Cymru if a connection is required to the public sewerage system. The Company advises that it has no objections to the proposed development on water supply grounds.
REMARKS:	

PAGE NO. 21	APPLICATION NO. 15/01015/MNR
FROM:	Cllr Ford
SUMMARY:	Petition of objection (137 signatories). The grounds of objection are: issues relating to the height of the building, traffic issues, current footpath, main water supply, drainage and sewerage in the vicinity and insufficient storage space in the garden for refuse,
REMARKS:	Attention is drawn to the following sections of the Committee report: Design/height - paragraphs 8.3 to 8.6. Traffic issues – paragraph 5.1- OM Transportation Officer advice. Footpath - paragraph 8.7. Water supply/drainage - condition 6 (drainage scheme) attached. WW/DC has raised no objections to the application advising that a water supply can be made available to serve the development. Insufficient storage space in garden – paragraph 8.9

PAGE NO. 45	APPLICATION NO. 15/01321/MNR
FROM:	Neighbouring Occupier (Glendower Court)
SUMMARY:	A further letter of objection has been received. Attached is the original letter of objection referring to reduction of light to apartment; loss of privacy from overlooking; existing open aspect will now become oppressive; view of the development will impact on property value. In addition, reference is made to the issues of vehicle congestion/parking that is experienced in the area which can impact on the access for the public bus service. Suggests that the land would be better used for car parking.

REMARKS:	The comments are noted and will be available for the members of the Planning Committee.
-----------------	---

PAGE NO. 68	APPLICATION NO. 15/01863/MNR
ADDRESS:	16 Rhyd Y Penau Rd
FROM:	Waste Strategy Manager
SUMMARY:	A change of use to A3 may lead to an increase in the volume of waste produced. Current plans make no reference to the storage of waste and recycling. The agent/applicant should be advised that a commercial contract is required for the collection and disposal of all commercial waste.
REMARKS:	This could be dealt with by a condition if the application were to be approved.

PAGE NO. 68	APPLICATION NO. 15/01863/MNR
ADDRESS:	16 Rhyd Y Penau Rd
FROM:	Head of Planning
SUMMARY:	A further objection has been received from a local resident
REMARKS:	The objection is on traffic and parking grounds and does not raise any new issues

PAGE NO. 68	APPLICATION NO. 15/01863/MNR
FROM:	Local Resident
SUMMARY:	No objection in principle to the proposal. Suggests that the roads in close proximity are properly maintained and that suitable parking facilities are provided.
REMARKS:	The comments are noted and will be available for the members of the Planning Committee

PAGE NO. 68	APPLICATION NO. 15/01863/MNR
FROM:	The Applicant
SUMMARY:	A further petition in support of the proposal has been submitted containing 25 signatures
REMARKS:	The petition will be available for members of the Planning Committee

PAGE NO.	APPLICATION NO. 15/01863/MNR
FROM:	Local Resident/Committee Member Prostrate Cancer Cardiff Support Group
SUMMARY:	A letter in support of the proposal has been received which refers to the importance of use of the premises as a meeting place for the Support Group
REMARKS:	The letter will be available for the attention of the members of the Planning Committee

PAGE NO. 83	APPLICATION NO. 15/00306/MJR
	5-7 Oakfield Street
FROM:	Resident at No. 3 Oakfield Street
SUMMARY:	Has forwarded a letter from a neighbour at 17 Oakfield St. The correspondence relates to the amended drawings which are considered only to modify the view of the proposals from the street; and that the reduction in ridge height does not impact on the scale of the rear extensions which are considered to remain overbearing; to spoil outlook; and to be overbearing. The principle of providing flatted development in an area of predominantly family housing is also raised.
REMARKS:	These matters are considered in the report. The extension will not be visible from No. 17; The Coach House is not considered overbearing and to be aesthetically appropriate to the context ; The Council has no policy to protect family housing, however the premises are not currently used as such and are currently multiply occupied as bedsit and flatted accommodation.

PAGE NO. 83	APPLICATION NO. 15/00306/MJR
	5-7 Oakfield Street
FROM:	Resident at No. 3 Oakfield Street
SUMMARY:	Has forwarded an e-mail previously received from the owner of 58 Oakfield Street in respect of the development proposed under cover of application 14/01544/DCI (Subsequently Withdrawn) which he considers to still be pertinent. The correspondence relates to issues of conservation area status, efforts undertaken by the writer to preserve No 58

	Oakfield Street and to the principle of allowing demolition in the area, and of inadequacy of car parking in the area.
REMARKS:	These matters are considered in the report.

PAGE NO. 83	APPLICATION NO. 15/00306/MJR
	5-7 Oakfield Street
FROM:	Resident at No. 3 Oakfield Street
SUMMARY:	<p>Advises that his objections of 24th March and 17th June 2015 still apply</p> <p>Considers that the proposals breach Policy 3 of the Cardiff Local Plan in that they do not preserve or enhance the Character or Appearance of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The proposals are not considered to enhance as after demolition they seek to replicate the street view using similar types of sash window and materials as appear and exist at present.</p> <p>The proposals would not enhance its character (the key qualities of which are identified in the Appraisal 2008) since none of these would be affected or enhanced.</p> <p>The proposals would make the Conservation Area Worse because :-</p> <p>They would demolish two houses considered locally historic at the time the CA was designated and when its boundaries were reaffirmed</p> <p>Behind a rebuilt façade there would be a block of high value leasehold flats</p> <p>Precedent would be provided for other houses in Oakfield Street all built around the same period to be inadequately maintained and then justified for replacement blocks of flats leading to the loss of conservation area designation</p> <p>Oakfield Street was built of spacious Victorian Semi-detached residences for single family occupation, with many still in single occupancy, They differ fundamentally from the in character from the proposed very small flats.</p> <p>The need for demolition has not been established, Both Houses have been kept tenanted and fresh families have moved in The owners business at the rear of 7 Oakfield Street remains operational.</p>

	<p>The two front doors shown on the amended plans only serve two ground floor flats and are more decorative than functional.</p> <p>The side entrance will present major security problems with up to 44 residents entering and leaving daily, the bins would provide access over the retained low boundary walls and the security lighting will introduce light pollution causing lack of sleep.</p>
<p>REMARKS:</p>	<p>These matters are dealt with in the report; but in short there is no presumption against development within conservation areas; the policy requirement that new development within a conservation area should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area is considered to have been met as the proposed building is very similar in character to the existing in terms of its contribution to the character of the area; The buildings do not appear on the Council's Local List of buildings of merit; the value of the development is not in itself a valid planning objection to a development proposal (although it is accepted that neither is it in itself a reason to justify demolition of a building); the Council has no policy to retain dwelling houses in single occupancy and the application property itself is currently multiply occupied; There may or may not be a structural need to demolish the buildings but the merit of preserving them must be weighed against the contribution they make to the character of the conservation area and against that of the replacement building. The side entrance proposed is set down from the level of the ground floor of 3 Oakfield Street and a condition is proposed to ensure that there is minimal light spillage from the entrance. The final arrangements for waste storage and presentation have yet to be finalised, but it is not considered that the proposed bin stores would make the adjacent neighbours any more vulnerable to instances of crime and disorder than the existing arrangement. A condition can be attached in respect of the detail of security lighting to mitigate against potential nuisance as might be caused by PIR switches etc..</p> <p><i>Prior to the beneficial occupation of any of the residential units hereby approved, the development shall be fitted with a scheme of security lighting in accordance with a scheme of detail which shall first have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing, and only lighting which accords with the approved details shall thereafter be provided.</i></p>

	<i>Reason: To ensure for an acceptable level of security whilst protecting neighbouring amenity.</i>
--	--

PAGE NO. 83	APPLICATION NO. 15/00306/MJR
	5-7 Oakfield Street
FROM:	Resident at No. 10 Oakfield Street (opposite the application buildings)
SUMMARY:	<p>Raises Issues of policy (Policy 3 of the Local Plan). Precedent. Does not believe it is possible for the scale of development to retain the character and appearance of the area. Would as a minimum seek to retain the current footprint of the building. Severe loss of privacy to occupants of adjacent premises. Infers that the coach house will lend itself to residential use. Loss of amenity cause by footfall and servicing via the side entrance; Severe loss of natural daylight for neighbours caused by increased height, width and depth of the extensions. Light pollution; Attraction of vermin to the banks of bins; smell, better serviced from communal bins close to the highway</p>
REMARKS:	<p>These matters are considered in the report. The development is considered policy compliant Should further proposals for demolition be received they would be judged on their individual merit ; The footprint of the existing building is for the greater part retained and the rear extension to it are considered acceptable in scale, not dissimilar to other extensions in the area and considerably smaller than some. The proposal has been designed to attempt to minimise overlooking and additional conditions seek to reinforce this further. It is accepted that there would be a transference of footfall from the front of the property to the side, but not that this would cause any undue loss of privacy or amenity; refuse storage and presentation are subject of a planning condition but may well allow for bulk bin storage.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank