

LATE REPRESENTATIONS SCHEDULE
PLANNING COMMITTEE – 12TH AUGUST 2015

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 12.08.2015

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 14/01659/DCI
ADDRESS :	97-103 NEWPORT ROAD, ROATH
FROM:	Head of Planning
SUMMARY:	<p>Neighbours, representators and local members were notified of amended plans on 28.7.15.</p> <p>Representations objecting to the amended plans have been received from 1 and 1A Wordsworth Ave., Flat 7 Stephenson Court, 10 Southey Ave and 34 Fair oak Road. The objections reiterate issues related to parking, traffic, neighbour amenity (daylighting) and scale.</p> <p>1A Wordsworth Ave. requested a visit from Planning to assess the impact on daylighting received by the gable windows of the property. 10 Southey Ave have requested the gating of the lane to the rear of nos. 10-14 Southey Ave.</p>
REMARKS:	<p>The issues raised are addressed in the Officer's report. The planning officer has visited 1A Wordsworth Ave. to look at the potential impact of the development on the amenity of the occupiers of 1A. Gating of the lane to the rear of 10-14 Southey Ave. is not a planning issue.</p>

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 14/01659/DCI
ADDRESS :	97-103 NEWPORT ROAD, ROATH
FROM:	Head of Planning – impact of development on neighbours' amenity.
SUMMARY:	<p>The planning officer visited 1A Wordsworth Ave to assess the potential impact of the development on the levels of daylighting enjoyed by the occupiers.</p> <p>The development will be 3 storeys tall with a partially hipped pitched roof at a separation distance of 5.3m. I was not admitted to the property but I spoke to the owner who explained what rooms the windows serve.</p> <p>As far as could be ascertained from an external inspection and speaking with the occupier of the property the only window which is not 'secondary' is the ground floor dining room window.</p> <p>There are also a number of mature trees along the boundary which significantly overshadow the property - these will be removed to enable the development. It is likely that the impact of the development in terms of cutting out daylight</p>

	<p>will be similar to the current situation with the trees.</p> <p>It should also be noted that 1A Wordsworth Ave is not itself a good neighbour because it has windows on the boundary and cannot therefore expect the full level of daylighting protection except in special circumstances.</p> <p>The impact of the development on the daylighting of 1A has been assessed in the report. The site visit has confirmed that the habitable room windows affected are secondary windows with the exception of the ground floor dining room. Having visited the site it is concluded that on balance the development will not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of the occupiers of 1A Wordsworth Ave.</p> <p>The site visit also confirmed that the ground floor windows of the 3 storey element of Stephenson Court are single aspect. Those to the 4 storey Stephenson Court gable appear to be secondary. The agent has provided additional cross sections applying the BRE 25' rule of thumb criterion. The site visit has confirmed that the development will not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of the occupiers of Stephenson Court.</p>
REMARKS:	None.

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 14/01659/DCI
ADDRESS :	97-103 NEWPORT ROAD, ROATH
FROM:	Head of Planning – additional privacy condition.
SUMMARY:	<p>Add condition as follows:</p> <p>The 8no. gable windows adjacent to the boundary with the school grounds (see elevation BB on dwg. 205.01) shall be non-opening below a height of 1.8m above internal floor level and glazed with obscure glass and thereafter be so maintained. Reason: To ensure the privacy of adjoining occupiers is protected.</p>
REMARKS:	The elevations show the windows as obscure glazed. The condition is added to clarify the extent of obscure glazing required and which part of the window can be openable.

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 14/01659/DCI
ADDRESS :	97-103 NEWPORT ROAD, ROATH
FROM:	Head of Planning – report clarification.
SUMMARY:	The report states in para 2.3 that the lane to the rear serves the school. This is not the case. The lane serves the rear of Southey Street properties and the former doctors surgery only. Access to the school is from Southey Street.
REMARKS:	None.

PAGE NO. 25	APPLICATION NO. 15/00867/MJR
ADDRESS:	149 HEATHWOOD ROAD
FROM:	Neighbouring Objections
SUMMARY:	<p>Subsequent to the completion of the relevant Committee report, and as a result of a re-consultation exercise, an additional 24 letters have been received from neighbouring occupiers.</p> <p>In general, these representations seek to reiterate comments made in objection to the original proposals, with the amendments now under consideration not being sufficient to address concerns relating to parking, traffic impact, scale, design, and character.</p> <p>However, it is also noted that there are additional comments relating to the lack of direct re-consultation to some previous representees, the timing of the re-consultation (not having regard for the 'holiday period'), and the ambiguity of the amended description of development.</p>
REMARKS:	<p>The general thrust of these representations offers no significant change to the consideration of the amended application, and has no impact on the recommendation. The application is recommended for refusal.</p> <p>Whilst it is noted that some previous representees may not have received the Council's direct re-consultation notifications, given the scale of the task it is considered that best efforts have been made to ensure that the re-consultation process has been as thorough as possible. Notwithstanding this, it is also of note that as comments have subsequently been received from individuals who may not have been directly notified, there has been no significant harm caused as they have been able to voice their opinion.</p> <p>The timing of the re-consultation is not of the Council's making. The exercise was undertaken once the intentions of the applicant in terms of the amended proposals had been determined. The Council cannot reasonably or justifiably</p>

	<p>delay determination of a planning application to cater for individual personal circumstances that it has no knowledge of, or control over.</p> <p>The amended description is accurate in that it indicates the development proposed. There is no requirement on applicants to include every detail of a proposal in its description. Further details of the amended proposals are available to view via the Council's website.</p>
--	---

PAGE NO. 25	APPLICATION NO. 15/00867/MJR
ADDRESS:	149 HEATHWOOD ROAD
FROM:	Occupiers of 58 & 80 St Isan Rd and 155 Heathwood Rd
SUMMARY:	<p>Objections are made in respect of the proposals as amended.</p> <p>The occupier of 58 St Isan Rd reiterates comments made in objection to the original proposals, with the amendments now under consideration not being sufficient to address concerns relating to parking, traffic impact, scale, design, and character.</p> <p>The occupiers of 80 St Isan Rd and 155 Heathwood Rd object to the proposals as amended on grounds that are reflective of those indicated above.</p>
REMARKS:	The general thrust of these representations offers no significant change to the consideration of the amended application, and has no impact on the recommendation. The application is recommended for refusal.

PAGE NO. 25	APPLICATION NO. 15/00867/MJR
ADDRESS:	149 HEATHWOOD ROAD
FROM:	Councillor Hudson (on behalf of neighbouring occupiers)
SUMMARY:	<p>Cllr Hudson hand delivered 41 no. representations (on Tuesday 11th Aug 2015), that neighbouring occupiers had sent directly to her.</p> <p>Of those, 26 no. were representations that had also been submitted to the LPA. The remaining 13 no. had not been submitted to the LPA.</p> <p>The contents of the letters/emails that have not been previously seen by the LPA are representative of the comments indicated in the report to Planning Committee, raising concerns relating to parking, traffic impact, scale, design, and character.</p>
REMARKS:	The general thrust of these representations offers no

	<p>significant change to the consideration of the amended application, and has no impact on the recommendation.</p> <p>The application is recommended for refusal.</p>
--	--

PAGE NO. 25	APPLICATION NO. 15/00867/MJR
ADDRESS:	149 HEATHWOOD ROAD
FROM:	Councillor Bowden
SUMMARY:	Councillor Bowden continues to oppose this planning application, as amended by the developer, and fully supports the officer's reasons for refusal.
REMARKS:	Noted

PAGE NO. 50	APPLICATION NO. 15/01303/MJR
ADDRESS:	NEW DEVELOPMENT AT, ST ANDREW'S LANE, CITY CENTRE
FROM:	Pollution Control (Noise & Air)
SUMMARY:	Consultation response from Pollution Control dated 4.8.15: The Noise report submitted as additional information assesses the proposals against English policy and guidance. The PC response sets out performance criteria for the glazing and requests more details on the proposed ventilation system.
REMARKS:	To address Pollution Control concerns standard road traffic noise, railway noise, railway vibration and plant noise conditions are imposed.