

LATE REPRESENTATIONS SCHEDULE
PLANNING COMMITTEE – 22nd JULY 2020

PAGE NO. 38	APPLICATION NO. 20/00361/MJR
ADDRESS	160-166 STRATHNAIRN STREET, ROATH, CARDIFF
FROM:	Agent – C2J Architects
SUMMARY:	<p>I am writing to you in regard to the above mentioned planning application, which was presented to the Planning Committee on the 17th June 2020 with the recommendation of officer approval subject to conditions.</p> <p>This planning application was deferred at the Committee meeting to enable officers to draft reasons for refusal based on the Committee’s objections regarding Design.</p> <p>Having watched the Committee meeting live via the web cast, both the applicant and I were surprised to see that the application was deferred for reasons for refusal, as there appeared to be support from the majority of the members of the Committee during the live debate.</p> <p>A subsequent review of the webcast recording appears to support our concern regarding the voting on the deferral of the application. During the Committee debate, both Cllr’s Ali and Cllr Sattar confirmed their support for the proposed application, citing reasons of improve visual amenity.</p> <p>During the vote for the deferral of the application (for reasons for refusal), they vocally confirmed there ‘support’ for the application, not ‘for’ or ‘against’ the motion proposed by Cllr Jones-Pritchard .</p> <p>If the Councillors voted against the motion (i.e supported the officers original recommendation), the motion would have been defeated by 7 (Against) votes to 4 (For).</p> <p>We are minded however that this was the first remotely held Planning Committee due to the Covid 19 restrictions.</p> <p>In light of the above, we would respectfully request that the Committee Chair highlights the above matter to members prior to the vote on the proposed reasons for refusal suggested in paragraph 8.12 of the officer’s report.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, we note the proposed reasons for refusal within section 8.12 of the report, which state:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The development by virtue of its height, massing and scale would be out of keeping with other buildings in the surrounding area and detrimental to the visual

character of the area, contrary to policy KP5(i) of the Cardiff Local Development Plan.

- 2) The scale and massing of the development, together with its close proximity to the boundaries with neighbouring properties, would result in an unacceptable overbearing and obtrusive impact which would be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to policy KP5(x) of the Cardiff Local Development Plan.

In relation to the first reason for refusal, we would echo the salient points highlighted within section 8.12 of the professional officers committee report which states:

It should be noted that within close proximity is a tall flat roofed building towards the north end of Cottrell Road and buildings with front facing gables towards the south on the east side of Cottrell Road. As such, it is considered that the proposed height would not represent a visually intrusive form that would dominate the area.

In regard to the second reason for refusal, the justification of this reason for refusal provided by Cllr Jones-Pritchard within the debate was the impact of the additional height of the development on the residential amenities of the adjacent occupants at Glenroy Street.

Whilst it is recognised that the proposed development would result in an increase in height of the elevation facing the rear of the properties at Glenroy Street, the closest elevation would be 10m from any habitable rooms and has been intentionally set back off the site boundary to provide relief when viewed from the limited rear of amenity space of Glenroy Street.

It is also key to note that the adjacent properties located on Glenroy Street, that face the proposed development, all include single storey garages to the rear of their respective gardens. The single storey garages are currently bounded by a two storey pitched roof coach house. When considering the current situation, it is not judged that the proposed increase in height would have such an adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers to warrant a refusal.

In conclusion, we would respectfully request that members take into consideration the above material rebuttal and further revisit their original views on the proposed development prior to voting on the proposed reasons for refusal highlighted in section 8.2 of the committee report.

REMARKS:	Committee Members please note the correspondence.
-----------------	---

PAGE NO. 38	APPLICATION NO. 20/00361/MJR
ADDRESS	160-166 STRATHNAIRN STREET, ROATH, CARDIFF
FROM:	Residents of nos. 95 & 142 Strathnairn Street, 149 Glenroy Street.
SUMMARY:	<p>Object to the application, reasons summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Overdevelopment/higher scale than surrounding streets, and increased height to the previous proposal; b) Effect on the character of the area; c) Inadequate parking and traffic impact; d) Loss of privacy/overlooking of adjoining properties;
REMARKS:	Correspondence noted. Specific issues are addressed within paragraph 8.9 of the report.

PAGE NO. 38	APPLICATION NO. 20/00361/MJR
ADDRESS	160-166 STRATHNAIRN STREET, ROATH, CARDIFF
FROM:	Jo Stephens MP
SUMMARY:	<p>I note that the applicant has submitted a further planning application for this site and I am writing to object to the latest plans.</p> <p>Demolishing four perfectly good Victorian buildings and replacing them with a three-storey building that towers over the neighbouring properties, constitutes an overdevelopment in the area and changes the character of the area. This new application does not address any of key issues with the previous plans and even attempts to increase the number of flats proposed to 12. The proposals also significantly increase the height of the development, overlooking gardens to the rear on Glenroy Street and houses on Cottrell Road. The increased roof height where the coach house would be just 8 metres from the house in Cotterell Road.</p> <p><u>Overdevelopment and change of character to the area</u></p>

	<p>A three-storey development containing 12 flats, on such a small site in a built-up area, where all other properties in the immediate area are on average only two-storey buildings is a considerable overdevelopment and will be a detrimental change to the character of the area. LOP HS.22 states that developments should have "a lower visual impact on the street scene by preserving the existing frontage and respecting the character of an area." Strathnairn Street is a street of distinctive well used Victorian residential houses, and the proposal to remove 4 perfectly good houses currently in use to be replaced by 12 units in an already overcrowded residential area means that this requirement is not met.</p> <p>I also note that none of the proposed development's scale, form, massing, height, density, colour, materials, detailing could be described as in keeping with the distinctive Victorian residential houses in the area, and certainly not in keeping with the local character and context of the built and landscape setting.</p> <p><u>Impact on Neighbours</u></p> <p>It can be clearly seen from these latest plans that the height of the roof of the proposed development is higher than the height of the roofline of the entirely residential houses in the surrounding area. The height of the proposed property will greatly overshadow the rooms and gardens of the neighbouring houses, blocking out natural light. This will also impact on neighbouring properties' privacy: the proposed flats on the higher levels will have a clear view into neighbour's gardens and rooms. The over development of Strathnairn Street and reducing family housing stock will have a significant detrimental effect on the local community.</p> <p><u>Local Parking</u></p> <p>There is already pressure on parking from customers of the shops on Albany Road/Wellfield Road, and a large Primary School on the same street, making it difficult for residents to park, and a development with the potential for many additional cars would exacerbate the situation, with a knock on effect on all the neighbouring streets.</p>
REMARKS:	Correspondence noted. Specific issues are addressed within paragraph 8.9 of the report.

PAGE NO. 131	APPLICATION NO. 19/01083/MJR
ADDRESS	BARCLAY COURT, 104-108 CATHEDRAL ROAD
FROM:	Transportation Officer
SUMMARY:	Would like to replace condition 16 (Cycle parking) with the following condition to allow control of detail.
REMARKS:	<p>No Objection</p> <p>Action: That condition 16 be replaced with the following condition</p> <p><i>Notwithstanding the approved drawings, Prior to the beneficial occupation of any of the flat units approved, an accessible, secure and covered cycle parking facility shall be provided in accordance with a scheme of detail that shall first have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. Thereafter the cycle parking facility shall be maintained and shall not be used for any other purpose.</i></p> <p><i>Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made for the sheltered and secure parking of cycles.</i></p>

PAGE NO. 168	APPLICATION NO. 20/00748/MNR
ADDRESS:	Part of Land at Rear of 35 Ely Road, Llandaff
FROM:	Applicant's agent
SUMMARY:	The application is withdrawn.
REMARKS:	Noted. Application withdrawn.