

CONSULTATION RESPONSES	Supports	Objects	No objection or no comments	Comments	No reply
Community Council		X			
Local member(s)					X
Highways					
Public Protection			X		
Natural Resources Wales			X		
Welsh Water			X		
Other					
Neighbours					X

RELEVANT HISTORY	None relevant.
------------------	----------------

PLANNING POLICY/CONSTRAINTS	YES	ACCEPTABLE	NOT ACCEPTABLE
Outside settlement	X		X
Inside settlement			
Conservation Area			
Listed Building/ setting			
Green Barrier			
Special Landscape Area			
Flood Risk			
Within Buffer Zone or affecting SAC*			
World Heritage Site			
AONB			
Other			

LOCAL PLANNING GUIDANCE	ACCEPTABLE	NOT ACCEPTABLE
LPG 03 – Converting Rural Buildings		X
LPG 13 – Housing in the Countryside		X

KEY ISSUES	Acceptable	Not Acceptable	Observations below	N/A
Residential Amenity			X	
Design			X	
Highway safety			X	
Parking			X	
Conservation/LB				X
Ecology			X	
Trees			X	
Other				

OBSERVATIONS:

Officer Report

Garage Conversion / Extension

The garage subject of conversion is simply a domestic garage currently serving the main dwelling. The submitted proposed floor plans show the proposal would involve extending the depth of the garage by 3.375m to achieve a larger living space. Even with this increase in depth, the resultant floor area would still be considered small.

I have assessed this part of the application having regard to UDP Policy H3 and H4.

UDP Policy H3 states that the floor plan of the existing building should be sufficient to create a habitable dwelling. The existing floor area of the garage measures approximately 42m squared. The proposed floor plan would measure approximately 63m².

In order to increase the floor area of the garage and provide sufficient accommodation, an extension to the garage would be required, which UDP Policy H3 presumes against.

In addition to the existing floor area, UDP Policy H3 states that the proposed dwelling and resulting curtilage should not create an undesirable intrusion into the landscape or create access problems. There are highway safety implications arising from this proposal, discussed further along.

In regards to the first part (undesirable intrusion into the landscape) no curtilage or private amenity space/garden area has been shown for this property. The proposed parking bays are shown would encroach into the paddock area located north of the main dwelling. This would have to be the same for the garden area on the basis of the submitted Proposed Site Plan. The proposal would therefore increase the existing residential curtilage associated with the existing dwelling, encroaching into open countryside and therefore having a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of this location. The proposal would conflict with UDP Policy H3 in this respect.

No garden area or private amenity space has been shown for the dwelling, subject of the garage conversion.

Creation of semi-detached dwellings

The proposal to extend the existing dwelling to create one pair of semi-detached properties lies outside a defined settlement limit and does not meet the criteria set out within UDP Policy H5 where housing outside settlement limits will be allowed.

The proposal would encroach into open countryside, harming the character and appearance of the area and conflicting with UDP Policies H5 and EC5. The proposal is not considered to represent sustainable development as set out in Planning Policy Wales and there are no material considerations associated with the scheme to warrant its approval.

Conversion of stable block

No elevations have been submitted of the inner sections of the stable block, facing the courtyard. It is therefore not possible to establish the appearance of these parts of the building and therefore whether the appearance proposed is acceptable.

Whilst not shown, I have concerns with the use of clerestory windows and the resultant impact this would have on both the character and appearance of the existing building, as well as the amenity of occupants – there would be very little light entering the rooms served by these windows. On this basis, it is considered that insufficient information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the proposals in regard to the stable conversion are acceptable and whatsmore based on the submitted plans to date, there would appear to be a detrimental impact on the proposed occupants. As it stands, this part of the scheme is considered would represent overdevelopment.

Ecology: NRW raise no objection. Council's Ecology Officer advises that whilst the submitted Bat Survey is considered to be acceptable, no mitigation has been shown on the submitted plans and this is required up front to ensure the three tests set out in Regulation 44 of the Habitats Regulations can be met.

Furthermore, submission of a Phase 2 Habitat Survey is requested to assess the impact any removal or setting back of a hedgerow along the highway, would have on ecology. There are also GCN present in the area. A method statement for the proposed works should be submitted with any formal application. Neither have been submitted and the application will be refused on this basis.

Insufficient information has been submitted to assess the impact of the proposal on the hedgerow proposed for re-location along the site frontage. In the absence of this information it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would be achievable without having an adverse impact on the hedgerow or visual amenity of the area. The proposal would conflict with UDP Policy EC6 and GDP1 (a).

Insufficient information has been submitted having regard to bat mitigation details as well as the impact of the proposal on Great Crested Newts. In the absence of this information, it has not been shown that the proposal can meet the necessary tests set out in Regulation 44 of the Habitats Regulations in relation to bats and that there would be no adverse impact to Great Crested Newts, both of which are a European Protected Species. The proposal would conflict with UDP Policy EC6.

Highway Safety: There is restricted visibility at the site access with the A539, which would result in unsafe means of vehicular access onto the highway. The visibility splay to the west appears to cut across third party land, of which, no information has been submitted to demonstrate that the splay is achievable in this respect. The proposal would conflict with UDP Policy GD1 (d).

PROW: The alignment of Penley public footpath 24 is affected by this development.

The parking area for unit A will obstruct the footpath and the footpath passes through the garden area of unit A, which appears to have a boundary feature separating it from the parking area which would also obstruct the footpath. Public Rights of Way advise that the development cannot be supported in its current form, but the applicant can apply for a diversion, subject to a suitable alternative route being agreed.

No such diversion has been put forward by the applicant. In the absence of this information, the application is refused on this basis.

The proposed development would result in an obstruction to Penley Public Footpath 24. No information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate how the footpath would be protected or maintained, conflicting with UDP Policy CLF6.

Recommend refusal on the following:-

The cumulative alteration and extensions of existing buildings on the site, by virtue of the resultant design, layout, appearance, associated curtilages as well as increase in hard standing, would represent overdevelopment of the site and would adversely impact on the character and appearance of this open countryside location and surrounding landscape, as well as adversely impact on residential amenities of proposed occupants. The proposal would conflict with UDP Policies H3, H4, H5 and GDP1 as well as Local Planning Guidance Notes 03 and 13.

Insufficient information has been submitted to assess the impact of the proposal on the hedgerow proposed for re-location along the site frontage. In the absence of this information it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would be achievable without having an adverse impact on the hedgerow or visual amenity of the area. The proposal would conflict with UDP Policy EC6 and GDP1 (a).

Insufficient information has been submitted having regard to bat mitigation details as well as the impact of the proposal on Great Crested Newts. In the absence of this information, it has not been shown that the proposal can meet the necessary tests set out in Regulation 44 of the Habitats Regulations in relation to bats and that there would be no adverse impact to Great Crested Newts, both of which are a European Protected Species. The proposal would conflict with UDP Policy EC6.

There is restricted visibility at the site access with the A539, which would result in unsafe means of vehicular access onto the highway. The visibility splay to the west appears to cut across third party land, of which, no information has been submitted to demonstrate that the splay is achievable in this respect. The proposal would conflict with UDP Policy GD1 (d).

The proposed development would result in an obstruction to Penley Public Footpath 24. No information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate how the footpath would be protected or maintained, conflicting with UDP Policy CLF6.

RECOMMENDATION	
GRANT	
REFUSE	x
S106	