

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

RELEVANT HISTORY	P/2019/0325 – Reconstruction of existing garage, to comprise ground floor garage, hall and store with first floor office and wc facilities. Refused 10/06/2019.
-------------------------	---

PLANNING POLICY/CONSTRAINTS	YES	ACCEPTABLE	NOT ACCEPTABLE
Outside settlement			
Inside settlement	x		x
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 16 – Parking Standards	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:

Background: The application is a re-submission of the previously refused application under P/2019/0326.

The same development is proposed as previous.

The site conditions remain the same as previous.

Principle: The application site is located within Sydalit Settlement Limit where the principle of employment development on unannotated land within settlement limits is acceptable.

The description of the proposal states that the application is for the re-construction of an existing garage.

Based on the submitted proposed floor plans, the resultant development would be for a ground floor garage, hall and w/c facilities and first floor office and store.

No information has been submitted to outline the nature of the proposal and its end use/what kind of office work is intended at first floor.

The resultant use looks like a dwelling and whilst UDP Policy H2 allows for residential development on unallocated land within settlement limits, this is provided there would be no adverse impacts, having regard to other materials considerations associated with the scheme.

A site visit was undertaken by the case officer on 11th December. The outrigger attached to the front elevation of the garage is in a poor state of repair, with exposed timber purlins, missing roof tiles as well as the roof appearing to collapse downwards. See below photograph.



This part of the proposal is considered likely would need complete demolition and re-build.

The main part of the building appeared to be structurally sound, however access to the rear of the building was not possible during the site visit. Furthermore, a large proportion of the east elevation was substantially overgrown so it was not possible to assess whether this part of the building was intact.

Whilst the main roof appears to be structurally sound, the ridge line drops towards the centre and rises back up either end.

Changes proposed to the building include the following:-

- Construction of a single storey front extension
- Construction of a first floor gable to the front elevation (notwithstanding that the ground floor beneath the gable is considered would also likely need demolition and replacement)
- Construction of a new roof
- Addition of a dormer window to the front elevation
- Addition of 2 no. windows in the side (west) elevation
- Addition of a door in the side (east) elevation

No Structural Survey has been submitted to demonstrate whether the building is structurally sound and given the nature of the work involved, it is ambiguous as to whether the building is capable of reconstruction and essentially conversion to facilitate the proposed development.

Furthermore, the existing ridge height measures 6.2m whilst the proposed ridge height measures 6.7m, meaning the building would be increased in height which would have to mean raising the height to accommodate provision of a new roof.

Based on the submitted information, the building may very well need complete re-building given the extent of change proposed and based on the description of the application as well as extremely limited information submitted by the agent.

Nevertheless, the site and building in question is within settlement limit and therefore in principle, a proposal for office use could be accepted on the basis of the principle of development.

Design and Layout: Whilst there are no fundamental objections to the proposed design and layout of the building in principle, its appearance by virtue of dormer gables and extensions is considered to be excessive for its proposed use as an office, particularly given there is very limited information submitted to explain the nature of the end use.

Residential Amenity: Part 18 of the application forms asks if there will be any employment of staff, which the agent states no.

Part 19 of the application forms asks if there are any hours of opening relevant to the proposal, which the agent states no.

Part 17 asks for the resultant floor area of the proposed use class – the agent does not specify a use class, referring to the use as 'Other'.

The proposal is for an office, therefore there has to be at least one person employed by the resultant business use. The applicant lives approximately 2km away from the site. No information has been submitted to indicate why the office is required/if the applicant is self-employed/his current employment status and associated information.

There is no indication as to the number of staff proposed to be employed – resulting in uncertainty as to the number of potential staff coming and going from the site on a daily basis.

There also has to be some indication of opening hours, given the proposal is for a commercial use. Surrounding uses are residential, and without knowing the purpose and exact use of the nature of the office/commercial use proposed, as well as the opening hours or the number of staff who will be working from the site, it is uncertain what the resultant noise, nuisance and disturbance the proposal would have on existing levels of residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

The fact that the agent has referred on Part 17 of the forms that the use comprises 'Other' without any further explanation, reinforces the ambiguity of the end use and scheme as a whole.

UDP Policy E4 states that proposals must not prejudice existing amenities through noise, vibration, smell, safety or excessive traffic generation.

No indication has been made as to the purpose of the garage. No information has been submitted to indicate why the application site extends to the east of the building and to the south. No parking layout has been included in the application therefore the proposed use of this land is considered to be ambiguous.

On the basis of the above, I consider that insufficient information has been submitted with this application to demonstrate that no harm would result to residential amenities of neighbouring properties by virtue of the proposed use, which is sufficient to warrant refusal of the application. The proposal would conflict with UDP Policy E4 and GDP1.

Ecology: No objection from NRW or the Council's Ecologist.

Access and Car Parking: The Highway Authority have commented that given there is an existing garage on the site, the proposed replacement garage is unlikely to generate more traffic than the existing and on this basis have no recommendations to make.

The application is for the reconstruction of the building to facilitate an office, where LPG 16 requires 1 car parking space per 30m² (B1 use class) and 1 car parking space per 20m² (A2 use class). On the basis of a 63m² floor area (not including the garage), a maximum of 2 no. on-site parking spaces (B1) and 3 no. on-site parking spaces (A2) would be required to serve the end use.

Whilst one space could be accommodated in the garage, no indication is shown on the submitted Proposed Site Plan as to where the other one/two spaces would be accommodated on site.

It should be noted that the red edge drawn around the application site appears to include land that was formerly part of the application to convert the New Inn to residential development under P/2005/0971. Condition 2 attached to the permission for P/2005/0971 specified that the parking areas shown on the approved plans should be laid out and thereafter retained for parking purposes.

The inclusion of this land within the curtilage and application site associated with this scheme would appear to compromise the condition attached to P/2005/0971 and it is therefore unknown where the actual on-site parking spaces would be located.

On both site visits, the area of land in question has not been laid out to form the parking spaces required as part of this application. Furthermore, google maps streetview shows from July 2009 to May 2018 that the dwarf wall spanning the northern boundary of the New Inn is in place during

this period. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that these car parking spaces were never laid out or implemented as part of the application approved under P/2005/0971.

On the basis of the age of the application, and that during the 9 years between 2009 and 2018, as well as the current situation, the time to take enforcement action on this basis has lapsed.

Notwithstanding the above, there appears to be sufficient space within the curtilage of the site to provide the parking spaces which would be required, subject to the submission of a parking layout plan.

RECOMMENDATION	
GRANT	
REFUSE	x
S106	