

## RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

## PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

### 28<sup>th</sup> July 2020 SITE MEETING

APPLICATION NO's: 18/0880 and 18/0886- Change of use of first and second floors of property from former snooker hall (Class D2) to 22 no. selfcontained residential student flats (Sui Generis) and associated works (Amended description received 03/10/2016) (Listed Building Consent). (Amended Heritage Impact Assessment Received 12/07/2019) 1 FOTHERGILL STREET, TREFOREST, PONTYPRIDD, CF37 1SG.

# REPORT OF THE SERVICE DIRECTOR, DEMOCRATIC SERVICES & COMMUNICATION

Author: Jessica Daniel, Council Business Unit.

### 1. <u>PURPOSE OF THE REPORT</u>

1.1 To consider the outcome of the site inspection in respect of the abovementioned proposal and to determine the application, as outlined in the report of the Director, Prosperity & Development, attached at Appendix 1.

#### 2. <u>RECOMMENDATION</u>

It is recommended that Members:

2.1 Approve the application in accordance with the recommendation of the Director, Prosperity & Development.

### 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 In accordance with Minute No 193 (Planning and Development Committee – 16<sup>th</sup> July 2020) a site inspection was undertaken on Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> July 2020 to consider the impact of the proposed development on highway safety.
- 3.2 Due to Welsh Government social distancing restrictions in response to Covid-19, Committee Member attendance at the site visit was reduced to ensure the safety of those attending. The meeting was attended by the

Planning and Development Committee Members County Borough Councillors S. Rees, G. Caple, S. Powderhill and J. Williams.

- 3.3 Members met at the front of the proposed development 1 Fothergill Street, Treforest, Pontypridd.
- 3.4 The Planning Officer in attendance informed members that listed building consent and planning permission is sought for the conversion of the first and second floors of the property from a former snooker hall (Class D2) to 22 no. self-contained residential student flats (Sui Generis).
- 3.5 The Planning Officer outlined the details of the application to Members and Members walked to the rear of the proposed development. They noted the lack of parking provision within the application. The Highways Officer advised Members that the existing use requires substantially higher parking requirements than the proposed. Members were also informed that the site is in a highly sustainable location with access to public transport, local amenities, employment and the University. The applicant also proposes 15 secure cycle stands and therefore on that basis the Highways Officer confirmed that no highway objection is raised.
- 3.6 Members also expressed concerns regarding highways safety noting the busy roads alongside the proposed development. The Highways Officer advised Members that the local highway network serving the site incorporates a comprehensive traffic management scheme to maintain highway safety and the free flow of traffic. The existing traffic management, coupled with the suggested condition for HGV deliveries during construction and powers made available to the Council as Highway Authority under Highways Act 1980, would enable necessary action to be taken if the highway safety requirements are breached.
- 3.7 Members also raised concerns over the location of the refuse and recycling storage area. Members felt that this area was small in size and close to the highway. The Highways Officer advised Members that the storage area must be outside the limit of the adopted highway and any obstruction could be dealt with under separate Highway legislation, which empowers the Council to take necessary enforcement action if required.
- 3.8 Members raised the potential for neighbouring properties to be overlooked as a result of the proposed development. The Planning Officer showed Members images of the design for the final development and acknowledged that this would result in some degree of overlooking into the properties opposite. The Planning Officer advised Members that the degree of overlooking is not considered significant enough to warrant an officer recommendation of refusal.

- 3.9 Members also discussed concerns over the proposed number of flats sought as part of the application. Members expressed concern that 22 would be an overdevelopment of the site and the number could exacerbate their other concerns detailed above. The Planning Officer informed Members that the possibility of reducing the number of units had been discussed with the applicant however this would impact on the viability of the proposed development.
- 3.10 Members also discussed the application for listed building consent. The planning officer acknowledged that the proposal would lead to the loss of some internal historic fabric, specifically the plaster ceilings in the main, first-floor hall area and informed Members that while this would be regrettable, it was considered that due to the poor state of repair that the ceilings were in that this would be an acceptable loss if a viable alternative use was found for the building. The Planning Officer advised Members that the lost ceilings would also be recorded, and the details retained on the architectural record by the imposition of suitably worded condition.
- 3.10 The Chair thanked the officers for the report and closed the meeting.