



**RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**PLANNING AND  
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
20 AUGUST 2020**

**REPORT OF: SERVICE  
DIRECTOR PLANNING**

**Agenda Item No. 11**

**APPLICATION NO: 20/0306 – TWO-  
STOREY SIDE / FRONT EXTENSION, 17  
MANOR CHASE, BEDDAU, PONTYPRIDD**

**1. 1. Purpose of the Report**

Members are asked to consider the determination of the above planning application.

**2. Recommendation**

That Members consider this report in respect of the application and determine the application having regard to the advice given.

**3. Background**

This application was originally reported to the 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2020 meeting of the Planning and Development Committee with a recommendation of refusal. A copy of the original report is attached as Appendix A. At that meeting Members were minded to approve the application contrary to the recommendation. Members considered that the proposed two-storey side / front extension to 17 Manor Chase would not result in a significant impact to the visual amenity of the wider area.

As a consequence, it was resolved to defer determination of the application for a further report from the Service Director of Prosperity and Development to highlight the potential strengths and weaknesses of taking a decision contrary to the recommendation.

**4. Planning Assessment**

The considerations in respect of the potential impact the proposed development works could have upon the visual amenity of the street scene and wider area are set out in the original Committee report (Appendix A), however, a brief outline is set out below:

It was considered that, on balance, the creation of a two-storey side extension that projected 2 metres in depth beyond the principal front elevation of the dwelling would result in a visually incongruous form of development which would have a detrimental

impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding locality. An impact significant enough to warrant refusal of the application.

As indicated within the original report, the proposal displays certain aspects of appropriate design with the majority of the proposal being set to the rear of the host dwelling, having no impact upon the street scene of Manor Chase. Furthermore, it is not considered the design and siting of the proposal would result in a significant impact to the residential amenity of any adjacent occupier. It is also acknowledged that there is a single example of a similar protruding gable feature that exists within the locality that arguably results in a comparable impact to that which would occur as a result of the proposed extension at this property.

Members are advised that the impact of any development upon the visual appearance of an area is subjective, and the original officer considerations were an 'on balance' recommendation. Therefore, whilst the original concerns remain and the scheme would undoubtedly result in some noticeable impact upon the street scene, the works could also be considered acceptable in this respect.

Therefore, if having considered the above advice and after further consideration Members remain of a mind to approve planning permission, it is suggested that the following conditions of consent would be appropriate:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Sections 91 and 93 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan(s) and documents received by the Local Planning Authority as set out below:

- ALL-IN-ONE Plan – Received: 24/03/2020

That is, unless otherwise to be approved and superseded by details required by any other condition attached to this consent.

Reason: To ensure compliance with the approved plans and documents and to clearly define the scope of the permission.

**PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**REPORT OF: DIRECTOR PROSPERITY AND DEVELOPMENT**

**PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

Members are asked to determine the planning application outlined below:

**APPLICATION NO:** 20/0306/10 (GS)  
**APPLICANT:** Mr R Williams  
**DEVELOPMENT:** Two-storey side / front extension  
**LOCATION:** 17 MANOR CHASE, BEDDAU, PONTYPRIDD, CF38  
2JD  
**DATE REGISTERED:** 24/03/2020  
**ELECTORAL DIVISION:** Beddau

---

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE**

**REASONS:**

It is considered that the proposed extension, by virtue of its scale, massing and siting, would represent a visually incongruous form of development which would have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to the relevant policies of the Local Development Plan (AW5 and AW6) and Supplementary Planning Guidance: A Design Guide for Householder Development.

---

**REASON APPLICATION REPORTED TO COMMITTEE**

The application is reported to Committee by Councillor Yeo, in order to assess the potential impact of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the locality and the amenity and privacy of surrounding residents.

**APPLICATION DETAILS**

The proposal relates to a two-storey side extension and ground floor garage conversion at the dwelling. The proposals would result in a structure 9.6 metres in total depth by 3.4 metres in width at the front elevation, reducing to 1.6 metres in width at the rear elevation, forming a side extension that is 'staggered' inwards towards the rear of the property given the shape of the plot. The staggered footprint of the extension would allow for an existing path to the rear of the site, along the northern boundary, to be maintained. The proposal would create a front projection of 2 metres at first floor level beyond the established first floor building line of the dwelling. The garage would be converted to provide a habitable room.

**SITE APPRAISAL**

The application site is located towards the end of the Manor Chase cul-de-sac, a modern residential estate within Beddau. The dwelling is situated to the north east of the highway, with the principal elevation sited accordingly, facing a south westerly direction. The site itself contains a two-storey detached dwellinghouse of fairly modern design, with surrounding properties also being similar in scale and appearance, predominantly detached, brick built dwellings set on a similar ground level and characterised by small feature variations.

The property benefits from an open front garden, accompanying vehicular hard standing and landscaping, as well as a private amenity area to the rear. The site is bounded to the north, south and east by the curtilages of other residential properties off Manor Chase and to the west by the highway.

### **PLANNING HISTORY**

There are no recent applications on record associated with this site.

### **PUBLICITY**

The application has been advertised by direct notification to 8 neighbouring properties. No letters of objection or representation have been received.

### **CONSULTATION**

None undertaken

### **POLICY CONTEXT**

#### **Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan**

The application site lies within the settlement boundary for Beddau but is not allocated for any specific purpose.

**Policy AW5** - sets out criteria for new development in relation to amenity and accessibility.

**Policy AW6** - requires development to involve a high quality design and to make a positive contribution to place making, including landscaping.

#### **Supplementary Planning Guidance**

A Design Guide for Householder Development

#### **National Guidance**

In the determination of planning applications regard should also be given to the requirements of National Planning Policy which are not duplicated in the Local Development Plan, particularly where National Planning Policy provides a more up to date and comprehensive policy on certain topics.

Planning Policy Wales Edition 10 sets out the Welsh Government's current position on planning policy, which incorporates the objectives of the Wellbeing of Future Generations (Wales) Act in to planning.

It is considered that the current proposal fails to meet the seven wellbeing of future generation's goals and, as a result, the proposed development is also inconsistent with the five ways of working set out in the Act.

It is also considered that the proposed development is inconsistent with the key principles and requirements for placemaking as defined by Chapter 2 People and Places: Achieving Wellbeing through Placemaking of Planning Policy Wales; with the proposal also being contrary to the following insofar as they relate to the development proposed –

Chapter 3 (good design and better places, promoting healthier places, sustainable management of natural resources)

Other relevant policy guidance consulted:  
PPW Technical Advice Note 12 – Design

## **REASONS FOR REACHING THE RECOMMENDATION**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that, if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purposes of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Furthermore, applications that are not in accordance with relevant policies in the plan should not be allowed, unless material considerations justify the grant of planning permission.

### **Main Issues:**

#### **Principle of the proposed development**

The application relates to an extension to an existing residential dwelling; this type of development could therefore be considered acceptable in principle. However, in this case and on balance, the works are considered to have an unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene. The reasons for this recommendation are set out in detail below.

#### **Impact on the character and appearance of the area**

It is noted that no. 20 Manor Chase has an existing two storey gable feature to the front of the property, this pre-existing structure appears to be an original feature. This particular property is located at the tail end of the cul-de-sac where it is not overly noticeable from many public vantage points. Properties within Manor Chase have been designed to respect the existing first floor property line, with many featuring attached side garages and subservient first floor side extensions or, more commonly, small dormer windows within the garage roof-scape. The applicant has been made

aware of the concerns through pre-application advice and a suggestion in regards to amending the design to pull back the first floor aspect to the existing building line of the host dwelling; however, the applicant wishes to proceed with the application in its current form.

The Council's SPG on householder development stipulates that side extensions should be sufficiently set back from the front of the property and have a lower ridgeline, to give the impression of subservience to the main house. In this instance, the proposed extension extends outwards 2 metres past the front of the property. As such, the proposed development would dominate the existing property to such a degree as to make the host dwelling appear subservient to the extension when viewed from the highway within Manor Chase.

Subsequently, taking the above into account, it is considered the proposed extension would form a dominant and incongruous addition to the property and a highly prominent feature within the street scene, contrary to Policies AW5 and AW6 of the Local Development Plan.

### **Impact on residential amenity and privacy**

Dwellings to the west, east and south of the site are either not located within a proximity to be impacted by the proposed extension or are shielded from the proposal by the bulk of the host dwelling. As such they would see no impact to their current levels of residential amenity.

It is noted that the adjacent dwelling of no.16 Manor Chase is within a proximity that could potentially be impacted through the proposal. But given that there are no side openings within the neighbouring property which feature direct views of the proposal, it is not considered the new extension would have any impact on the outlook from no. 16. It is noted that there is a conservatory to the rear of no.16 that services the dwelling from which some views of the proposal would be present. Whilst, through the application, the bulk of the host dwelling would move closer to the common boundary; it is not considered that views from the conservatory would differ greatly from current.

A first floor side facing window proposed within the new extension does raise some points of concern. But were the other concerns regarding the detrimental impact upon visual amenity overcome, it is considered that a condition that requires this window be obscurely glazed and non-opening would ensure the privacy levels of neighbouring residents were maintained.

On balance, in terms of the impact on the amenity and privacy of neighbouring residents, the application is considered to be acceptable.

### **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Liability**

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was introduced in Rhondda Cynon Taf from 31 December 2014.

The application is for development of a kind that is not CIL liable under the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

## **Conclusion**

It is considered the proposal would have a significant detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene. The application is therefore considered contrary to the relevant policies of the Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan (AW5 and AW6).

## **RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE**

1. It is considered that the proposed extension, by virtue of its scale, massing and siting, would represent a visually incongruous form of development which would have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to the relevant policies of the Local Development Plan (AW5 and AW6) and Supplementary Planning Guidance: A Design Guide for Householder Development.