



RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

21st September 2021

SITE MEETING

APPLICATION NO: 21/0431/15 Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) to seek permission for amended building location, building height, forecourt and external cladding. (Original application 19/0791/10) (Amended plans received 02/08/21).

Storage Unit off Heol Y Beddau, Pontypridd, CF38 2AG

REPORT OF THE SERVICE DIRECTOR, DEMOCRATIC SERVICES & COMMUNICATION

Author: Jessica Daniel, Council Business Unit.

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

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

2. RECOMMENDATION

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 54 (Planning and Development Committee – 2nd September 2021) a site inspection was undertaken on Tuesday 21st September 2021 to consider the distance from nearby properties, whether the proposed development is in keeping with the local area and highways matters concerning the lane accessing the site.

- 3.2 The meeting was attended by the Planning and Development Committee Members County Borough Councillors S. Rees, G. Caple, D. Grehan and J. Williams.
- 3.3 Members met at the entrance to the site at land off Heol Y Beddau and walked onto the site. The Planning Officer advised Members that the application seeks to vary the plans previously approved within planning permission ref. 19/0791/10. The previous application gained consent for the construction of a single storey storage unit at the site for the personal storage of the applicant's classic car collection.
- 3.4 The Planning Officer pointed out to Members that development works have started on site and it is apparent that they are not progressing in accordance with the approved plans. The unit has not been located in the position previously set out and its height has increased. The Planning Officer advised that this application therefore seeks consent to retain the structure as built / being built by amending the wording of Condition 2 in line with the updated proposed plans/design. The proposed amendments consist of the following:
- Resiting of the unit 4.5 metres to the south of its original position, towards the centre of the plot. It has been indicated that this was required due to the location of a sewer line towards the northern boundary of the site that would have needed to be moved or built over.
 - The ridgeline of the building has increased from 6.5 metres to 7.4 metres in height, with the eaves height increasing by 1 metre, from 5 metres to 6 metres.
 - The forecourt depth to the east of the building has been reduced by 0.5 metres, from 10 metres to 9.5 metres.
 - The applicant has also indicated that he wishes to amend the approved cladding colour from Goosewing Grey to Merlin Grey.
- 3.5 The Planning Officer talked Members through details of the original report presented at Committee on 2nd September covering the site appraisal, planning history and the details of responses received as part of the public and statutory body consultation. The Planning Officer addressed the points raised by objectors as part of the public consultation including concerns regarding impact on character and appearance of the area and the impact on residential amenity and privacy. Members were advised that the overall appearance of the development does not vary significantly from the originally approved scheme. The Planning Officer outlined that the alteration in siting is not considered to result in a significant difference in layout/appearance from that originally approved. Additionally, whilst the amendment has seen the height increased by 1 metre, the structure would still remain largely screened from view outside of the immediate vicinity of the site and would therefore not be any more prominent than that

previously approved. Regarding the impact on residential amenity and privacy, Members were advised that the unit would still be separated from the rear of these properties by at least approximately 25 metres and that it is not considered to result in such an impact that would warrant a refusal of the application.

- 3.6 The Planning Officer also discussed concerns raised by objectors regarding highways safety regarding the use of the access lane and junction with Heol Y Beddau. Members were reminded that as set out in the original report there were no objections raised by the Council's Transportation Section noting that the site is large enough to meet its SPG access, turning and parking requirements and the amended site layout is acceptable. The Planning Officer also addressed concerns raised regarding the use of the land as a turning point by residents. It was confirmed to Members that the land is under the ownership of the applicant and surrounding residents have no right of access.
- 3.7 Members also discussed the concerns regarding SuDs approval at the site. The Planning Officer confirmed that the development has commenced despite it not benefitting from SuDS approval. Members were advised that the Council's Flood Risk Management team noted that SuDS consent has not been granted at the site but that there is sufficient scope within the site to implement an appropriate scheme and that a retrospective application was possible, which should overcome any concerns. Following this point, the Planning Officer reminded Members of the suggested condition as outlined in the report requiring full site drainage arrangements be submitted to the Council for approval within 56 days of consent, and the unit shall not be brought into beneficial use until the approved drainage arrangements have been implemented on site.
- 3.8 Members raised a question regarding if enforcement action had taken place at the site. The Planning Officer advised that Enforcement Officers had attended site and noted the difference in the previously approved details and the structure that was being built. Members were advised that Enforcement Officers requested that work cease on the site whilst the revised application was submitted.
- 3.9 Local Member, County Borough Councillor J. Barton and County Borough Councillor G. Holmes spoke on the application. One Member outlined their concerns regarding the requirement for the storage unit to be built to such a large scale noting the building appeared to impose as an industrial unit in a residential area. One Member also raised concerns regarding the distance of the development to nearby residential properties and the proximity of the development to sewer lines at the site. Further concerns were raised regarding highways safety and the ability of emergency services to access the site if required.

3.9 The Chair thanked the officers for the report and closed the meeting.