

**ITEMS RECEIVED AFTER THE PRODUCTION OF THE REPORT**  
**FOR THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**TO BE HELD ON 16 DECEMBER, 2020**

---

<b>Page</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
1.	2019/01194/FUL	16, Tair Onen, Welsh St. Donats	1.	Comments from Councillor Michael Morgan in support of the application.
20	2020/00711/FUL	Land off Roseberry Place / rear of 86 Stanwell Road, Penarth	2.	Comments from neighbour at 90, Stanwell Road, Penarth
42	2020/00712/CAC	Land off Roseberry Place / rear of 86 Stanwell Road, Penarth	3.	Comments from neighbour at 92, Stanwell Road, Penarth

---

**MATTERS ARISING FOR COMMITTEE****COMMITTEE DATE : 16 December 2020**

<b>Application No.:</b> 2019/01194/FUL	<b>Case Officer:</b> Mr. Mark Stringer
<b>Location:</b> 16, Tair Onen, Welsh St. Donats	
<b>Proposal:</b> Proposed granny annexe. Ancillary to main dwelling	

**From: Cllr M Morgan****Summary of Comments: Comments in support of the application as a means of supporting retirement living and sustaining rural communities in the Vale of Glamorgan.****Officer Response: The issues are covered in the report.****Action required: None.**

**From:** [Thomas, Mark E](#)  
**To:** [Edgerton, Elaine](#); [Robinson, Victoria L](#)  
**Subject:** FW: For inclusion in matters arising: Planning Committee - 16th December 2020 Application 00194/FUL  
**Date:** 15 December 2020 11:39:24  
**Importance:** High

---

Hi Vicky, Elaine - please see Cllr Morgan's observations below in relation to the planning application 2019/01194/FUL - 16 Tair Onen, Welsh St. Donats; if possible, could these please be included in the Matters Arising for tomorrow's meeting please?

Kind regards,

Mark Thomas  
 Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer  
 Scrutiny and Committee Services  
 Vale of Glamorgan Council / Cyngor Bro Morgannwg  
 tel / ffôn: 01446 709279  
 mob / sym:  
 e-mail / e-bost: [methomas@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk](mailto:methomas@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk)

*Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.  
 Ystyriwch yr amgylchedd. Peidiwch ag argraffu'r neges hon oni bai fod gwir angen.*

---

**From:** Morgan, Michael J (Cllr) <[mjmorgan@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk](mailto:mjmorgan@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** 15 December 2020 11:35  
**To:** Thomas, Mark E <[methomas@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk](mailto:methomas@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Committee - 16th December 2020 Application 00194/FUL

Good Morning Mark,

I have registered to speak at tomorrow's meeting and thought it would assist the Committee to have a note of my observations :

I have requested that this application be called into Committee because it raises the important issue of the provision of retirement Housing within the Vale of Glamorgan.

We are told that by the year 2035 the population of the Vale over the age of 75 is expected to have risen by 70 % but we have limited provision for where our aging population will safely live. In particular there seems to be no current policy for the provision of retirement dwellings in our rural communities.

I speak regularly with the more mature residents of the communities within my ward . There are many who have invested their lives in these communities, raising families, building businesses and helping to develop a variety of social organisations . These people become the lifeblood of our communities. They then reach a stage in life when their children have left, they may be widowed and are worried about where they will spend their twilight years . Often they hang on in family homes with which they cannot cope because they wish to remain in the communities they love. So often when illness strikes and an older person is admitted to hospital and a decision is made that they cannot be discharged to their own homes because it is no longer suitable. Those who have had family members in this situation will know that it is often easier to get someone out of prison that it is out of

hospital - so many agencies are involved in the decision.

How different it could be if people , like Mr and Mrs Taylor, could plan ahead and create their own future proof home, adapted to meet their needs as they get older , enabling them to enjoy their retirement and remain in their community - living with their children in the same family unit.

This development proposal has been recommended for rejection principally because in the planning officer's opinion it fails to demonstrate that the proposed annexe would not be ancillary to the house and the annexe would be occupied as an independent, self-contained dwelling . It is the planning officer's opinion that the development proposal amounts to a new market dwelling in an unsustainable location .

Whilst I respect the planning officers opinions I do feel that a more objective and flexible approach could be adopted in applications of this nature. Mr and Mrs Taylor genuinely wish to create a retirement dwelling "annexed" to the family home where they have brought up all of their children , a home where they can prepare for old age within their family unit. This is not a speculative application to create a market dwelling.

There are no objections locally to this application and the proposed site is not in open countryside.

The planning officers report also refers to the sustainability of rural communities. Transport Connections are actually very good at Tair Onen with the X2 bus passing in either direction every 30 minutes giving easy access to Cowbridge and Culverhouse Cross. The access to bus stops is however not good - and this is a separate issue that needs to be addressed by our council so that bus stops along the A48 are made safer and more accessible for residents.

Our Council should not write off communities because they are not considered sustainable - on the contrary we should adopt policies to assist and support rural communities in remaining sustainable.

Our Council needs to prepare for the future and this includes a realistic approach to retirement housing in the rural vale. If this cannot be achieved within the current planning guidance then we should be seeking to overhaul the system.

Please could you include a copy of this email with the papers for tomorrow's meeting.

Regards,

Michael Morgan  
Independent Councillor for Llanbedr-y-fro/Peterston-super-Ely Ward  
Vale of Glamorgan Council / Cyngor Bro Morgannwg  
tel / ffôn:  
mob / sym: 077771803639  
personal contact number / rhif cyswllt personol:  
e-mail / e-bost: [mjmorgan@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk](mailto:mjmorgan@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk)

*Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.  
Ystyriwch yr amgylchedd. Peidiwch ag argraffu'r neges hon oni bai fod gwir angen.*

Visit our Website at [www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk](http://www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk)

**MATTERS ARISING FOR COMMITTEE****COMMITTEE DATE : 16 December 2020**

<b>Application No.:</b> 2020/00711/FUL	<b>Case Officer:</b> Mr. Peter D.J. Thomas
<b>Location:</b> Land off Rosebery Place / rear of 86, Stanwell Road, Penarth <b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of existing pre-fabricated garages to be replaced by proposed new, low energy 3 bed dwelling with associated external works and replacement boundary walls	

**From:** Neighbour at 90 Stanwell Road

**Summary of Comments:**

1. The proposal fails to preserve characteristics of the Conservation Area
2. Overdevelopment
3. Scale and Massing
4. Overbearing and overshadowing

**Officer Response:**

1. The proposal fails to preserve characteristics of the Conservation Area

The assessment of the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area is already set out in the report.

2. Overdevelopment

Since the refusal of application 1991/01063/OUT there has been significant changes in planning policy at a national and local level with a greater emphasis on higher densities.

It is considered that the current proposal provides an additional dwelling that complies with density policy of the Local Development Plan whilst ensuring sufficient amenity space is provided for the future occupiers of the dwelling and the existing flats.

For this reason it is considered that the proposal does not comprise an overdevelopment.

### 3. Scale and Massing

As set out in the report it is considered that the proposal is appropriate in terms of its scale and massing within the street scene relative to the existing dwellings on Roseberry Place and Stanwell Road.

### 4. Overbearing and overshadowing

The SPG identifies possible design solutions which are listed in the objection letter. These are suggestions but are not the only solutions which may be acceptable.

The report considers the relative impacts on neighbouring properties including the findings of the solar studies (shadowing impact assessments) and concludes these as acceptable.

#### **Action required:**

N/A.

90 Stanwell Road  
Penarth  
CF60 3LP

14<sup>th</sup> December 2020

Vale of Glamorgan Council Planning Department  
For the attention of - Mr. Peter D.J. Thomas

Dear Mr Thomas

**Land off Roseberry Place / rear of 86 Stanwell Road, Penarth 2020/00711/FUL&2020/00712/CAC**

We have read the Planning Report in advance of the meeting to be held on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2020. We note that the report supports the application, which is disappointing. We feel it contains several inaccuracies and oversights which we would like to bring to the attention of Planning Committee.

The report justifies supporting the application asserting that it complies with requirements in the;

- Planning Guidelines MD8 – Historic Environment of the Vale of Glamorgan Adopted Local Development Plan 2011-2026 and,
- Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Residential & Householder Development 2018.

It concludes that the development is *'therefore acceptable in terms of its principle, effect on the historic environment, scale and impact on neighbours'*.

We do not believe this to be the case for the following reasons: -

- 1) **Failure to preserve characteristics of the Conservation Area** - the opinion on compliance with MD8 appears to be based on an assertion on p.29/30 that the only adverse impact of the proposal is the removal of an existing stone garden boundary wall with 88 Stanwell Road. The report fails to acknowledge that the proposal further erodes the character of the Conservation Area comprising of a layout of houses and rear gardens, some with small scale garage/stable structures serviced by rear lanes. This principle is supported in section 7.3.2 of the SPG, requiring developers to consider *'Do the houses in the area occupy a similar position within their plots, creating a pattern of development in terms of siting, space between houses and arrangement of garden space?'*

The ratio of house to rear garden on the 86 Stanwell Road plot has already been eroded by the addition of a two-storey extension of two flats, adjoining the plot. It should be acknowledged that further construction on the remaining garden/backland area does not preserve, but causes further harm to this characteristic of the Conservation Area.

- 2) **Overdevelopment** - despite asserting that the scale of the proposed development is acceptable, the report offers no evidence to support this. It points out that a 1991 Planning Application for a 2 bedroom house on the same site was rejected for reasons including *'The proposal represents overdevelopment of a restricted site and would lead to a cramped form of development out of character with the locality'*. This report fails to explain how a three-bedroom dwelling on the same site is any less of an overdevelopment.

- 3) **Scale and Massing** - Section 8.5.1 of the SPG states '*You must ensure that the scale and massing of a new development is appropriate when compared to the original property*'. Assuming the original property at 86 Stanwell Road had a garage or stable then the current proposal is a significant increase in the scale and massing compared to what might have existed in the past.

The report states on p.20/21 that the existing garage/store structures comprise total built volume of approximately 173 cubic metres. By comparison (using the dimensions provided on p.23), the proposal is to construct approximately 654 cubic metres, nearly 4 times greater, and on a very constrained site of only 290 square metres.

The degree to which the proposal overdevelops the site is also illustrated by the fact, referred to on p.31, that windows in the proposed dwelling will be only 10 metres from those in the rear of 86 Stanwell Road ground floor flat, less than half the distance required by a Key Principle of 9.2.5ii in the SPG.

- 4) **Overbearing and overshadowing** - impacts on neighbours are controlled by section 9.1 of the SPG, requiring new developments to '*ensure that your neighbour's existing residential amenity is safeguarded*'. Several Key Principles are articulated to provide such safeguarding, including setting large two storey structures away from garden boundaries and not enclosing outlook or causing overshadowing. The current proposal fails to provide such safeguarding in terms of outlook and overshadowing, and further, extends development right up to and including the garden boundary of 88 Stanwell Road.

Despite the assertion in the report that impacts on neighbours are acceptable, the impact is greater than it would be with a design exhibiting more sympathetic scale and massing. Section 9.1.3 describes the features of a '*successful*' development. These include;

- i. Carefully considering the scale of the existing buildings within your property and adjacent to it, to ensure that new development is of an appropriate scale in comparison.*
- ii. Siting development away from neighbouring boundaries.*
- iii. Setting back upper floors of new development from the ground floor element*
- iv. Development of one and half storeys.*
- v. Using lower ridge heights or shallow pitched roofs.*
- vi. Slope roofs away from the neighbour's property.*

In summary, based on the above, we do not believe this is an acceptable proposal and urge its rejection. The proposed design takes none of the solutions suggested in the SPG to minimise overshadowing, provide an appropriate scale of development or one that safeguards the existing amenity of its neighbours, nor does it preserve the characteristics of the Conservation Area. The intent of the design appears to be focused on maximising the volume and size of dwelling that can be shoehorned onto a tight backland plot.

Yours sincerely

Terry and Hannah McCarthy



**MATTERS ARISING FOR COMMITTEE****COMMITTEE DATE : 16 December 2020**

<b>Application No.:</b> 2020/00711/FUL	<b>Case Officer:</b> Mr. Peter D.J. Thomas
<b>Location:</b> Land off Rosebery Place / rear of 86, Stanwell Road, Penarth	
<b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of existing pre-fabricated garages to be replaced by proposed new, low energy 3 bed dwelling with associated external works and replacement boundary walls	

**From:** Neighbours at 92 Stanwell Road

**Summary of Comments:**

Comments objecting to the officer's appraisal and considerations in the report.

**Officer Response:**

National and local policy no longer make reference to 'backland' development, with all proposals considered on their particular circumstances. The site is located to the rear of Stanwell Road with a substantial frontage to Roseberry Place. This is a material consideration in the determination of the application. A different conclusion may well be reached where the only access is from rear lane but that is not the case in this application.

The impacts on neighbours are described in the report together with extracts from the solar report which shows the impact of overshadowing. The approximate mass of the building and its relationship with the surrounding environment is also shown in this study.

It is inevitable that there will be some impact on neighbouring dwellings from any development. Subject to the recommended conditions, the proposal is considered acceptable.

**Action required:**

N/A

92 Stanwell Rd  
Penarth  
CF64 3LF

Dear Members of the VoG Planning Committee

I am writing to object to the recommendations made by the planning officer that permission be given for development 2020/00711/FUL on rear of 86 Stanwell Road. I am unfortunately unable to attend the meeting in person due to short notice of the application being pulled forward from 23<sup>rd</sup> December.

Having read the report from the Planning Officer, I feel overall that the legitimate concerns of the neighbourhood are being downplayed, which means that they can more easily be dismissed as an 'acceptable level of impact'. There have been 14 objections to the proposal and approximately nine of those come from neighbours who will be directly affected by the proposed build. The report lists reasons for the objections but does so in a manner that fails to communicate the very coherent overall narrative which is that this proposal represents an over-development of the site and the neighbourhood and a significant loss of amenity to those most directly affected.

My original letter of objection noted that this proposal is presented as an acceptable roadside development but is materially a backland development due to the position of the house on the plot and its relationship with the garden space behind Stanwell Road. This concerns remains and I would urge Members to play close attention to the overall geography of the area in this respect.

I feel that the Planning Officer's summarisation of the erection of a single house for one family as having an 'acceptable level of impact' when so many other properties are affected by this development is neither proportionate nor fair. I would ask that Members please play close attention to the full version of the solar report provided by Dr. Christine Stokes and carefully consider the overall impact of a two storey structure in this position.

Thank you, for your consideration.

Yours faithfully

Nicola and Tim Edwards