

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**26 MAY 2022**

**AMENDMENT SHEET**

**The Chairperson accepts the amendment sheet in order to allow for Committee to consider necessary modifications to the Committee report to be made so as to take account of late representations and corrections and for any necessary revisions to be accommodated.**

<u>ITEM NO.</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>
8	35	P/22/102/FUL

The two objectors who wished to speak at the meeting have advised that they cannot attend the meeting and wish for their statements to be read out by the Legal Officer as follows:

Mr and Mrs White of 42 Bryneglwys Gardens on behalf of them and the occupiers of 41 Bryneglwys Gardens and 43 Bryneglwys Gardens.

'Section 4.1 Note 1 of the Council's relevant 'Supplementary Guidance Note 2 Householder Development' (also referred to as SPG2 - House Extensions) states that no extension should unreasonably dominate the outlook of an adjoining property. Paragraph 4.1.1 further states that some extensions can appear unreasonably dominant and overbearing when seen from neighbouring houses.

Whether a proposed extension will be unreasonably dominant and overbearing is a matter of judgment and opinion, and we all - whether planners, Councillors, or affected local residents - have the right to our own opinions.

Whilst the Council's Planning Department has arrived at its opinion, we as neighbouring residents are very concerned that:

1. It has failed to recognise that the application property sits at a higher ground level (approximately six feet) than the adjoining Bryneglwys Gardens properties;
2. It has not provided the Committee with a copy of an artistic sketch which we commissioned in order to help us understand the visual effect that the proposed extension will have on the existing amenity and our enjoyment of our rear gardens;
3. The conservatory at the rear of the property, as included in the application, was removed some time ago;
4. There is a window in the side elevation of the side extension;
5. The Block Plan Extract included in the Application documents, gives a misleading impression of the proximity of the side extension to the boundary with the properties in Bryneglwys Gardens. Whilst the front corner may be 2.4 metres from the boundary wall, the rear corner, as may be seen in the enclosed photographs, would be much closer;
6. If consideration is, therefore, given to the fact that there would be a near thirty feet high wall at the border adjoining our properties, then the development is most certainly overbearing in the extreme.

We enclose the photographs below to further illustrate our concerns.

It is our genuine fear, as those who will be directly affected by the proposed extension, that the aforementioned extension will make the property at 7 Acacia Avenue, unreasonably dominant and overbearing contrary to the Council's own SPG 2 guidance. We therefore simply ask Members of the Committee whether you too would object to having such an extension at a higher ground level and only 2.4m from your own rear garden boundaries?

Please therefore refuse planning permission, or at least visit our properties to arrive at your own impartial conclusions before deciding whether to accept your Planning Officer's recommendation.

Thank you for your consideration.'



Maj. Plewa of No 6 Acacia Avenue:

'The rear of No 6 Acacia Avenue has a very narrow and short garden and patio, approximately 4 x 14 m and receives very little direct sunlight due to being NW facing and mid terrace. Even in the Summer months it only gets direct sunlight on the patio and subsequently sunlight into the living room in the later part of the afternoon and early evening.

The existing partition fence (approx. 1.8 m high) already restricts light to the patio and living room for most of the day. Any extension to the rear of No 7 Acacia Ave, which exceeds that boundary fence, would severely reduce the already restricted natural light. During the Summer months the living room would be in the shadow of the proposed rear extension for most of the day and during the rest of the year direct sunlight would be negligible. Not only is this oppressive for the residents of 6 Acacia, it would also severely restrict their right to light should their view of the sky be further restricted by the proposed monolith.

A viewing is strongly recommended should this application proceed.

I declare this statement to be accurate and factual.'

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Amendment to the wording of Condition 3 to ensure that the side facing window serving the en-suite is obscurely glazed as follows:

3. The rear-facing window serving the walk-in-wardrobe to Bedroom 02 and the side-facing window serving the en-suite at first floor level as shown on drawing ref. 034-(99)100-B (received 12 May 2022), shall be fitted with fixed pane obscure glazing to a minimum of Level 5 on the Pilkington index of obscurity. The windows shall be fitted prior to the beneficial use of the extension hereby approved commencing and shall then be retained in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of privacy and residential amenities.

**9**

**35**

**P/21/1111/OUT**

A letter of objection has been received from the Occupiers of 1 Railway Terrace, primarily raising concerns about amenity impact and Japanese Knot Weed on the site; Matters that have been previously addressed in the report to Members.

**JONATHAN PARSONS**  
**GROUP MANAGER – PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**  
**26 MAY 2022**