

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**5 February 2026**

**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	15	P/25/758/FUL

The applicant's agent has made a representation raising concern that the committee report does not consider all the points raised in the Planning Statement that accompanied the application.

Members should note that the Planning Statement seeks to address the reasons on the previous refusal of permission with the first reason for refusal split into a rebuttal concerning location, scale, intensity of use and inappropriate land use. The second reason for refusal is dealt with through the submission of a Tourism Needs Viability Impact Assessment (TNVIA).

Extracts from the Planning Statement are reproduced below with our response below:

*Location: The building which is currently used as a holiday let is completely in scale with the host dwelling and surrounding residential area. Its previous approval as an ancillary single storey structure, set well away from the main host dwelling structure clearly indicates that the LPA were happy with its form and design.*

**Officer Comment:** The location of development was considered appropriate for an ancillary "granny" annex to a host dwelling. It is considered, however, that the application is for a stand-alone residential property – a new planning unit and NOT ancillary to any host dwelling which the Council understands has been sold subject to contract and may no longer in the ownership/control of the applicant. Therefore, a distinction in the appropriateness of siting has been duly reviewed and, overall, it is not considered appropriate for the reasons outlined in the report (Intensity of use and overdevelopment).

*Scale: The LPA consider the scale to be inappropriate for the proposed use. The host dwelling remains in a substantial plot with a large front and rear garden remaining after the bottom end of the plot is taken out for use as a short-term holiday let. The planning statement has provided photos (one of which is in the report) outlining the scale of number 52 Coychurch Road as the main discussion point for allowing the scale of the scheme.*

**Officer Comment:** Whilst number 52 Coychurch Road has sufficient amenity space, the proposed holiday let will itself become a separate planning unit akin to a new dwelling, with an intensity of use over and above that associated with a residential annex which in the officer's view is out of scale and will impact on the amenities of the neighbours and provide poor living conditions for future occupiers. Overall, the scale is also considered within the wider context of the area and not just 52 Coychurch Road. The scheme represents a development akin to a 1-bedroom dwelling to be sited on its own plot, which, in the officer's opinion, is overdevelopment of the site.

*Intensity of use: There would be no increase in intensity of use in relation to vehicles on the private road as holiday guests tend to leave in the morning and return in the evening, or at best, possibly come back once in the day before going out in the night. This compares favourably with data that shows that normal C3 dwellings have up to 8 movements in and out per day. The holiday let and curtilage are totally in keeping and proportionate to the scale of the host dwelling and its remaining large curtilage. The case officer report mentions cleaning visits, but cleaning is done by the owner who lives in the host dwelling.*

**Officer Comment:** Our opinion differs to the agent in that changing the use of the building from an ancillary “granny” annex to a holiday let would result in an increased intensity of use, materially greater than the former and that being to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. With regards to the cleaning of the holiday let, the claim that it is to be carried out by the owner of the ‘host’ property is challenged as it was understood that 52 Coychurch Road has been sold subject to contract without the annex.

*Inappropriate Land Use:*

- 1. the scale and form of the holiday let is totally in proportion to the size of the host dwelling and curtilage that remains*
- 2. the development leaves a substantial amenity area for the host dwelling*
- 3. it possesses its own amenity area and car parking space and does not need to rely on the host dwelling for these*
- 4. it has its own safe and convenient access for walking, cycling and the car and is accessible by public transport and there are no highway objections*
- 5. the scale, form and design of the existing building have already been approved; and*
- 6. it possesses no adverse harm to neighbours.*

**Officer Comment:** The officer’s view is that changing the use from an ancillary annex use to a stand-alone holiday let with no connections to the former host dwelling would be inappropriate in land use terms for the reasons outlined in the report and above. With reference to the points above, it is accepted that the scale and form of the building is in proportion to the host dwelling – it has previously been consented. Our contention is the use of the building, the appropriateness of the location for a holiday let and its impact (use) on the living conditions of residents that should be safeguarded through Planning policy.

Members attention is drawn to the Planning Statement that sought to challenge the contents of the officer’s report on the previously refused application.

*Page 1 – Canopy in host dwelling garden. The fact that the host dwelling has an outbuilding/canopy in the south-west corner is irrelevant to the determination of the application.*

**Officer Comment:** The inclusion of this detail was to ensure that a discrepancy with the submitted plans were noted.

*Page 4 – Letters of Objection. Do the three letters of objection quoted come from three separate addresses or from people in the same household?*

**Officer Comment:** Letters of objection were received from separate households. The applicant had the opportunity to review redacted versions of the objections, although no request was made.

*Page 8 Fencing off. Fencing in the garden is permitted development.*

**Officer Comment:** The boundary treatments are considered to be permitted development.

*Page 9 - Poor View from Bedroom Window. Guests do not pay to stay in the bedroom and use it as a room to stay within and look out of in the day. The holiday let has plenty of light and ventilation and view from the kitchen/diner and sitting room.*

**Officer Comment:** As outlined in the report and above, a holiday let is tantamount to a residential dwelling and represents independent living accommodation. The block plan indicates the parking space is directly adjacent to the habitable rooms which represents a poor arrangement for future occupiers.

*Page 11: the proposed development is not in a Flood Risk Zone.*

**Officer Comment:** The pre-commencement condition attached to the original consent that related to drainage has not been agreed/discharged. The applicant attempted to discharge the condition on two separate occasions, but they were both refused due to insufficient information. The condition stated:

*No development shall commence on site until a scheme for the comprehensive and integrated drainage of the site, showing how foul and surface water will be dealt with, including any future maintenance requirements, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage system shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the agreed scheme and so maintained in perpetuity.*

*Reason: To prevent overloading of the public sewerage system and prevention of pollution.*

Finally, the agent has suggested that a condition could be imposed to restrict converting the holiday let (C6) to (C3) dwelling which is permitted development. Such a condition could be challenged as not meeting the test allowing a stand-alone living unit to be permitted in this location for the reasons set out in the report would be unacceptable.

Members of the Development Control Committee have received an email from the applicant along with copies of the Planning Statement, Tourist Viability Needs & Development Impact Assessment, Financial Forecast and an email from the planning agent which is referenced above. All the documents were reviewed as part of the assessment of the application. Sensitive information relating to the applicants finances was removed from the Council's website at the request of the applicant. The applicant

has suggested that the committee report contains 'untrue statements', and 'technical jargon'. Officers refute the claim that we are misleading Members and the format of the report is standard including all the relevant sections and the Policies against which the application has been assessed.

The applicant's agent has submitted a further communication with a request that its contents be brought to the attention of Members of the Development Control Committee. The agent seeks to demonstrate how the application complies with Policy SP3 in the following ways:

*"Scale, mass and design: The ancillary building has already been approved and built and is appropriate in its location and scale being clearly much smaller and subsidiary to the large main dwelling house. Clearly the LPA were previously content that the building at the bottom of the garden was appropriate to its local context and had a perfectly complimentary relationship with the host dwelling. It's the proposed use not the scale, mass and design that the LPA are concerned over.*

*Previously Developed Land and Efficient Use of Land: The proposed use is in operation and is a sustainable use on brownfield land.*

*Access and Parking: The Highway Authority have no objections recognising that the intensity of use would not cause issues in terms of pedestrian or cyclist safety or traffic congestion. The location promotes active travel and is in close proximity to public transport and local facilities at the Triangle, Haywain, Asda and the town centre.*

*Amenity of Neighbours: As indicated in the previous delegated report by the case officer, the use of the holiday let would be less intensive than an ancillary area of accommodation could be with short staying guests spending much more time away from the building at local tourism spots locally and at the wider south Wales valleys, Cardiff and The Gower for example. Noise is not an issue and is in any event controlled by separate legislation. There is no evidence of guests creating unwelcome noise.*

*Amenity of Staying Guests: The short-term holiday let receives good quality feedback with no issues in terms of outlook, amenity area and parking. Guests do not stay in the bedroom which is mentioned in the case officer's report but are often out exploring the local area in the day. The way the holiday is used is common in short term holiday lets.*

*Biodiversity: Biodiversity gain is provided by the willingness to erect a bird box which is a proportional response to an existing building.*

*In terms of Tourism Policies in the LDP, the Planning Policy team have already confirmed that the use is tourism policy compliant and is viable. In terms of the County Borough's drive to improve its offer and increase the spend in local areas, cumulatively, these individual modest one bed units can contribute to meet the Tourism Policy objectives of diversifying and expanding the Borough's offer."*

**JONATHAN PARSONS**  
**GROUP MANAGER – PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**  
**5 FEBRUARY 2026**