

RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015-2016

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
COMMITTEE
3 DECEMBER 2015**

**REPORT OF: SERVICE DIRECTOR
PLANNING**

	Agenda Item No.8
APPLICATION NO: 15/0705 PROPOSAL: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOW AND DETACHED GARAGE AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW STUDENT ACCOMMODATION COMPRISING 51 BEDROOMS WITH EN-SUITE BATHROOMS AND KITCHEN/DINING FACILITIES AND ASSOCIATED WORKS (AMENDED PLANS SUBMITTED 22 SEPTEMBER 2015 SHOWING RE-SITING OF BUILDING, AMENDED PARKING AND ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS AND INCLUSION OF CONCIERGE SERVICE), PARK PRIDE, BROOK STREET, TREForest	

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

Members are asked to consider the report and determine the application in accordance with the advice given.

2. RECOMMENDATION

To **APPROVE** the application in accordance with the advice given.

3. BACKGROUND

This application was originally reported to a meeting of the Development Control Committee on 5 November 2015 with a recommendation from the Service Director, Planning that planning permission be granted (see **APPENDIX A**). At that meeting Members resolved that they were minded to refuse the application because they considered the scale of the proposed development would be excessive and create over development on the site contrary to Local Development Plan Policy AW5, and there was a lack of car parking provision for the development which result in an adverse effect on the amenity of the area contrary to Policy CS2. As a consequence it was resolved that the matter be deferred to the next appropriate meeting of the Development Control Committee for a further report on the strengths and

weaknesses of taking a decision contrary to the Director's recommendation prior to determining the matter (Minute 93 (1) refers).

The principal planning considerations of the proposal are set out in detail in the report attached as **APPENDIX A**, and Members are respectfully asked to re-consider them ahead of making a decision on the proposal. In addition the following comments are offered in relation to the concerns expressed by Members.

Firstly, with regard to the scale and intensity of the development and its consequences for the amenity of the area, it is acknowledged in the Report at **APPENDIX A** that the proposed building will be larger in terms of its design, scale and height than neighbouring residential development in Brook Street, especially when compared with the bungalows that are situated on plots along the private lane off next to the application site. In this context the proposed development of substantial two-storey building that occupies the majority of its curtilage is arguably over-intensive and will conflict with the character and appearance of the single-storey dwellings residential dwellings in that part of Brook Street. However, by the same token it has to be acknowledged that the majority of dwellings elsewhere in Brook Street and neighbouring streets are two-storey terraced houses, of which a high proportion are intensively used as houses in multiple occupation mainly by students of the nearby University of South Wales. To this extent the design, appearance and intended use of the development will share characteristics of other houses in Brook Street, though it is nevertheless acknowledged that the scale of the proposed building will still be greater in depth and height than neighbouring terraced dwellings. The proposed development has its greatest affinity with student accommodation buildings situated within the confines of University campus immediately west of the application land. Ultimately, given the variety of the built environment surrounding the application site, it is a matter of judgement whether or not the scale of proposal is considered excessive and therefore amounts to over-development and will result in an adverse effect on the amenity of the area, therefore it is acknowledged that there is some weight to be attached to the concern expressed by Members in this regard.

Turning to Members concerns about the lack of car parking provision for the development it is respectfully pointed out that the proposal meets the parking requirements laid down in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 'Access, Parking and Circulation' (March 2011), as noted in the report at **APPENDIX A**. Moreover, the proposal is located in a residential area of Treforest next to the University of South Wales and near to a variety of local businesses, shops and public transport links. Also, there is scope within the Council's SPG that enables the developer to enter into a Section 106 agreement with the Council with the intention of overcoming any obstacles that may arise to prevent the awarding of planning permission such as restricting future occupiers of the student accommodation from using vehicles to and from the proposed development site which would be considered acceptable to prevent increased pressure on the limited parking provision in Brook Street and the surrounding area. Taking all of these factors in account it is considered that refusal of planning permission for reason of lack of car parking provision is unlikely to carry significant weight in this case.

If, after further consideration, Members are still minded to refuse the application then the following reason is suggested which reflects concerns expressed at the previous meeting:

The proposed development is contrary to Policies AW5 and CS2 of the Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan because it is considered excessive in terms of its design, scale and height, lacks adequate car parking provision, amounts to over-development of the site, and therefore will result in an adverse effect on the character, appearance and amenity of the of the area.

This page intentionally blank

APPENDIX A

APPLICATION NO: 15/0705/10 (PB)
APPLICANT: T L Developments Ltd
DEVELOPMENT: Demolition of existing bungalow and detached garage and construction of new student accommodation comprising 51 bedrooms with en-suite bathrooms and kitchen/dining facilities and associated work (amended plans submitted 22 September 2015 showing re-siting of building, amended parking and access arrangements, and inclusion of concierge service)
LOCATION: PARK PRIDE, BROOK STREET, TREFOREST, PONTYPRIDD, CF37 1TW
DATE REGISTERED: 22/06/2015
ELECTORAL DIVISION: Treforest

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to a Section 106 Agreement.

REASONS:

The proposal is for a dedicated student accommodation facility in Brook Street immediately next the University campus and surrounding residential properties. It will result in the loss of a dwelling house in an existing residential area, though will be replaced with alternative residential accommodation albeit an intensive housing scheme specifically for accommodating students of the University.

In principle the proposal is in accordance with LDP settlement policy which encourages this kind of development in sustainable locations. However, the development involves a large building that shares little, if any, of the characteristics of neighbouring bungalows along the private lane that runs west of the site. On the other hand, the development has more affinities with the adjacent University development to the south and share features and characteristics of much of the neighbouring terraced housing elsewhere in Brook Street, much of which is now in use as student HMOs. Being a dedicated student accommodation similar to on-campus accommodation facilities, the proposal is not in itself a HMO and might actually reduce the demand on the existing local housing stock for conversion to student HMOs.

The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its consequences for access, parking, highway safety, residential amenity and associated issues. For the above reason the proposal, on balance, is considered acceptable overall and recommended for approval subject to the conditions specified below and the applicant first entering into a planning obligation to prevent occupation of the development by any more than six car-owning students of the accommodation.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Full planning permission is sought for the demolition of an existing bungalow and garage and construction of a new student accommodation building comprising 51 bedrooms with en-suite bathrooms, communal kitchen/dining facilities and a concierge service. The dimensions of the proposed building would be 35.5m in width, 12.5m in depth, and 11.5m in height to the ridge of the roof and 6m to eaves level. The building is designed into 3 stepped sections, reflecting the gently sloping profile of the site, with each section having its own communal access to student accommodation laid out over three floors, the upper (second) floor being incorporated into the roof space. Each of the three sections of the building would comprise a cluster of 17 bedrooms and en-suite bathrooms, made up of 6 on each of the ground and first floors and 5 on the second floor. A communal kitchen / dining room would be provided on each floor of each cluster. The external finishes of the building would be a combination of white render with red brick plinth and replica slate tiles. Off-street parking for 6 cars plus one disabled space would be laid out within the site curtilage and covered secure cycle parking and refuse bin storage would be provided, with access taken from the public highway at the site entrance off Brooke Street.

The development is proposed as a privately operated student accommodation block, with a concierge management arrangement.

The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement and supporting letter (dated 25 September 2015) from the applicant.

SITE APPRAISAL

The application site has an area of 1125 square metres and presently comprises a bungalow and surrounding garden space with vehicular access directly off Brook Street and immediately adjacent to the University campus. A private road runs alongside the site and provides additional vehicular and pedestrian access to the application land and to other residential properties further along it. The maintenance of the private road, which also serves as part of a public footpath, is understood to be the responsibility of the owners of the properties that are accessed from it.

The application site adjoins and is one of a series of five detached dwellings in spacious plots developed in tandem along the private road which extends off the west (top) end of Brook Street at its junction with Oxford Street. To the east of the site there is a narrow road that separates the land from a terrace of residential dwellings that runs the length of the southern side of Brook Street. Opposite the application site there is small landscaped space with a public seat and beyond that there is a fire station. Other residential properties, including former police houses, extend northwards in Oxford Street opposite the application site. The southern boundary of the application site comprises a narrow strip of derelict land which has an open ditch running over it. Beyond that land lies the extensive complex of land and buildings that comprise the University of South Wales, Treforest Campus.

PLANNING HISTORY

The application site has no recent planning history relevant to the application proposal.

PUBLICITY

Neighbours notified of the application, site notices displayed and notice published in the Press.

A total of 23 letters/emails of objection received from members of the public, comments summarised below.

- The development is unnecessary as there is ample student accommodation already available in Treforest and on the University campus;
- Insufficient parking provision will lead to indiscriminate parking in an area where on-street parking is already at a premium;
- Access located in a busy and hazardous position;
- Students crammed into small rooms, with insufficient facilities, particularly refuse and waste recycling, and no on-site security/management to control noise;
- Development will further erode the residential character, identity and social fabric of Treforest;
- Loss of privacy, overshadowing and overlooking;
- Drainage issues;
- Design, scale and height of development is inappropriate in its context, unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the area, conflicts with policies AW5 and AW6 of the LDP, and better located within the university campus not a residential street;
- Noise, disturbance and disruption during the construction phase;
- Japanese Knotweed infests land adjacent to the site;
- No access will be permissible to the development via the private road adjacent to the site frontage.

In addition, a petition of objection containing 144 signatures has been received, the grounds of objection being as follows:

'The proposed development, in terms of its scale, proportions and appearance, would constitute an unsympathetic form of development, which would be poorly related to the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal conflicts with policies AW5 and AW6 of the Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan and Planning Policy Wales. We consider the proposal to be contrary to policy AW5 of the Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan as it would result in an adverse impact upon highway safety in the vicinity of the application site following reasons:

The proposal would result in indiscriminate on-street parking in a designated residential parking road which is the main route from the nearby local fire station and could possibly result in tragic events for the following reasons. Treforest has suffered greatly due to a huge loss of family and affordable housing that has been turned into House of Multiple Occupation. This has caused widespread damage and harm to the village identity, the character, amenity and social fabric. The community is being destroyed with constant environmental waste / recycling, antisocial behaviour, drug and alcohol abuse, parking, crime problems and the huge loss of permanent residential homes this is a clear breach of the Welsh Government's and Local Authority's planning objectives and policies. The site plans show inadequate parking in a residential parking area, inadequate recycling and waste facilities, no on-site

management or security, is totally out of character with the single storey homes already built on the private road. This is a village and no similarity should be made to any other development especially a city development. We totally disagree with the design and access statement provided to the planning department by the applicant and those who have vested business interests that have contributed to it and reiterate our concerns.'

CONSULTATION

Transportation Section - no objection, the proposed development is in a sustainable location and provides adequate access, circulation and parking for vehicular and pedestrian movements therefore the proposal is considered on balance to be acceptable.

Flood Risk Management - recommends submission and approval of full drainage details prior to commencement of development.

Public Health & Protection - offers advice and recommendations in respect of mitigation of hazards from demolition of existing buildings, noise, dust, disposal of waste, and lighting.

Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water - no reply received.

POLICY CONTEXT

Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan

Policy CS2 - sets out criteria for achieving sustainable growth including, promoting and enhancing transport infrastructure services.

Policy AW2 - advises that development proposals on non-allocated sites will only be supported in sustainable locations.

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.

Policy AW10 - development proposals must overcome any harm to public health, the environment or local amenity as a result of flooding.

National Guidance

Planning Policy Wales, Chapter 2 (Development Plans), Chapter 4 (Planning for Sustainability), Chapter 8 (Transport), Chapter 9 (Housing) set out the Welsh Government's policy on planning issues relevant to the determination of the application.

Other relevant policy guidance consulted:

Technical Advice Note 12: Design

Technical Advice Note 18: Transport;

Manual for Streets

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 development

The application site comprises an existing, vacant dwelling and its associated garden area that lies within an established residential area and of Treforest and is immediately adjacent to the Treforest campus of the University of South Wales. The site is within settlement limits as defined in the Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan. Although the proposal will result in the loss of an existing dwelling, redevelopment of the site to provide an alternative kind of residential accommodation geared towards students of the University is as a matter of principle in accordance with the provisions of the LDP. The proposal is therefore acceptable unless any of the other material considerations discussed are of sufficient weight to indicate to the contrary.

Design, character and appearance

The relationship of the proposal to the character and appearance of neighbouring properties and of the wider area is matter that requires careful consideration in this case. The proposal will involve the demolition of an existing bungalow set within a moderately spacious curtilage and its replacement with substantial two-storey building having a footprint that would occupy a far greater proportion of the curtilage by comparison. The scale and appearance are designed to provide a transition from the five storey administration and faculty buildings on the adjacent University campus to the south. The two-storey elevations with pitched slate roofs are designed to reflect the surrounding residential character of the area. Moreover, the building is stepped into three linked blocks to reflect the profile of the site which helps break up its otherwise quite imposing mass.

In its current state the application site has a strong relationship with the neighbouring land along the private access lane off the end of Brook Street being the first of a series of plots that accommodate similarly designed single storey residential dwellings with generous garden areas along that lane. Redevelopment of the site in the form proposed clearly will be very different due to its scale, height and appearance coupled with its use as intensive residential accommodation. The proposal will not be in character with these neighbouring dwellings and is a considerable shortcoming of the proposal.

On the other hand, the application proposal has far a greater affinity with the characteristics of neighbouring terraced dwellings to the east and north in Brook Street, which are similarly two-storey and the majority (though by no means all) are in use as houses in multiple occupation by students. To this extent the proposal is reflective of the character of Brook Street. That said, the proposed building would be

significantly deeper and greater in height than neighboured terraced dwellings, with a third floor accommodated in its roof space all permitting a greater degree of intensive residential use by comparison. As it shares a boundary with the Treforest Campus, the proposed development also has considerable affinity with the University. The scale, appearance and use of the proposal shares characteristics of the student accommodation found on-campus.

Ultimately the consequences of this proposal for the character and appearance of the area is a matter of judgement. On the one hand the proposal jars with neighbouring residential bungalows that extend along the lane to the west of the site. On the other hand given the site's proximity to the University campus and neighbouring terraced houses in Brook Street, many of which in use as student HMOs, the proposed development would not be out of character in that wider context. It is acknowledged from the public representations made in this case that the demolition of an existing dwelling and redevelopment of the site for intensive housing use is viewed as being likely to contribute to the further erosion of the traditional residential character and social cohesion of Treforest. However, this form of development will provide sufficient accommodation to create a viable alternative to the conversion of terraced family houses to HMO's in the same way that on-campus halls of residents already does so. Moreover, the proposed development is for a purpose-built self-contained student accommodation adjacent to the University: it is not a HMO. On the basis that the proposal would provide 50 students that might otherwise be seeking alternative accommodation in Treforest, it could reduce pressure on the existing housing stock to be converted to HMO's for students, and some could even be returned to family use if the demand for student accommodation can be satisfied with sufficient provision of this type of accommodation.

Taking all of the above factors into account, on balance it is considered the proposed development is acceptable in terms of its consequences for the character and appearance of the area.

Accessibility, parking and highway safety

In regards of these issues the application site is located in a residential area of Treforest, near to the University of Glamorgan and near an area with a variety of local businesses and good transport links. Brook Street is a bus route and a main access route to Treforest Fire Station. The surrounding area contains a large proportion of student accommodation and is located adjacent to pedestrian routes to and from the University. The submitted Design and Access Statement indicates that it is intended that the accommodation will be occupied only by students. Brook Street is subject to parking restrictions, and where provided, on-street parking is restricted via resident permit parking and short stay parking for up to 2 hours. Parking within the lane between the development site and No. 35 Brook Street is prohibited by double yellow line markings. A main pedestrian access to the university is located off the rear lane between Nos. 14 and 15 Brook Street approximately 130m from the proposed development site. The rear lane has access to Brook Street adjacent to No 1 and between Nos. 14/15 and 26/27 and between the development site and No 35 Brook Street.

The submitted plans indicate access to the accommodation will be provided at the junction of the private road with Brook Street. At the proposed access with Brook

Street, which is subject to a 30mph speed limit and in the absence of a speed survey to identify the 85th percentile, wet weather speed visibility splays of 2.4m by 40m would be required in accordance with TAN 18. A vision splay in excess of 2.4m by 40m is achievable to the right however, parking within the designated on street parking bays at Brook Street could limit visibility to the right to 2.4m by 19m. Considering the location of the access on the outside of a sharp bend which would constrain vehicle speeds to the order of 20mph or less the visibility to the right is considered acceptable. Visibility to the left is in excess of 2.4m by 40m which is acceptable. There is insufficient information with regard to longitudinal and cross sections, retaining wall design and detail and the tie into the existing highway however, such details can be secured by appropriate planning conditions.

The length of lane between the development site and No 35 Brook Street is to be improved to provide a 4.8m wide carriageway which is sufficient for vehicles to pass which is acceptable. The existing parking restrictions consisting of double yellow line markings within the lane will need to be amended to reflect the change in road layout to tie into existing restrictions in Brook Street and the Traffic Regulation Order will need to be amended therefore a suitable condition is suggested.

All pedestrian access to the development will be via private internal paths/vehicle access to the existing footway at Brook Street which is acceptable.

The proposed access will improve the junction geometry of the lane serving the rear of Nos. 1-35 Brook Street junction of the widened lane with the private road and Brook Street and the access to the private road. Additionally an area of footway and uncontrolled pedestrian crossing point with tactile paving is to be provided at the entrance to the lane between the development site and No 35 Brook Street.

The private road which is not maintained at public expense and runs along part of the northern boundary of the development will not be affected by the development.

The proposed access arrangement shown on the amended plan provides for delivery and service vehicles to reverse into the site which gives cause for concern, however, considering the low speed of traffic at this location, short duration of delivery and refuse collection activities and the presence of a concierge to manage and oversee refuse collection and deliveries, the arrangement is considered on balance acceptable.

To meet parking requirements in accordance with the Councils' SPG Access Parking and Circulation March 2011 the development would require a maximum of seven off street spaces (calculated as 1 space per 25 beds for servicing/drop off plus 1 space per 10 beds for student and visitor parking). Seven off street parking spaces, (including two disabled spaces), are proposed which is in accordance with the requirements of the SPG.

The proposal also provides for secure bike storage to encourage use of sustainable modes of travel. There is scope within RCT's SPG that enables the developer to enter into a Section 106 agreement with the Council with the intention of overcoming any obstacles that may arise to prevent the awarding of planning permission such as restricting future occupiers of the student accommodation from using vehicles to and from the proposed development site which would be considered acceptable to

prevent increased pressure on the limited parking provision in Brook Street and the surrounding area. This has been discussed with the applicant who has indicated a willingness to enter into a planning obligation to limit the number of car-owning occupants of the development to six. The proposed access width of 6m is sufficient for vehicles utilising the parking spaces to turn and exit in forward gear which is acceptable.

Full engineering design and detail of the retaining wall which is adjacent to the highway has not been submitted with the amended plans. It is noted that the drawings indicate that the eastern boundary the retaining wall will consist of a 1m high retaining wall with a 0.75m high boundary wall on top. The applicant's attention is drawn to that the minimum height to prevent pedestrians falling over the wall would be 1.1m, alternatively suitable parapet may be affixed to the wall to satisfy the minimum height requirement. The foundations of retaining walls should not extend beneath the adjacent footway and therefore to ensure an adequate and acceptable design a suitable planning condition is suggested.

The proposed development is in a sustainable location and provides adequate access, circulation and parking for vehicular and pedestrian movements therefore the proposal is considered on balance to be acceptable in terms of its consequences for access, parking and highway safety.

Residential amenity and associated issues

Representations have been made by neighbours that the proposed development will cause loss of residential amenity through overshadowing and overlooking. With regards to these concerns the proposed development would infringe the normally acceptable privacy distance standards between habitable rooms of opposing residential buildings. And, although the building would be greater in height than the nearest neighbouring dwellings, especially the neighbouring bungalow, the sloping topography of the site helps mitigate its impacts to an acceptable level in respect of the concerns expressed. In particular, the site is at a lower level than the adjacent bungalow from which it is partially screened by a landscaped bund.

Neighbouring residents also have expressed concerns about the potential for increased crime, anti-social behaviour, inadequate refuse storage facilities, lack of security and management at the development. In response to these concerns the amended plans for the proposal provide for 50 student rooms and a dedicated room for a concierge service on the ground floor at the site entrance. Also, the refuse storage area has been enlarged and relocated adjacent to the access point to the site for refuse vehicles.

Taking all of the above into account it is considered the proposal would not have unacceptable impacts in terms on residential amenity for the reasons discussed.

PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended) enables local planning authorities and developers to agree to planning obligations to require operations or activities to be carried out on land (in-kind obligations) or require

payments to be made (financial contributions) to mitigate any unacceptable impacts of development proposals.

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010, with effect from 6 April 2010, state that a planning obligation (under Section 106) may only legally constitute a reason for granting planning permission if it is:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development; and,
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Planning Policy Wales (Chapter 3) advises that contributions from developers may be used to offset negative consequences of development, to help meet local needs, or to secure benefits which will make development more sustainable. Further guidance regarding what types of obligations developers may be expected to contribute towards is also contained within Policy AW4 of the Local Development Plan and the Council's SPG on Planning Obligations, however it is made clear that this is intended to form the basis of negotiations between all parties.

The Section 106 requirement in this case

As noted under the 'accessibility, parking and highway safety' heading earlier in this report it is considered possible that the proposal could introduce a significant number of cars into the area despite the level of on-site parking provision. Any additional competition for parking spaces in the surrounding residential area would result in congestion and possible hazard to other road users. Although students without cars may be attracted to the proposal because of its accessibility, it would not be possible to prevent a student from owning a car and parking along any of the residential streets in the area, the majority of which already suffer from significant on street parking problems.

TAN 18 states that planning obligations will have a role to play in ensuring residents do not own cars and cites purpose-built student accommodation as an example where such agreements can be effective. This has been discussed with the applicant who has indicated a willingness to limit the number of car-owning student occupants of the development to no more than six. This will require the submission of a planning obligation as this is not something that can be done by condition

It is considered that this requirement meets all of the aforementioned tests and is compliant with the relevant legislation. The applicant has yet to agree the detailed requirements of the obligation and it requested that Members grant delegated powers to the Service Director Planning to discuss the requirements with the applicant in consultation with the local members should Committee resolve to approve the application.

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 liable for a charge under the CIL Regulations 2010 as amended. However, the CIL rate for this type of development as set out in the Charging Schedule is £nil and therefore no CIL is payable.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the proposal will result in the loss of a dwelling in an existing residential area, though will be replaced with alternative residential accommodation albeit an intensive housing scheme specifically for accommodating students of the immediately adjacent University. As a matter of principle the proposal is in accordance with LDP settlement policy which encourages this kind of development in sustainable locations. However, the development would involve a large building that shares little, if any, of the characteristics of neighbouring bungalows along the private lane that runs west of the site. On the other hand, the development would be more characteristic of the adjacent University development to the south and share features and characteristics of much of the neighbouring terraced housing elsewhere in Brook Street, much of which is now in use as student HMOs. Being a dedicated student accommodation similar in kind to that found on-campus, the proposal is not in itself a HMO and might actually reduce the demand on the existing local housing stock for conversion to student HMOs. The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its consequences for access, parking, highway safety, residential amenity and associated issues. **For the above reason the proposal, on balance, is considered acceptable overall and recommended for approval subject to the conditions specified below and the applicant first entering into a planning obligation to prevent occupation of the development by no more than six car-owning students of the accommodation.**

RECOMMENDATION: Grant

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 shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Site Layout Plan (Drawing No. 1019 AL (90) Rev A)

Proposed Plans (Drawing No. 1019 AL (99) 01 Rev A)

Proposed Elevation (Drawing No. 1019 AL (99) 02)

Site Location (Drawing No. 1019 AL (90) 03)

and documents received by the Local Planning Authority 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 clearly define

the scope of the permission.

3. Building operations shall not be commenced until samples of the external materials proposed to be used as finishes to the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and all materials used shall conform to the sample(s) so approved.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the proposed development will be in keeping with the character of the area and adjoining buildings in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policies AW5 and AW6 of the Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan.

4. Works of construction and conversion on the development shall not take place other than during the following times:
 - Monday to Friday 0800 to 1800 hours
 - Saturday 0800 to 1300 hours
 - Nor at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the noise emitted from this development is not a source of nuisance to occupants of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy AW10 of the Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan.

5. Notwithstanding the submitted layout plan, full engineering design and details including longitudinal, cross sections and construction details of the improvements to the lane between the development site and No 35 Brook Street, junction and development access and tie in to the existing highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any building works commencing on site. The approved details shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority prior to beneficial occupation.

Reason To ensure the adequacy of the proposed development, in the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy AW5 of the Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan.

6. No works shall commence on site until full engineering details and design calculations of the retaining walls abutting the highway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to beneficial occupation.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with policy AW5 of the Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan.

7. Surface water run-off from the proposed parking areas shall not discharge onto the public highway unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with policy AW5 of the Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan.

8. No development shall take place, including any works of site clearance, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to provide for;

- the means of access into the site for all construction traffic,
- the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors,
- the management of vehicular and pedestrian traffic,
- loading and unloading of plant and materials,
- storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development,
- wheel cleansing facilities,
- the sheeting of lorries leaving the site.

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the development process unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and free flow of traffic in accordance with policy AW5 of the Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan.

9. No HGV deliveries shall take place during the construction period between the hours of 08:00 am to 09:00 am and 15:00 pm to 16:00 pm on weekdays to and from the site.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and free flow of traffic in accordance with policy AW5 of the Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan.

10. No development shall take place until drainage arrangements have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The building shall not be occupied until the drainage works have been completed in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure adequate disposal of foul and surface water drainage in accordance with Policy AW10 of the Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan.

=====

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

as amended by

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

3 DECEMBER 2015

REPORT OF: SERVICE DIRECTOR PLANNING

REPORT

**APPLICATION NO: 15/0705
PROPOSAL: DEMOLITION OF
EXISTING BUNGALOW AND
DETACHED GARAGE AND
CONSTRUCTION OF NEW
STUDENT ACCOMMODATION
COMPRISING 51 BEDROOMS
WITH EN-SUITE BATHROOMS
AND KITCHEN/DINING FACILITIES
AND ASSOCIATED WORKS
(AMENDED PLANS SUBMITTED
22 SEPTEMBER 2015 SHOWING
RE-SITING OF BUILDING,
AMENDED PARKING AND
ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS AND
INCLUSION OF CONCIERGE
SERVICE), PARK PRIDE, BROOK
STREET, TREFOREST**

OFFICER TO CONTACT

**MR P BRISTOW
(Tel. No. 01443 494763)**

See Relevant Application File

This page intentionally blank