

**DC/2016/01487**

**ALTERATIONS TO APPROVED SCHEME FOR TWO DWELLINGS;  
ALTERATIONS INCLUDE THE ERECTION OF A SINGLE DETACHED GARAGE  
FOR EACH PLOT, THE REMOVAL OF REAR CANOPIES, THE REMOVAL OF  
CHIMNEYS AND THE REMOVAL OF HEADERS**

**LAND REAR OF 252 NEWPORT ROAD, CALDICOT**

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE**

Case Officer: Kate Young  
Date Registered: 26/01/17

### **1.0 APPLICATION DETAILS**

1.1 In March 2015 planning permission was granted for two detached dwellings to be erected to the rear of 252 and 254 Newport Road in Caldicot. The two dwellings were approved to be accessed off an unadopted road, Ferneycross. Work on these two dwellings has commenced. The current application seeks some minor alterations to those properties, including providing each dwelling with a detached single garage. The access to the properties would remain unchanged. The garages would be finished in materials to match the main dwellings, including natural slate roofs and self-coloured rendered walls. The other design alterations to the scheme are the removal of the canopies on the rear elevations, the removal of the chimneys and the removal of the headers.

### **2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

DC/2014/01487 Residential Development; approved 11/03/15

DC/2013/00941 Certificate of Proposed Lawful Development for a change of the garage into a bedroom (254 Newport Road) – Allowed.

### **3.0 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES**

#### Strategic Policies

S1 – Spatial Distribution of New Housing  
S17 Place Making and Design

#### Development Management Policies

EP1 – Amenity and Environmental Protection  
DES1 General Design Considerations  
H1 – Residential Development in Main Towns  
MV1 – Proposed Developments and Highway Considerations

### **4.0 REPRESENTATIONS**

#### 4.1 Consultations Replies

Caldicot Town Council – Refuse  
Overdevelopment

Ongoing concerns about the un-adopted Road  
Extra Traffic  
Lighting Issues  
Highways

MCC Highways – No objection.

A revised proposal has been submitted which now demonstrates the two proposed garages have minimum internal dimensions of 6m x 3m. The garages can therefore be counted as one car parking space towards the overall parking provision for each dwelling. Furthermore, it has also been demonstrated that at least two vehicles can be parked directly in front of each garage therefore meeting the maximum requirement of three car parking spaces per dwelling in accordance with the Monmouthshire Parking Standards.

In light of the aforementioned there are no highway grounds to sustain an objection to the application subject to a condition requiring that the garages be retained for the parking of vehicles.

#### 4.2 Neighbour Notification

Letters of objection received from five addresses

This is a private road

No permission has been granted by the residents of Ferneycross to access over Ferneycross

Faults in the planning process need to be investigated

No permission has been granted to allow access to the road, water and drainage

Object to the building of new houses

Mess and disruption

We objected to the previous application yet still the houses have been built

The drains have been blocked because of the construction.

The residents of Ferneycross never gave consent for this development to take place

The street is not adopted by MCC

Opposed to any additional building work on this plot

The builders are constantly staring through the windows.

Danger to life from increased traffic

The houses are too big for this plot of land

It will cause misery to a couple that live next door and are highly respected members of the community.

#### 4.3 Local Member Representations

Councillor Easson - adjoining ward member

Thank you [to the MCC Highways Officer] for your full response.

I understand everything you say, in particular the following paragraph,

"What is required for this road to be brought up to an adoptable standard, - Basically an adoptable standard cannot be achieved hence why the extension of Kipling Road (Ferneycross) was not adopted following construction in the past, this was considered by Highways during the planning application stage and discounted hence the comments in respect of the road being private and remaining so thereafter should planning consent be granted."

This suggests that you (Highways) were clear before Ferneycross was developed that the road would not be able to be brought up to an adoptable standard. So why was this not raised at Planning Committee or even before by planners at the pre Planning stage, that it was basically an unviable proposition for any developer to develop this site without offering a way of a feasible access to the properties after completion?

Regarding your comment about dialogue between the parties, the developer has just driven his way through the private road and only last week met with residents, following them receiving a threatening letter from his solicitor. We now are at a position where it is not a Planning or Highways matter, but decisions taken at Committee on Officers' recommendations are now rebounding on residents for no fault of their own. I believe that this should not have been supported by Planning Committee unless stringent restrictions were put onto the developer, actually it should have been rejected due to the need to use a private road for access.

The developer claims that he has legal title to cross this unadopted road, which is not true, his legal title is a strip of land adjacent to Ferneycross, off 254 Newport Road which appears to have become extinguished when No 22 Kipling Road was built. In fact having divested of the land by two property owners 252 and 254 Newport Road, for development they should have ensured access to have been made onto Newport Road for these new properties.

A new plan has now been put forward for two garages. This plan has not been found to be acceptable for various reasons, one being the use of a private road for access. Residents are now considering to refuse a developer to have access over this road.

Just for the record, I am dealing with this matter on behalf of Cllr Evans, who is recovering from a serious operation, and will get him up to speed when he is well. But as the Ward Member for the adjacent Ward ask that this is considered by Committee and that I be allowed to speak.

## **5.0 EVALUATION**

### **5.1 Principle of the proposed development**

5.1.1 The current application seeks the erection of two detached garages and some minor design alterations to the two dwellings. Planning permission has already been granted for the two dwellings currently under construction so that the principle of residential development and the access thereto, for two dwellings on this plot is already established. In determining this current application it is necessary to consider the acceptability of the two garages, their design, visual impact and impact on highway safety as well as the visual impact of the design amendments to the two dwellings.

### **5.2 Design of the garages.**

5.2.1 Each garage would be to the side of the property, and would measure 6.4 by 3.5 metres, externally. The ridge height would be 4.3 metres. There would be an up and over door at the front and one window on the side elevation. The garages would be finished in materials to match the main houses, with slate on the roof and self-coloured rendered walls. The size of the garages meets Highway standards for a single garage and the finishing materials are acceptable. The windows would be on the east elevations, facing towards the houses to which the garages relate. The design and size of the single garages is quite standard and acceptable in this location.

### **5.3 Highway Impacts**

5.3.1 The adopted Monmouthshire Parking Standards require one parking space per bedroom, up to a maximum of three to be provided on site. A detached garage can be counted as one parking space. In this case the garages will count as one space and an additional two spaces will have to be provided on site. During the course of the application the site plan has been amended and now demonstrates that at least two vehicles can be parked directly in front of each garage therefore meeting the maximum requirement of three car parking spaces per dwelling in accordance with the Monmouthshire Parking Standards.

#### 5.4 Design Alterations to the approved dwellings

5.4.1 The removal of the canopies on the rear elevation is acceptable and will have no impact on the street scene. The removal of the chimneys and headers is regrettable as this would diminish the design quality of the dwellings and the contribution that they would make to the street scene. This area of Caldicot however is characterised by a mix of house types and design features. Given the mixed quality of the existing housing in this area and the fact that the two new dwellings are not prominent in the street scene it would be difficult to justify refusal of the application based on the removal of these two design features.

#### 5.5 Residential amenity.

5.5.1 The main property to be affected by the proposals set out in this current application, is no. 22 Kipling Road. The proposed garage for plot no. 1 would be very close to the side boundary of no. 22. Following negotiations with officers the proposed garage has been set further back in the plot. No.22 Kipling Road has a blank gable wall facing towards the plot of no.1 and this combined with the fact that the garage is only single story with a maximum ridge height of 4.3 metres means that the proposal is acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

#### 5.6 Other issues raised.

5.6.1 The current application only seeks permission for the detached garages and design alterations. The principle of the two residential properties in this location has already been established and granted planning permission. At the time of the previous approval the issue of access off an unadopted road was fully considered. The current proposal for two detached garages will no impact significantly on the amount of traffic using Kipling Close or Ferneycross. The proposed dwellings are to connect into mains drainage and Welsh Water had no objection to this arrangement at the time of the previous consent for the two dwellings. Any disturbance and disruption during construction will only be temporary and is not an exceptional circumstance.

#### 5.7 Response to the Representations of the Community/ Town Council

5.7.1 These have been considered previously when the proposal for two houses at this site was originally granted permission. The addition of two garages does not in itself cause an over-development of the site and there is adequate space retained around the two dwellings.

#### 5.8 Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015

5.8.1 The duty to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales has been considered, in accordance with the sustainable development principle, under section 3 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 (the WBFG Act). In reaching this recommendation, the ways of working set out at section 5 of the

WBFG Act have been taken into account and it is considered that this recommendation is in accordance with the sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives set out in section 8 of the WBFG Act.

## **6.0 RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE**

### Conditions/Reasons

1. Work shall commence within 5 years
2. To be built in accordance with the approved plans
3. The garages hereby approved will be kept available for the parking of motor vehicles and not be used for other residential purposes.