

## Planning Committee

Thursday, 13 August 2020

**PRESENT:** Councillor A. Lenny (Chair)

### **Councillors:**

J.M. Charles, S.M. Allen, I.W. Davies, J.A. Davies, P.M. Edwards, W.T. Evans, S.J.G. Gilasbey, J.K. Howell, J.D. James, C. Jones, D. Jones, H.I. Jones, M.J.A. Lewis, K. Madge, B.D.J. Phillips, G.B. Thomas and J.E. Williams

### **Also in attendance:**

Councillor H.A.L. Evans who addressed the Committee in respect of planning application W/39913;

Councillor D. Cundy who addressed the Committee in respect of planning application S/40617.

### **The following Officers were in attendance:**

L. Quelch, Head of Planning

J. Edwards, Development & Built Heritage Manager

G. Noakes, Senior Development Management Officer [East]

J. Thomas, Senior Development Management Officer [South]

Z.M. James, Development Management Officer [South]

H. Rice, Development Management Officer

K. Byrne, Assistant Solicitor

E. Bryer, Democratic Services Officer

### **Virtual Meeting - . - 10.00 am - 12.15 pm**

#### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

#### **2. DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of personal interest.

#### **3. AREA SOUTH - DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**RESOLVED** that the following planning applications be granted subject to the conditions detailed within the Report / Addendum of the Head of Planning and or reported at the meeting:-

<b>S/40580</b>	<b>Variation of condition 2 on S/39644 (proposed front and rear extension with new dormer windows, lifting of existing ridge line by 350mm and roof pitch change) we would like to substitute the current approved plans to show the following changes: extend the rear first floor out to the line of the ground floor external wall, and one number new rooflight to the front bedroom at 43 Pen Llwyn Gwyn Road, Bryn, Llanelli, SA14 9UH</b>
----------------	--

S/40617	<p><b>Proposed garage extension and first floor bedroom extension at 6 Llys Pendderi, Llanelli, SA14 9PY</b></p> <p>Representation were received from the Local Member and an objector re-iterating the points detailed within the Head of Planning's written report with the main areas of concerns being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed garage was too close to the boundary wall and would impact on the maintenance of the boundary</li> <li>• The Juliette balcony and the large glazed area would negatively impact on privacy.</li> <li>• The height of the roof line would result in the loss of light.</li> </ul> <p>The Development Management Officer responded to the issues raised.</p> <p>The planning permission shall not be issued in advance of the Bat Survey being submitted and approved by the Planning Ecologist.</p>
---------	--

#### 4. AREA WEST - DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATION

**RESOLVED that Planning application W/40035 be granted, contrary to the Head of Planning's recommendation to refuse, on the basis that the proposed development was deemed to be within the policy of TAN6 and that the necessary conditions be imposed.**

	<p>A representation was made by the local Member, who stated that she was in support of the application, contrary to the officers recommendation to refuse and commented that the development would support the security of the existing business and improve the quality of family life for the applicant.</p> <p>In addition, contrary to the Officers recommendation to refuse the application, it was felt that the development was not deemed to be an extensive alteration to the existing footprint and therefore proposed to grant the application, which was seconded.</p> <p>The Development Management Officer reiterated to the Committee the reasons why the application was recommended for refusal as outlined in the report. Particularly, that the proposal did not comply with the definition of a rural enterprise and that it did not meet the functional test that requires it essential for a full-time worker to be present on most occasions. Further, in terms of a conversion, the proposed development amounted to an extensive alteration, and re-construction to facilitate the creation of a home for the applicant. The proposal was therefore not compliant with TAN6 nor Policy H5 of the LDP.</p>
--	---

	<p>The consensus of the Committee was that it believed the interpretation of the policy and the application was subjective and that the application met the criteria of TAN6, in particular the first sentence of paragraph 4.3.1.</p> <p>The Committee agreed that the necessary conditions should be imposed by officers under delegated authority including a Section 106 agreement to tie the dwelling to the business.</p>
--	---

**5. TO SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE**

**5.1. 16TH JULY, 2020**

**UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on the 16<sup>th</sup> July, 2020 be signed as a correct record.

**5.2. 28TH JULY, 2020**

**UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on the 28<sup>th</sup> July, 2020 be signed as a correct record.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**CHAIR**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**DATE**