

## PLANNING COMMITTEE – 3RD OCTOBER 2012

**SUBJECT: SITE VISIT - CODE NO. 11/0519/FULL - ERECT EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO HOTEL, LLECHWEN HALL HOTEL, CRAIG-EVAN LEYSHON, COMMON ROAD, NELSON, TREHARRIS, CF37 4HP.**

**REPORT BY: DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

---

PRESENT:

Councillor S. Jenkins – Chairman  
Councillor D.G. Carter – Vice Chairman

Councillors Mrs A. Blackman and S. Morgan

1. The Planning Committee deferred consideration of this application on 5th September 2012 for a site visit. Members and Officers met on site on Thursday, 27th September 2012.
2. Details of the application to erect an extension and alterations to hotel, Llechwen Hall Hotel, Craig-Evan-Leyshon, Common Road, Nelson, Treharris, CF37 4HP were noted.
3. Those present walked the site to ascertain the position of the different elements of the development including the proposed car park and location of the mature Ash tree noted as a potential bat roost and examined the initial plans submitted with the application to fully appreciate the proposals.
4. Members were asked to note that the proposed extension and alterations to the site would provide a 26 bedroom two-storey extension with ancillary gym, pool, beauty suites and new reception area. Two conservatory extensions on the western side of the existing hotel, a third conservatory at the front corner of the west elevation and a new car parking area is proposed to the eastern rear boundary of the site.
5. Attention was drawn to the scale of the proposed development; at 1405 square metres it exceeds that of the original building and increases the overall internal gross floor space from 1024 square metres to 2429 square metres. Officers confirmed that the applicant had not submitted a business plan in order to support the scale of the proposed development.
6. With regard to highway considerations Officers confirmed that the two roads approaching the development are substandard in terms of their width, horizontal and vertical alignment. There is no lighting and very few passing places on what are essentially winding country lanes. Members noted the poor visibility in accessing the development site and were advised that the traffic likely to be generated by the ancillary uses of the proposed development increased the potential for conflicting traffic movements and would also increase the wear and tear on the lane itself, which was already of an inferior standard.
7. Members sought clarification as to any actions that could be undertaken by applicant in order to resolve the highway concerns. Officer's confirmed that the applicant had submitted a plan for a number of passing bays; unfortunately they were insufficient in number and width and did

not meet the required standard. It was noted that there were also third party ownership issues that limited the applicant's ability to make improvements.

8. Members noted that no objections had been raised by the adjoining properties or from the local Community Council and felt that a development of this nature would be a benefit to the local community in terms of attracting tourism to the area.
9. Clarification was sought with regard to bat roosts and likely effect on the trees in the development area. Officers had felt it inappropriate to request a tree and bat survey at this time due to the other material planning considerations at the site, however should it become necessary these details would be required in order to ensure the protection and retention of the trees and any bat roosts on the site.
10. Officers confirmed that Rhondda Cynon Taf Council objects to the development because the proposed additional use of the sub-standard lane that lacks width, passing bays, pedestrian footways and forward visibility will create increased hazards to the detriment of highway safety and the Transportation Engineering Manager also objects to the development due to the poor highway network serving the site. Following consultation with neighbouring properties, and a site notice being posted, no responses had been received.
11. The initial planning report concluded that having given due regard to relevant planning policy and the comments from consultees, the application is considered to be unacceptable and Officers recommended that permission be refused.
12. A copy of the report submitted to the Planning Committee on the 5th September 2012 is attached. Members are now invited to determine the application.

Author:	E.Sullivan	Committee Services Officer, Ext. 4420
Consultees:	J. Forrester	Senior Planner (Team Leader North)
	C. Campbell	Transportation Engineering Manager
	M. Davies	Planning Officer

Appendices:

Appendix 1 Report submitted to Planning Committee on 5th September 2012