

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 7TH OCTOBER 2015

SUBJECT: SITE VISIT - CODE NO. 15/0023/COU – MANCHESTER HOUSE, 1 CLIFTON STREET, CAERPHILLY, CF83 1HA.

REPORT BY: ACTING DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES AND SECTION 151 OFFICER

PRESENT:

Councillor D.G. Carter – Chair Councillor W.H. David - Vice Chair

Councillors Mrs E.M. Aldworth, Mrs P. Cook, C. Elsbury, Ms. J. Gale, S. Kent and Mrs J. Summers

- 1. Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J. Bevan, J.E. Fussell, L. Gardiner, Mrs G. Oliver and J. Simmonds.
- 2. The Planning Committee deferred consideration of this application on 9th September 2015 for a site visit. Members and Officers met on site on Tuesday, 22nd September 2015.
- 3. Details of the application to retain A1 use part ground floor and convert upper floors to residential at Manchester House, 1 Clifton Street, Caerphilly, CG83 1HA were noted.
- 4. Those present viewed the site and examined the plans submitted with the application to fully appreciate the proposals.
- 5. Members were asked to note that the proposed development sought to provide 6 flats comprising five two-bedroom flats and one one-bedroom flat to the first and second floors and retain retail unit, store room and bin stores to the ground floor. Some alterations to the exterior of the building are also proposed which included the addition of new windows and doors.
- 6. Members noted that the proposed development had no associated car parking facility and expressed concern in relation to the additional traffic movements and parking problems that the introduction of 6 additional flats would have in an already heavily congested area. Local Ward Members referred to existing parking, air quality and highway safety issues and the impact an additional 12 possibly 13 cars would have. Concern was also expressed that this would cause major issues for residents on neighbouring streets and for Caerphilly town centre which is already gridlocked.

Highways Officers confirmed that given the less intensive demand in parking terms of the proposed uses, when measured against LDP 5 Car Parking Standards the application was acceptable in planning terms. It was noted that there was only a 46% subscription to resident parking-permits on Van Road and a twilight survey on Van Road at 7.00pm had shown some parking to be available. However Members felt that the short term parking associated with retail use where customers would access pay and display facilities for a limited period of time

Appendix throughout the day could not be compared to long term parking requirements and additional traffic movements that would be associated with a residential development of this size.

7. Officers advised that the proposed mixed retail and residential was acceptable in planning terms and would have a positive impact on the area, bringing an empty unit back into use and increasing footfall to the town centre.

Members expressed reservation that the tenants of the residential units would increase town centre footfall to any extent, but would inevitably have car parking needs that could not be met and increase traffic movements around an already heavily congested area.

- 8. Officers confirmed that following advertisement to neighbouring properties and a site notice being posted, 12 letters of objection had been received. Details of the objections are within the Officer's original report.
- 9. The initial planning report concluded that having given due regard to relevant planning policy and the comments from consultees and objectors, the application is considered to be acceptable and Officers recommended that permission be granted.
- 10. A copy of the report submitted to the Planning Committee on 9th September 2015 is attached. Members are now invited to determine the application.

Author: Consultees:	E.Sullivan C. Powell M. Noakes L. Cooper M. Godfrey	Democratic Services Officer, Ext. 4420 Senior Planner Senior Engineer (Highway Development Control) Engineer (Highway Development Control) Environmental Health Officer
Appandicase		

Appendices:

Appendix 1Report submitted to Planning Committee on 9th September 2015

DEFERRED FOR REASONS FOR REFUSAL