**Report Information Summary**

1. **Purpose of Report**
   To present planning applications for consideration and determination by Members of the Planning Committee.

2. **Scope of the Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C/2015/0284</td>
<td>Land adjacent to No. 3 Aneurin Rise, Tredegar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/2015/0292</td>
<td>7 Alma Terrace, Brynmawr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Recommendation/s for Consideration**
   Please refer to individual reports
**1. Background, Development and Site Context**

This application seeks full planning permission for a two storey building containing 3 flats on a parcel of land at Aneurin Rise Tredegar which measures at its maximum 12m x 8m. The site is an area of residual land following development of the surrounding area. To the north and east lie the residential curtilages of properties at Aneurin Rise, whilst to the west lies an established residential dwelling and associated curtilage known as Ravenstoke which fronts onto Bourneville Terrace at a significantly higher level than the application site.

When planning permission was granted in 1994 for the residential development which resulted in the construction of Anerin Rise and the surrounding area, the land was originally indicated as a children’s play area. However, full planning permission was subsequently granted in 2005 (C/2005/0247 refers) for the erection of a two storey 4 bedroom house on the land. However, the site has remained undeveloped with no apparent use.

Permission is now sought to erect a two storey detached building with a rear one and a half storey annexe to house three two bedroom flats. Flat one is located on the ground floor with a private access located on the eastern side of the building. Flat two is located to the rear of the premises and is split over the ground and first floors with a private access provided to the rear of the premises. Flat three is located on the first floor with access on the western elevation. Each flat provides two double bedrooms, a kitchen, living room and a bathroom/shower room.

The proposed building is set back 7.8 metres from the back of the footway and positioned a minimum of 1.2m from both side boundaries of the plot apart from a porch.
constructed on the western elevation. The plot has a stepped rear boundary which wraps around the curtilage of no 6 Aneurin Rise hence the side extension of the proposed annexe will run parallel with the rear boundary of no 6 Aneurin Rise for a distance of 2m. Provision is made on the frontage of the plot for 3 car parking spaces. The building is to have a face brick finish with concrete tile roof.

2. Site History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6776</td>
<td>Residential (including sheltered housing) mixed commercial &amp; retail (including 40000ft² Class 1 and 26000ft² DIY with garden centre &amp; car parking)</td>
<td>Approved 29.10.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94/0042</td>
<td>Residential development</td>
<td>Approved 10.3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/0374</td>
<td>Pair of semi detached houses</td>
<td>Refused 23.10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/0247</td>
<td>Two storey 4 bedroom house</td>
<td>Approved 7.10.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Consultation and Other Relevant Information

**Internal BG Responses**

**Team Manager Building Control:**  
Building Regulations Required

**Service Manager Infrastructure:**  
**Highways:**  
Confirms that the submitted application is acceptable to the highway authority and complies with Policy DM1 3 subject to condition relating to visibility splays and retention of parking areas.

**Drainage:**  
The applicant is suggesting the use of soakaway drainage as a means of dealing with surface water. However, I can see no evidence of any testing to prove that the soil permeability is acceptable for the purpose. The applicant will need to provide evidence that an acceptable method of dealing with surface water runoff is in place.

**Service Manager Public Protection:**  
I have reviewed the application and I do not have any objections or comments to make in relation to the proposal.
## External Consultation Responses

### Town / Community Council:
Tredegar Town Council is minded to **object** to this application due to the nature of the development and its location the closeness to existing property which will have its view restricted and that it will overshadow other properties.

### Welsh Water:
Requests conditions and advisory notes are added to any consent relating to the discharge of foul, surface and land drainage.

### Western Power:
Provides details of their apparatus in the vicinity.

### W&W Utilities:
Provides details of their apparatus in the vicinity.

### Coal Authority:
The Coal Authority considers that the content and conclusions of the Coal Mining Risk Assessment Report are broadly sufficient for the purposes of the planning system and demonstrates that the application site is, or can be made safe and stable for the proposal.

## Public Consultation:

- 10 letters to nearby houses
- site notice
- press notice
- website public register of applications
- ward members by letter
- all members via weekly list of applications received
- other

### Response:
One letter as been received from a Ward Member and five letters have been received from members of the public objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The land for the proposed development is elevated above the existing properties and will have an overbearing effect.
- Concerns about access as the site is very close to a very busy junction onto Earl Street.
- Flats by their very nature do not come without issues as proven by flats nearby where we have experienced a lot of anti-social behaviour issues.
• Concerns over the types of occupiers of the flats
• Loss of light
• Loss of views
• Privacy
• Development of the site would cause stress on an existing retaining wall making it dangerous. It is alleged that works by previous developer removed a substantial amount of soil causing subsidence to the objector’s home.
• The level of disruption caused to the area if construction takes place

4. Planning Policy

Team Manager European and Planning Policy:
Planning Policy broadly support the proposed development

LDP Policies:
DM1 New development
DM2 Design and Placemaking

5. Planning Assessment

The site lies within the settlement boundary and is located within an established residential area. Additionally planning permission has previously been granted for a dwelling on the site therefore I am therefore satisfied that the principle of residential development on this site has been firmly established.

In assessing the details of the scheme there are a number of matters to consider.

The proposed building is a large detached property which although not characteristic of properties on Aneurin Rise is capable of being accommodated on the site with sufficient amenity space and car parking provision. Whilst I have some concerns regarding the visual impact of the provision of frontage parking this is consistent with the parking layout of the Aneurin Rise development and would not be out of keeping with the area.

The design of the proposal is such that windows in the first floor north, east and west elevations have been kept to a minimum. A window in the eastern elevation serves a bathroom which can be conditioned to be obscurely glazed, whilst a window in the western elevation serves a stairwell. Only one window is proposed in the first floor of the northern (rear) elevation which serves a bedroom. I am mindful that this window looks out towards the rear garden of no 6 Anuerin Rise however this area is already overlooked by windows in neighbouring properties therefore I do not consider that the approval of this application would unduly prejudice the privacy interests of the occupiers of surrounding residents.
In terms of layout and the impact of the proposal on the adjoining properties the site is at a significantly lower level than the property to the west and I consider that any impact on that property will be minimal. I am mindful that the proposal will be at a higher level than the properties to the east and that the main building will project approximately 3 metres beyond the rearmost wall of the dwelling on the adjacent plot to the east (no 3 Aneurin Rise). However I feel that the relationship between the proposed buildings and adjacent properties would be such the development will not have an unreasonable effect upon the amenities of the occupants of the said properties. Notably the design of the annex and its position relative to the adjoining properties should ensure that any impact is minimal.

Below I have listed and addressed other issues raised by the Ward Member and neighbouring residents.

**Highway Matters**

The Highway Authority have confirmed that they have no objections to the proposal, Conditions are proposed which will ensure that the visibility splays are kept free of any obstacles and that the proposed car parking is to be retained. I note the reference to an earlier refusal of planning permission on the site. Planning records indicate that an application for a pair of semi detached dwellings was refused in 2003 (plan ref 2003/0374). The reason for refusal related to inadequate visibility along the highway.

The proposed parking layout differs from that previously refused and as stated above the Highway Authority has confirmed that they have no objection to the current proposal.

**Dominating effect/loss of light/views and privacy**

It is acknowledged that the property is larger than those immediately surrounding it however it is of a similar size to the dwelling granted planning permission in 2005 (planning ref C/2005/0247). Street elevations have been provided in support of the application which in my opinion demonstrate that the property would relate visually to properties. There is no right to light or views in planning terms, however as discussed above the position of the dwelling relative to its neighbours is such that I consider the effect of the proposal to be within acceptable tolerances.

**Concerns re future occupiers**

Concerns have been raised regarding the proposal as it would involve introducing flats into an area characterized by family homes. It is alleged that the flats would be occupied by persons who would give rise to anti social behaviour and drug related activities. The Local Planning Authority can give no consideration to who may occupy the flats in the future. It must restrict its consideration to the acceptability of the proposal in land use terms only.
Retaining wall
The retaining wall referred to runs along part of the western edge of the site and is not in the ownership of the applicants. Having considered the issue I am satisfied that such matters are private civil matters covered by other legislation (including the Party Wall Act 1996) and should not influence the planning decision which should be made having regard to material planning considerations only.

Disruption during construction
It is acknowledged that development can give rise to disruption during its construction. However this is normally short term and is not material to the determination of a planning application. However I propose to add a condition requiring a Construction Management Plan to be submitted for the approval of the Local Planning Authority to ensure that any disruption is kept to a minimum.

Therefore having had full regards to all material issues I consider that the proposal is acceptable and recommend that the application is granted.

6. Conclusion and Recommendation

Planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following condition(s):

1. The development shall be completed in full accordance with the following approved plans and documents
   - Proposed floor plans   Dwrg Ref 2814-07a dated 4.7.15
   - Proposed elevations   Dwrg Ref 2814-08a dated 4.7.15
   - Proposed site plan and site section Dwrg Ref 2814-09a dated 3.6.15
   - Proposed cross sections Dwrg Ref 2814 -11a dated 4.7.15

   unless otherwise specified or required by conditions 2-8 listed below.

   **Reason:** To clearly define the scope of this permission.

2. All works undertaken shall be implemented in full accordance with the recommendations contained in the Coal Mining Risk Assessment (Richard Hernon 27.07.2015) The development shall not be brought into use until the Local Planning Authority is provided with a validation report, signed by a suitably qualified person that confirms that all the recommendations, measures and/or works have been fully implemented.

   **Reason:** To ensure that the development is implemented in a manner that gives due regard to ground stability issues.

3. Notwithstanding any details indicated on the approved plans no development shall commence on site until details are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority of a scheme for the comprehensive and integrated drainage of the site showing how foul water, surface water and land drainage will be dealt with. None of the flats hereby approved shall be occupied until all drainage
works relating to that property and its connection to the wider drainage network are completed in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure that effective drainage facilities are provided for the proposed development and that no adverse impact occurs to the environment or the existing public sewerage system.

4. No flat hereby approved shall be occupied until the access and parking areas relating to that flat are constructed, surfaced and drained in full accordance with details which must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before works commence on site. The areas provided shall be retained for their designated purposes at all times.
Reason: To ensure the parking needs of the development are adequately met and to safeguard highway interests.

5. Before flat 3 hereby permitted is brought into use the window marked x shall be fitted with obscured glazing, details of which shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. A window of such design and glazing shall be permanently retained in that opening thereafter.
Reason: To safeguard the privacy and amenities of occupiers of nearby properties.

6. No development shall commence until details/samples are submitted to the Local Planning Authority of all external finishes to the flats hereby approved. All flats shall be erected and completed in accordance with details approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before they are occupied.
Reason: To safeguard visual amenity interests

7. The visibility splays shall be kept free of all obstructions to visibility exceeding 0.9 metres in height at all times.
Reason: In the interest of highway safety

8. No development shall commence on site until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by The Local Planning Authority. The Statement shall provide details of for :-
   • hours of working;
   • the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
   • delivery of materials.
   • wheel washing facilities;
   • storage of plant and materials used during construction;
   • the erection and maintenance of security hoarding;
   • measures to control the emissions of dust and dirt during construction;
   • a scheme for the recycling/disposing of waste resulting from the construction works; and
   • the siting and details of any construction compound.
Such details and measures as contained in a Statement that is approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.
Reason: To safeguard local amenity interests and to ensure that the impacts of
the construction phase of the development are appropriately and adequately addressed.

9. The development shall begin no later than five years from the date of this decision notice.
Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Informative advice

1. The applicant/developer is advised that in order to access the proposed driveway an existing street lighting column must be relocated and the footway strengthened and the kerb lowered. These works are to be completed prior to occupation of the dwellings in accordance with the Highway Authority's specification and approval. The applicant/developer is to bear the costs of these works.

2. The developer is advised that the responsibility and subsequent liability for the safe and satisfactory development lies entirely with the developer and/or landowner.

3. The developer is advised that any development that involves works to a party boundary may require an agreement under the Party Wall Act. This planning permission is issued having regard to the land ownership certificate submitted by the applicant.

7. Risk Implications

None. I am, satisfied that approval this application subject to conditions meets the relevant criteria set out in the Adopted Blaenau Gwent Local Plan
Land adjacent to 3 Aneurin Rise, Tredegar
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No:</th>
<th>C/2015/0292</th>
<th>App Type:</th>
<th>FULL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agent:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rhodri Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Alma Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brynmawr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Alma Terrace, Brynmawr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention of flat roof rear dormer extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Officer:</td>
<td>Steph Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Background, Development and Site Context

This application seeks planning permission for the retention of a flat roof dormer extension which is substantially complete at 7 Alma Terrace, Brynmawr which is a semi-detached property. The plans submitted indicate that the dormer measures approximately 5.4m wide x 2.3m high x 3.4m deep, has a flat roof and hanging tile finish. There are two windows in the rear elevation which serve a bedroom and landing window.

As can be seen from the Site History section of this report, planning permission was granted for a rear dormer extension at 7 Alma Terrace in October 2013. A complaint was received in October 2014 that the works were not being carried out in accordance with the approved plans and that the dormer was encroaching onto the adjoining property.

The dimensions of the approved dormer extension were approximately 5.5m wide x 2.3m high x 3.7m deep. The dimensions of the as-built dormer are marginally different from those approved. However the dormer as constructed does not visually represent what was presented on the approved plans. The as-built dormer extends further across the roof and exceeds the roof ridge by approximately 280mm than what is shown on the approved plans. This suggests that the original plans were not an accurate representation of the existing property.

The owners of the property were informed in November 2014 that the dormer extension is unauthorised and subsequently they submitted an application for the retention of the as-built rear dormer extension (C/2015/0031 refers). The owners were advised by the Compliance
Officer prior to the submission of the retrospective application that planning permission was unlikely to be granted on design grounds due to the fact the dormer projects above the ridge of the house. This application was refused in May this year under delegated powers on the grounds that the dormer broke the ridge of the main roof and was considered to be out of keeping with the characteristics of the neighbouring properties and surrounding area and had an unacceptable visual impact on the street scene. The applicant has not submitted an appeal in relation to this decision.

Following the refusal of planning application C/2015/0031 the applicant has submitted the current application which is a revised scheme in an attempt to overcome the reason for refusal. The only significant difference between the current application and the refused application is that the plans show the dormer being chamfered back off the main ridge of the roof with the addition of ridge tiles to mask the appearance of the dormer from the road.

2. Site History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C/2013/0262</td>
<td>Flat roof rear dormer extension</td>
<td>Approved 07.10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/2015/0031</td>
<td>Retention of flat roof rear dormer extension</td>
<td>Refused 30.05.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Information</td>
<td>Rear dormer loft extension</td>
<td>Approved 31.10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/1996/0316</td>
<td>at 6 Alma Terrace, Brynmawr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Consultation and Other Relevant Information

Internal BG Responses

Enforcement
Amended application submitted as a result of planning permission being refused for the retention of the dormer extension. The complainant has been notified that the application has been submitted.

Service Manager Infrastructure:
Highways:
No objections.

External Consultation Responses

Brynmawr Town Council:
No objection.
**Public Consultation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strikethrough to delete as appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 3 letters to nearby houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• site notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• press notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• website public register of applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ward members by letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• all members via weekly list of applications received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:**

One letter in support and one letter of objection has been received. The objections are summarised as follows:

- The dormer is encroaching onto 8 Alma Terrace.
- Part of the attic and roof of 8 Alma Terrace has been cut away during construction without consent from the occupiers of 8 Alma Terrace. If planning permission is granted legal action will need to be taken to have any materials encroaching onto the property removed.
- Under the Human Rights Act the Council has responsibilities, in particular to Protocol 1, Article 1. This states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes the home and other land.
- The extension has resulted in increased water fall which will run down 8 Alma Street as the water goods installed are not designed to take increased water flow. This will increase the possibility of water ingress and wear and tear/life expectancy of roof materials of 8 Alma Street.
- There is a significant increase in noise levels of running water and water dripping especially during the night from the raised extension.
- Future works on the extension should include restrictions regarding working hours as works have been carried out up until 22.00 hours on weekdays and weekends which is unacceptable.
- The dormer extension is out of keeping with the area by virtue of its size and design and has an adverse impact on the scale and character of the properties and the extension is overbearing.
- The extension is approximately 300mm above ridge level of the property. This has an adverse effect on the visual amenity of the road and requires lowering to ridge height to ensure uniformity with all neighbouring properties.
• The proposed alterations would not alter the visual impact of the
dormer in the slightest and would result in a structure that is
overbearing from all angles especially the front elevation.
The letter outlining reasons for support are summarised as follows:
• The author of the letter has extended her property over the last 20
years and that applicant supported her at the time, she therefore
extends her support to the applicant.
• The extension is on her side of the building and she has no
objection to the build.
• Alma Terrace is a nice place to live but the houses need to be
extended to accommodate a growing families needs.
• To see the extension completed would be advantageous to
everyone.

4. Planning Policy

LDP Policies:
Policy DM1 – New development
Policy DM2 – Design and place making
Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 3 – Residential extensions

5. Planning Assessment

The substantive issue in considering this application is the design of the
dormer extension as amended and its impact on the appearance and
character of the area, particularly as viewed as part of the existing street
scene.

A number of objections have been received regarding the retention of
the dormer; those referring to design which will be addressed within the
main body of the report and those referring to procedural and peripheral
matters will be addressed at the end of the report.

In considering the planning merits of this application the principle of a
large rear dormer has already been established by approval of
application C/2013/0262. Therefore it is the design and impact of the
as-built dormer with proposed amendments that is to be considered.

Objections have been received in respect of the design of the dormer
stating that it is not in-keeping with the area by virtue of its design and
size, that it has an adverse impact on the scale and character of the
properties and that the dormer exceeding the ridge level of the property
has an adverse effect on the visual amenity of the road.
The dormer is located on the rear of the property facing out onto a rear access lane serving the properties of Alma Terrace. There are no windows looking directly into any habitable rooms of neighbouring properties and therefore it is considered that the dormer will not impact adversely on neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of light or outlook. I therefore contend that it complies with policy DM1 (2c).

Policy DM1 (2b) and DM2 seek to ensure that development is of good design, has no unacceptable adverse visual impact on townscape and requires extensions to reflect, complement or enhance the form of the original building, its curtilage and the wider area. SPG 3 also clearly states that dormer extensions should not break the ridge line of the main roof.

I have reservations regarding the design of this dormer. I accept that as it is positioned on the rear of the dwelling its effects are limited. However, I have fundamental design concerns regarding the dormer breaking the main ridge line even in its proposed amended form.

The properties on Alma Street are large period dwellings, elevated above road level with a dominant presence on the street frontage. Whilst I accept that the applicant’s proposal to chamfer the dormer back off the main ridge and add decorative ridge tiles will partially mask the visual impact of the dormer as viewed from the front elevation in my opinion the form of the dormer would still be visible above the front and side elevations and remain an unattractive feature. It does not reinforce the character and distinctiveness of the area and in my opinion has an unacceptable visual impact on the street scene. I am also of the opinion that the addition of decorative roof tiles to one property in a pair of semis would unbalance the appearance of the roof.

It is noted that there is a large rear dormer extension constructed at 6 Alma Terrace that also breaks the main ridge line. I have checked the planning history for this property and planning permission was granted for a rear dormer loft extension in 1996. The plans do not indicate that the dormer will break the main ridge line. Therefore the dormer at 6 Alma Terrace was not constructed in accordance with the approved plans. It is evident that from Google Street View and OS maps that the dormer at 6 Alma Terrace has been insitu in excess of 4 years and is immune from enforcement action. Therein such a development has not been approved by the LPA and an unauthorised development should not be seen a setting a precedent.
In summary the retention of the dormer extension in its proposed amended form is unacceptable in design terms due to the fact that it breaks the main ridge line and it does not comply with policies DM1(2b), DM2(a, b and d) and SPG 3. I therefore recommend that this application is refused and that the authority take the necessary steps to ensure what is currently a breach of planning control.

I have listed an addressed below some of the other issues that have been raised by a neighbour in response to consultation on the application.

**Encroachment**
It has been alleged that the dormer encroaches onto the neighbouring property and that no consent was given for the roof and attic space of 8 Alma Terrace to be disturbed.

This application was submitted with Certificate A signed by the applicant which is a declaration that all works within the redline boundary are to be carried out on land within the applicants ownership. Having received an objection that alleges the dormer is encroaching onto the neighbouring property this certificate was queried in writing. The applicant has confirmed verbally in a meeting at the planning office that all works were contained on land within his ownership. I am content that procedurally, the Council has followed due process and that the application can be determined.

Any concerns regarding encroachment are a not a material planning consideration but a civil matter that must be addressed through the appropriate channels.

**Water ingress, dispersion and noise**
It is noted that the submitted plans do not show any details to discharge surface water run-off from the dormer and at present no rainwater goods have been affixed. The absence of any rainwater goods to ensure surface water drainage is satisfactorily discharged could be addressed through the imposition of a condition. Any issues regarding water run-off, water ingress and wear and tear/life expectancy of the roof as a result of the construction of the dormer roof are a civil matter and can also be addressed under Environmental Health Legislation. Environmental Health are aware of the objectors concerns but have noted that they would only become involved if the development was completed without adequate rainwater goods.
With regards to the increase in noise levels from running water as a result of the dormer, the same amount of rain would land on the roof regardless of the presence of the dormer and this is not considered to be a material planning consideration. If there is an issue regarding noise from dripping this would be a civil matter.

Restriction on hours of work
It is not usual to add conditions to restrict hours of work on developments of this scale. If there are issues regarding noise disturbance from late night working there are appropriate controls under Environmental Health legislation to deal with this.

Human Rights Act
It is noted that Protocol 1, Article 1 of the Human Rights Act has been quoted but without reference to any specific objection. However, it is assumed that this refers to noise disturbance from dripping water and late night working, both issues have been addressed above.

6. Conclusion and Recommendation
I am of the view that the retention of the dormer extension is unacceptable for the following reason:
- by virtue of the dormer braking the ridge of the main roof it is considered to be out of keeping with the characteristics of the neighbouring properties and surrounding area and has an unacceptable visual impact on the street scene;
- to approve such development would set an undesirable precedent for similar proposals in the future contrary to SPG advice.

I recommend that planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The retention of the rear dormer extension (with proposed amendments) by virtue of it breaking the ridge of the main roof is considered to be out of keeping with the characteristics of the neighbouring properties and surrounding area and has an unacceptable visual impact on the street scene. Approval of the retention of the dormer in its proposed amended would run counter to Policy DM1 (2 b) and DM2 (a, b and d) of the Blaenau Gwent Local Development Plan (adopted 2012).

7. Risk Implications
The granting of planning permission contrary to the recommendation of this report undermines the fundamental principles of adopted LDP
Development Management Policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance. Such a decision would demonstrate an inconsistent approach in the planning process given that permission was previously refused by the authority in May 2015 for a development with an almost identical impact and would set a precedent for dormer extensions breaking the ridge height in the locality.

Refusing to grant planning permission gives the applicant the right to appeal against the Council’s decision to the Planning Inspectorate.