

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

This statement is submitted in support of a householder planning application for a single storey side extension and replacement car parking space at 66 Clos Ysbyty, Cimla, Neath. SA11 3PL.

This application follows a recent pre-application to Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council on 27 June 2022. The response letter was received from the Council on 06 September 2022 and is referenced in this supporting statement.

PARKING CONSIDERATION

The current adopted parking standards used by Neath Port Talbot CBC for development control purposes are The Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 'Parking Standards (October 2016)'. This document sets out in Appendix C, specifically paragraph C.1 that the 'standard' dimensions of a car parking space is 4.8m x 2.6m.

This document sets out on page 1, that *"While only policies in the LDP have special status in the determination of planning applications, the SPG will be taken into account as a material consideration in the decision making process."*

The existing dwelling has provision for two off road parking spaces in tandem formation, each space measuring 4.8m long by 2.4m wide. The application by virtue of the proposed side extension will as a result displace one of the off road parking spaces, hence the application will need to offset the lost off road parking space currently located to the side with a like replacement to the front of the plot, as this will ensure there will be no degradation to parking within the plot or pressure for additional on street parking.

It should be noted that the existing parking spaces do not conform to current standards as the property was built in circa 2003, some time before the current parking guidelines were adopted in 2016. Where the required parking space dimensions at the time were 4.8m in length by 2.4m in width. And the required number of spaces were based on floor area and not the number of bedrooms proposed.

Paragraph 1.01 states that the SPG provides guidance on the provision of parking facilities associated with 'new developments' and 'changes of use'. The proposal is neither a new development or change of use, but an adaption to an existing dwelling. We put forward that this is a material planning consideration.

Therefore; it would seem logical that in order for the proposed development not to have a negative impact on highway safety, the proposal as a minimum should replicate the current off road parking provision.

The proposed drawing illustrates that an off road parking bay measuring in excess of 4.8m in length and 2.79m wide for 4.58m in length, with the remaining 220mm at 2.45m wide, is achievable at the front of the property without impeding on the existing access path to the front door.

Whilst this is not quite a 'standard' 4.8m x 2.6m bay. It only concedes on the 2.6m in width by 150mm for a very small distance of 220mm at the front corner. The remainder of the parking space 4.58m in length is 179mm wider than a 'standard' 2.6m wide parking bay. Therefore; on balance the parking bay proposed is more practical than a 'standard' 4.8m x 2.6m bay as there will be more room to open doors and only the nose of the parked car will occupy the very small area that is still 2.45m wide, which incidentally is wider than the tandem parking bay lost as a result of the proposed development.

The area of a 4.8m x 2.6m 'standard' parking space measures 12.48m². Whereas the area of the proposed replacement parking space will be some 3.08m² larger at 15.56m² and as a result will be more practical and user friendly.

In addition, it could even be argued that the removal of the existing tandem parking arrangement actually improves highway safety as there will be less vehicular movements onto the highway with a parallel parking arrangement as proposed. The parallel arrangement will allow each vehicle parking space to be accessed independently and not be reliant on the car parked closest to the highway to be removed every time in order to access the other vehicle as would be the case in a tandem arrangement.

It is also acknowledged that Paragraph 3.2.1 of the SPG (Application of Parking Standards) allows for *'flexibility in the standards for local circumstances to be taken into account'*.

Therefore; on balance the proposed parking space would provide a wider and more practical user friendly space than a 'standard' parking bay in this particular circumstance.

To further support the proposal we have included vehicle tracking illustrating that a large family sized SUV (Skoda Kodiaq) can be parked in and manoeuvre adequately into and out of the parking bay proposed.

The fact that the proposal relates to an existing dwelling, that the site specific replacement parking space is overall larger and more practical to use than a 'standard' parking space, the vehicle tracking works adequately and the resultant re-configuration would have a lower impact on highway safety by virtue of the removal of the tandem parking are all material planning considerations, in the same way the SPG is a material planning consideration.

It is also relevant that the Parking Guidelines SPG are maximum standards, not minimum standards as is set out in paragraph 3.0.2.

DESIGN

The pre-application response letter suggested several improvements to the design of the side extension. These were:

1. Removal of the window to the rear elevation which would overlook the adjacent garden.
2. To ensure that no part of the side extension encroaches on land belonging to the neighbouring property.
3. Open area at lower part of extension to be bricked up or enclosed by gates/doors.
4. A set back of the proposed extension by an additional 200mm (from 500mm to 700mm).

Of the above, to adhere to item 1, the window to the rear elevation has been removed in its entirety to prevent the potential for overlooking into the adjacent rear garden. This has been replaced with a high level roof light to the rear elevation.

The proposed side extension has also been adjusted to ensure that no part of the proposal encroaches onto land belonging to the neighbouring property, and thus satisfies item 2. To achieve this the external face of the external wall has been set in 50mm, this will allow for a 50mm verge roof overhang, wholly within the applicants ownership. The foundations will be designed by a qualified engineer to specifically finish flush with the outside edge of the external walls, and thus not encroach beyond the application site.

The proposed elevations have been amended to remove the open lower part of the extension to improve its visual impact, which would satisfy item 3.

With regards to item 4, the relevant part of the design guidance is Appendix B of the adopted Supplementary Design Guidance: Design (July 2017). Whilst paragraph B.2.24 requires a minimum set back of 1m, this relates to two storey side extensions only, and thus is not relevant to the proposal for a single storey side extension. The main purpose of such a set back is to make the two storey side extension subservient to the host dwelling, with this additional set back assisting with the ridge line of the two storey extension being set down lower than the main ridge line of the host dwelling.

Paragraph B.2.30 relates more to single storey extensions and requires that the extension should be set back from the principal elevation by a minimum of 0.5m in order to maintain a sub-ordinate appearance. The fact that the extension is only single storey in mass already significantly assists with its sub-ordinate appearance in relation to the two storey host dwelling. It is considered that a set back of a further 200mm as suggested in the pre-app response letter to 0.7m would not make the extension any more sub-ordinate than it would be at 0.5m, for the reason that it is only single storey in mass.

Furthermore; with a set back of 0.5m the proposed extension would also be set behind the front elevation of the adjacent property, and thus also subservient to this property. In this regard it is considered the set back of the proposal at 0.5m from the principal elevation is correct in the context of the thrust of the guidance.

Based on the submitted drawings and the above supporting information it is therefore respectfully requested that this application be approved.