Planning Committee – 7th July 2020
Update Sheet

Agenda Item No. 4 Deferrals/Withdrawals

Item	App. No.	Site Location	Officer Rec.
4	2020/0097/FUL	Land North Of Jockey Street, Swansea, SA1 1NS	APPROVE

Agenda Item no. 5 Determination of Planning Applications

Item	App. No.	Site Location	Officer Rec.
1	2019/2730/FUL	Hillside Nursing & Residential Home, Ffynone Road, Uplands, Swansea, SA1 6DE Objections 8 No. additional letters of objection received and details of which are appended in full to this Update Sheet.	Approve
2	2020/0071/FUL	41A Beaufort Avenue, Langland, Swansea, SA3 4PB Amendment to Report Description of Development – Reference to 'Front Porch' is an error. Remove from description to amend as follows: *Retention of two storey rear extension, addition of first floor front balcony, fenestration alterations, addition of front gable to roof, new vehicular access, demolition of detached garage, removal of front porch, construction of attached side garage and side boundary fence* Objections 3 No. additional letters of objection received and details of which are appended in full to this Update Sheet.	Approve

Planning Committee – 7th July 2020
Update Sheet

3	2019/2903/RES	Townhill Campus, Townhill Road, Cockett, Swansea, SA2 0UT	Approve
4	2020/0097/FUL	Land North Of Jockey Street, Swansea, SA1 1NS Item withdrawn from agenda due to incorrect land ownership completion on application form.	Approve
5	2020/0853/S73	Land At Upper Bank Pentrechwyth, Nantong Way, Pentrechwyth, Swansea,	Approve

Bethan Jones (Regeneration)

From: Stuart Hayes
Sent: 03 July 2020 15:25
To: Planning Services
Subject: 2020/0071/FUL

From: liam mcknight
Sent: 03 July 2020 14:48
To: Stuart Hayes <Stuart.Hayes@swansea.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: 41 A

Stuart,
many thanks for acknowledging our concerns in your recommendations to the planning committee. However reading through it it is clear that the developer is in contempt of the planning authority. The window at the rear of the gable overlooking my property was not in the original building and you have recommended a fixed opaque window. This was deliberately flouted and I assume he will apply for a change retrospectively and the same with the door that he intends to fit on the first floor. There is now a temporary screen erected to obscure the work being done.I would be grateful if instead of allowing him a long time to change these that you make these conditions compulsory immediately. I am unclear why you have said" prior to first beneficial occupation" as a condition and it should be changed to now in my view followed by enforcement as this will permanently invade my privacy and that of number 39. I am also concerned about the widened access from the highway. Is it your view that this can only be a garage as we all suspect this will change on occupation and would you allow this change of use? I am especially concerned by this rear window clearly flouting the planning authority and would be grateful if the members enforce this planning recommendation prior to first occupation. I would be grateful if you could inform the members of the committee of my concerns, I am grateful for your support, Liam McKnight

On Fri, 19 Jun 2020 at 07:55, Stuart Hayes <Stuart.Hayes@swansea.gov.uk> wrote:

> Hi Liam,
>
> I can certainly understand and appreciate your point of view. The difficulty the Authority has in this type of situation is that the construction works have not been completed and we cannot take action on intent only when a breach has actually occurred. At this point in time the dwelling is still under construction and the Applicant could block this opening up prior to completion of the dwelling, meaning that there would be no breach of planning. If we took enforcement action now (which I don't believe we would), the Applicant could appeal against it, arguing that work is ongoing and this opening will be blocked up. I think it is extremely likely that an Inspector would go against the Authority in this situation as a breach would not yet have technically occurred.
>
> If, as you suspect, the opening is fitted with a door/window in the future, then we can and would take enforcement action. A clear door/window and use of the roof as a terrace would not have consent and have a significant overlooking impact on the direct neighbour. In that situation we would likely serve a notice requiring the work be altered so it matched any approved planning consent and if the Applicant appealed against this I do not think they would be successful.
>
> If you choose you can raise an enforcement complaint here:

https://www.swansea.gov.uk/planningenforcementcomplaints

If you do not do this now, then I would you to do so if a window/door is fitted in the opening.

Kind Regards

Stuart

From: liam mcknight
Sent: 18 June 2020 18:28
To: Stuart Hayes <Stuart.Hayes@swansea.gov.uk>
Cc:
Subject: 41 A

Stuart, I am afraid I do not believe this response. There is ample scaffolding for access and I think he is showing contempt for the planning process and assumes you will roll over after the event but have shared this with my neighbour in 39.thanks for a prompt reply. Liam Mcknight

Application Reference No 2019/2730

Development at Hillside

Hillside lies within Character Area 2 of the Conservation Area Appraisal, which mentions the particular character of Richmond Road. Long views out of the area are among key characteristics of the Conservation Area, including the view from the road where Hillside Crescent drops down and curves to join Richmond Road. The view takes in Mumbles and Swansea Bay looking out across the existing roofscape of Hillside. The proposal will block this important view.

The Conservation Area Appraisal draws attention to key features which are part of the character of the Conservation Area, including:

- Its attractive location on a south-facing slope with long views to Swansea Bay
- The well preserved 19th and early 20th century properties with an interesting collection of detached, paired and terraced houses.
- The well preserved villas and more substantial terraced houses in Ffynone Road, including Hillside.
- Well detailed terraced houses dating to the 1870s onwards, the best preserved in Cwmdonkin Terrace, Richmond Road, and Richmond Terrace
- The Inter-War development in Hillside Crescent, mostly positive in its impact

There are 50 listed building entries in the Conservation Area (all grade II), which represents 10% of all of the Listed Buildings and Structures within the County of Swansea

The Hillside development will damage the character of the immediate locality and the Conservation Area more widely, and will harm the group of listed buildings including Hillside itself.

Disturbance from operation of Hillside care home, including at night, will increase. The application makes no proposals to manage the impacts of additional staff, visitor and service traffic and parking using Richmond Road nor provide alternative transport provision.

The Richmond Road entrance to Hillside is used as an emergency access for ambulances which are unable to enter the site, and park on street, causing an obstruction,

It is not only the setting of Hillside which will be affected. The area around the site contains a significant grouping of listed and locally important buildings and is a prominent and sensitive location within the Conservation Area. The group value of the listed buildings is mentioned in the listing schedules. The Council should consider the impact of this development on the preservation of setting of these nearby listed buildings.

The scale, height and mass of the proposed modern extension are excessive and visually out of keeping with the character of this group of historic buildings and will seriously damage their setting and the Council should resist the development on the grounds that it does not preserve the setting of this group of listed buildings and sets a damaging precedent for future development.

Given the major impact this proposal will have on the conservation area and the precedent that will be set for future development the application should be deferred to permit the planning committee to carry out a site visit to assess for themselves the impact this proposal will have on the area.

Judith Woodroffe Roland Woodroffe

Bethan Jones (Regeneration)

From: Irene Mann (Councillor)
Sent: 06 July 2020 09:22
To: Planning Services
Subject: Fwd: Planning application 2019/2730/FUL , meeting dated 07/0720

Subject: Planning application 2019/2730/FUL , meeting dated 07/0720
Date: Sun, 5 Jul 2020 22:03:56 +0100
From: Sandy Johns
To: Gregory.Hopkins@swansea.gov.uk

Dear Mr Hopkins,

Re Planning application Hillside 2019/2730/FUL

I apologise if I am submitting this wrongly, as I am not sure I understand the new methods being used because of Covid 19. Under normal circumstances, I would have wanted to be present at the above meeting and might have wished to speak. Instead I am now submitting an e-mail with regard to my **objection** to the proposed development. I am a member of the Ffynonne and Uplands Conservation Group and have attended a previous public meeting regarding this development.

My reasons for objecting are with regard to the overall size, scale and mass. I accept that there has been some reduction in the mass from the initial proposal, including the provision of a hipped roof and lower eave height but it is still a large 2 storey development, on top of a previous development. I also accept that from some views very little difference will be seen, but I do feel that the effect on those residents closest to the Nursing Home will be quite over-bearing and dominant. They have also already had to submit to a previous development encroaching on their immediate environment. I also feel that there is a substantial change in appearance and effect on View 7 - Richmond Road. This was previously a sweeping view of Mumbles Head and the Bay, and one which myself and others have always enjoyed, it was always a great pleasure. I realise that planning does not deal with the right to a view, but I would regard this view as being quite iconic within the area, and so close to the Dylan Thomas Trail and Dylan Thomas House- a great cultural and tourist attraction. This view has always highlighted the relationship between the Conservation area and the rest of the town. If it is lost, then the whole area loses something important.

I accept that considerable care has gone into the choice of materials, but particularly from this view the proposed building is clearly not closely related to the original building and in my opinion looks noticeably out of place.

Finally, I believe that there are various details including the lightning conductor, certain glazing and terrace plus barrier complexities which have not as yet been finalised. Should this application be approved I would respectfully request that such matters are vigorously dealt with by means of controls.

Yours truly,

Dr Sandy Johns

61 Glanbrydan Ave, Uplands, Swansea SA2 0HY

Bethan Jones (Regeneration)

From: Irene Mann (Councillor)
Sent: 06 July 2020 09:23
To: Planning Services
Subject: Fwd: Planning Application- Hillside Nursing Home

From:
Sent: Friday, July 3, 2020 2:58:33 PM
To: Planning Services <Planning.Department@swansea.gov.uk>
Cc: Irene Mann (Councillor) <Cllr.Irene.Mann@swansea.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application- Hillside Nursing Home

Mr Gregory Hopkins,
Case Officer, Planning,
Civic Centre,
Oystermouth Road,
Swansea,
SA1 3SA.

6 Richmond Road,
Cwmdonkin,
Uplands,
Swansea,
SA2 0RB.
3 July 2020.

Planning Application - Hillside Nursing Home.
Planning Application No.: 2019/2730/FUL
Listed Building Consent Application No: 2019/2731/LBC

We have already submitted a detailed letter to object to the amended planning application of Hillside Nursing Home. We now write to reiterate our objections although we are unable to present this by letter because of the "lockdown". These continuous "modifications" are designed to erode the legal status of the Conservation Area by concentrating on details. This obscures the fact that the main principle to the objection remains the same. This basic principle is the status of the conservation area. This plan is tantamount to invalidating the regulations of the conservation area and thus the legal status of the this "modification" is brought into question.

Addendum
In addition to these stated objections there is now a serious issue of Public Health. Recent surveys confirm that care homes have a significant impact on the transmission of the Covid 19 virus. Indeed, an item on BBC radio 4 today referred to this problem. Many residential homes are close to or adjacent to Hillside Care Home and this could have a substantial impact on local residents and residents of the care home. Therefore, this would seem an inappropriate time to increase the density of Hillside, on grounds of public health.

Yours sincerely,

Patrick & Marie Walters.

Sent from my iPad

Sent from my iPad

Bethan Jones (Regeneration)

From: Irene Mann (Councillor)
Sent: 06 July 2020 09:23
To: Planning Services
Subject: Fwd: objection to hillside carehome extension ,reference 2019/2730/FUL

Get Outlook for Android

From: Jill Williams
Sent: Sunday, July 5, 2020 9:23:22 PM
To: Planning Services <Planning.Department@swansea.gov.uk>
Subject: objection to hillside carehome extension ,reference 2019/2730/FUL

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to further object to the Hillside carehome extension, reference 2019/2730/FUL. I feel that the fact that committee members who are debating the issue should visit the site before taking any decision on the proposal and any decision should be deferred until these site visits can be carried out. Plans , drawings, photographs and planning reports do not compensate for actual site visits. I am particularly concerned as a resident of Richmond Court, Richmond Road, which is north east of the Hillside extension by the effect of parking on the road and the change of outlook from Richmond Court flats. Only 2 new parking spaces are proposed by the new development while 8 new residents will be accommodated for. This will involve extra staff with cars ,extra deliveries and extra resident visitors. Any new proposal should alleviate the present dire,dangerous problem, not exacerbate it. Cars park on both sides of Richmond Road , half on the pavement , including the bend. It is impossible for an elderly or disabled accompanied resident of Richmond Court to walk 2 abreast and for mother's holding children's hands with pushchairs to pass. Richmond Court is served by the number 5 Cwmdonkin Bus . Richmond Court is in fact one of its designated stops and residents are dependent on it.I am concerned that the large lorries, envisaged there for the works on the extension , as well as the current parking problem will put in jeopardy this bus route. Conversely, the report(p30) states the highway authority has no objection to this.Site visits by the committee members should occur at peak times.

As stated in the planning report p26 (view 7),RIchmond Court's outlook of Mumbles will be lost but will supposedly gain a mews type setting instead of what the report calls the subservient ,service character of the southside of Richmond Road. 2 flats were sold within 9 months of each other in Richmond Court ten years ago. One was a ground floor flat , with a western orientation that looked into the hillside . The other flat, mine, which was a second floor flat , street level with Richmond Road, had 3 window western orientation with an outlook to Swansea Bay and Mumbles. This was reflected in the price . Both flats needed the same amount of updating. What you call in your report, not key or not designated views(incidental), I feel, did bump up the price of my property. Also, the current outlook from Richmond Court has a lot of greenery. Plans show this greenery will be replaced like for like but I

fear it won't as residents in Hillside will have their light from the windows obscured by bushes and trees if they are replaced. It will just be a concrete mass, I will lose all concept of space and openness which is the reason I bought the flat and which contributes to my well being. Committee members should view the site to better understand our grievances.

Re pre negotiations(P29)Richmond Court was not informed of a public meeting would be held in February 2019, despite my contacting Councillor May by email in September 2018 after hearing rumours of a proposed extension. I received no reply. We were informed by neighbours that a public meeting had taken place a little after the event.A promised second public meeting never materialised. However this proposed extension alters our lives.

It would also be better to defer a decision until we can speak in person as we do have legitimate grievances as the plans can potentially change our lives.

Bethan Jones (Regeneration)

From:	Iwan [redacted]
Sent:	06 July 2020 09:51
To:	Planning Services; Democratic Services (Committees)
Cc:	Irene Mann (Councillor); Peter May (Councillor); Gregory Hopkins
Subject:	Re: Planning Committee 7th July, 20202 -Item 1 Application Number: 2019/2730/FUL Ward: Uplands - Bay Area Location: Hillside Nursing &Residential Home, Ffynone Road, Uplands, Swansea, SA1 6DE . For The attention of Cllr Paul Lloyd and Planning Committee
Attachments:	ID and JD Submission for Committee 070720[16360].docx

Dear Councillor Lloyd,

We believe that the Council's published protocols on speaking have established a legitimate expectation (which we believe would be legally enforceable) that we should be able to speak directly to Committee and we request that arrangements be made for this to happen. In the meantime, we seem to have no choice but to make a further submission as set out in your public notice dated 1st July 2020. This is attached (493 words) .

As Chairman of the Committee, we respectfully ask that you enable that the following photographs Attached below) and visualisations previously submitted are shown to Committee together with our statement and others received from neighbour objectors during its deliberation of this application.

Yours sincerely,

Iwan and Judith Davies.
Bryncerrig, Ffynone Road, Swansea.
Photographs of Hillside Nursing Home from Bryncerrig - Neighbouring Property
Viewpoint 8 with reference to the Visualisations provided by the Applicant.

i) View from the Front Door

II) View from Kitchen

iii) View from the Back Bedroom:

iv) View from the Side/ front Garden

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

Submission to Committee re Planning Application 2019/2730/FUL:

The decision on this application will involve members making their own judgements about the impact of the development on amenity, heritage and conservation factors. On this ground we feel that a full appreciation of the impacts is only possible by a site visit.

We have lived in Bryncerrig since 2007 and we have already been impacted to a substantial degree by the development previously carried out at Hillside. We are extremely dismayed by the excessive scale and intrusiveness of the further development now proposed and the further impact this will have on our amenity and privacy.

We have made very detailed submissions about these impacts in two letters of objection. These are not adequately presented in the officer's report (which is just a list of headings effectively) which we feel is very unfair.

The proposed development lies to the west of our property. This is described misleadingly in the report as a secondary outlook whereas, in fact, this contains the **main access to the property**, the front and rear entrances and the garden area, which is our main external amenity space. The report does not adequately represent the importance of this aspect to the setting of our listed building or for our amenity and privacy **and it is not the case as stated in the report** that it will be obscured 'year round'.

We also submitted photographs and illustration showing views from within our property and we request that these are shown to Committee during the proceedings (as set out in covering email). Together with revised Views 8 and 8.1, these give an indication of the additional significant intrusion and the oppressive and harmful impact of the proposals contrary to the impression given in the report. New, high level, vantage points are being created which are **not comparable** with existing as the report suggests (see photographs).

We feel that the assessment **does not give 'special regard'** to the impacts on listed buildings or 'special attention' to the desirability of preserving the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, as the duties require, and we consider the scale of the proposals and their impact on heritage and conservation are excessive and should not be allowed.

Without prejudice to our objections to the scheme we make the following requests should permission be considered **that**:

- additional limitations on hours of work and noise emissions be imposed on construction work to protect residential amenity.
- an external lighting scheme be required to reduce illumination at night to the minimum to protect residential amenity.
- because the number of grey-shaded side windows on the elevation plan (5, not 3 as described in the report) are not all annotated to be obscure glazed, we request that all the windows to be so treated are made clear condition.
- the privacy screens are increased to a height sufficient to prevent overlooking (i.e. 1.7m).
- because of inconsistencies between plans, a condition be included specifying clearly the omitted balcony area.

Iwan and Judith Davies

Bryncerrig

Bethan Jones (Regeneration)

From: Irene Mann (Councillor)
Sent: 06 July 2020 10:43
To: Planning Services
Subject: Objection to Hillside Development

This written objection is to go before the Planning Committee July 7

Cllr Peter May will amplify these concerns via Teams.
I hope this planning objection will come to the attention of the committee prior to its decision making process .
I have made my objections as succinct as possible

Please be aware that I did request a site meeting to allow an evaluation of the development

1)I concede that the developer has made appropriate decisions ref the use of materials and vernacular design features,which are compatible with the status of the Grade 2 building
2)The Jupiter owned care home is a business and as such has to ensure it's long term commercial viability. The envisaged development will increase this already solid fiscal security.
3)However on behalf of residents I continue to object to the size , scale and mass of this proposed development. The primary 2 storey development (built 2009 /2011)
was tentatively accepted by residents as it fulfilled criteria 1 and 2 .However this secondary development r is far more invasive and is seen as an over intensification of an iconic building
This will impact on residents'private living .
space.
4)This secondary development will also compromise the architectural integrity of the Belvedere The tower was meant to be unencumbered by any other structure and was never meant to form an optimum development eye line.
5)'The extension of a 2 storey structure on top of an existing 2 storey extension will create a precedent for any other planning application .
Yours Respectfully
Irene Mann

I respectfully submit the following (Charlotte Roberts 39 Beaufort Avenue)

- **Bulk /massing (A1)**

  41 A is on a corner with a slightly larger frontage than others yet the plot sharply decreases in width.

  Central to the renovation is the retention of a sea view dormer window which features in the adopted Swansea Design Guide as the example of poor design. (A1)

  Pre- app advice was that the existing dormer would impede most design solutions therefore the plans were submitted, considered and approved without a side extension.

- **Dimensions**
  The current proposal involves an approx 37 feet deep garage- angled to the rear. The main garage is 17.25 feet high reaching to the eaves of the house with a cathedral window. Main garage depth is 21 feet deep with a 16 foot flat roof extension to the rear. This flat roof element would run for 16 feet along the boundary, be 8 inches away from 39's boundary (excluding guttering/overhang) and be approximately 3 feet higher than the 1970s extension to the side of 39 and extend 5 feet further forward While this garage extension is referred to as single storey its visual impact and (excluding overhang on plans) Bulk is unlike anything in Beaufort Avenue. Garage window is on same level as first floor windows.

- **Impact**

  The report concludes the proposal is an acceptable form of development and compliant with PS2 and 2008 Design Guide.
  While respecting the case officer's view

- Massing - 41A is similar in footprint to one new build in the street (No.30) That plot is much larger and rectangular.
- All recent renovations respect neighbouring houses and street scene (appendix 2) re fenestration/ gaps with established properties. This proposal does not respect the form or footprint of neighbouring and opposite properties.(appendix 3)
- 39's small, low extension does not run along the boundary for 5 metres. Design guide (1.7) states space between houses avoids terracing effect. I consider the terracing effect will be evident from the street and will certainly be evident from the rear. It will also make maintenance impossible for both properties contrary to design guidance (appendix 4)
- Policy H7 -physical impact (see A5) I would point out that the orientation of 41A within the plot differs from 39 which exacerbates the impact and has a greater detrimental affect on my privacy and private amenity.

- Design Guide states side extensions should not be the full depth of house and also has clear advice on garages which appears to contravene key design principle 7.2 detrimental impact on space around house and 7.5 Your garage must not adversely affect your neighbour's enjoyment of their garden/house

  While I accept that a garage is a requirement of this application. I submit the design is unacceptable in its present form and especially request that the rear flat roof extension be omitted to reflect better the guidance contained in the adopted Design guide and PS2. I also support the objections of others that planning for 41A has been incremental in nature which has frustrated a final design proposal sympathetic to its surroundings and the wellbeing of residents, compliant with the adopted design guide/PS2 and the advice sought and given in the preapp.

Adopted Swansea Design Guide for Householders showing 41A Dormer as an example of poor design

FIGURE 32: "A large, poorly designed dormer extension can dominate a house and the streetscene."

Pre-application advice was that the dormer would impede most solutions and "In addition, the form an dormer, the massing and bulk of the proposed property would detract from the street scene."
Full planning approval was given on plans that reduced the development's massing and bulk.
Proposals now include bulk and massing of a "non- typical garage" in height, depth and shape. The dc Has been re built larger contrary to approved plans as an existing structure increasing its dominance.

Appendix 1

Recent renovations

The most recent renovations of existing properties in Beaufort Avenue with significant extensions added. All respect neighbouring properties in terms of street scene (including maintaining gaps between properties) and visual amenity as per the adopted design guide for extensions and LDP PS2.Their context within the street scene can be seen on Google maps. (Beaufort Avenue SA34PB)

Appendix 2

41 A and neighbouring and opposite houses


41 Beaufort avenue


39 Beaufort avenue and houses directly opposite

Appendix 4

Potential impact of massing/ bulk exacerbated by the orientation of the house and the limitations of the plot

Hayley Jenkins

From: Judy Rees
Sent: 05 July 2020 21:39
To: Planning Services
Subject: ENVIRONMENT AND FENESTRATION 41A.docx
Attachments: ENVIRONMENT AND FENESTRATION 41A.docx

Please circulate the following attached submission for consideration by the planning committee 7/7/20
The submission relates to 41a Beaufort Ave item 2 on the agenda
Regards
Judith Rees
35 Beaufort Ave

Sent from my iPhone

ENVIRONMENT AND FENESTRATION 41A

Submissions to councillors.

I would be grateful if our elected officials consider the following.

The windows to the front for which permission is now sought are now vastly different to those approved.
They now encompass a glazed gable, an extra floor to ceiling bedroom window an enlarged landing window, a large garage window parallel to the bedroom windows. The large bedroom window has already been fitted and the gap in the gable made, despite not having permission yet.

Windows on the ground floor were reduced in size during consultation. Screening prevents scrutiny . I hope an amendment will not be made some time shortly to reverse that change.

The windows installed appear to have reflective glass – that's not on plans and
is at odds with the look of the street.

The windows don't reflect the original house nor do they respect the street scene as per design guide. The new build opposite me has much larger windows than other houses (but not as large as 41a) The intrusion is such that it affects my sleep.

Moreover, light pollution is artificial light which shines where it is neither wanted, nor needed. The development is directly adjacent to the Gower AONB, excessive light harms ecology, causes urban glow and affects people's well- being. I would ask you to consider , at what point is enough ?

Beaufort Avenue is very attractive to developers and the light pollution is incremental. Our council is rightly committed to 'Dark Skies" going forward.Nature is now more important than ever.Light pollution has an adverse effect on the health and well- being of all.

Trees and hedgerows.

The developer has removed all the established greenery with 39 and his work on the boundary with 41 has appeared to undermine the bank and trees belonging to 41. Several trees have already died and more will follow. The result is as predicted by the consultee comment from the authority (Trees and Hedgerows Alan Webster) and I request that a condition is imposed to replace destroyed trees and hedgerow in the interests of established wildlife and compliance with design guide.

The developer wants planning permission for a fence on both boundaries. A fence is not characteristic of the area. Additionally, there's been a failed attempt at a retaining wall, not a fence on the eastern side. The bank on this boundary means that a fence would never be structurally appropriate, but there is no indication what the wall would look like .

The proposed garage would increase parking and the authority's Highways consultee said it should be kept as such. Why then is there a necessity for the applicant to have two driveways wholly uncharacteristic of the street and destroying yet more of a public green verge so characteristic of Beaufort Ave?

The whole drawn out process has been stressful and frustrating for residents who are lay people . I would ask the question, will continued inaccurate plans, additional incremental applications and retrospective applications result in a building and surrounds that you would have been happy to approve had they been presented together ?

Bethan Jones (Regeneration)

From: Michael Batchelor
Sent: 06 July 2020 10:14
To: Planning Services; Democratic Services (Committees)
Cc: Irene Mann (Councillor); Peter May (Councillor); Gregory Hopkins
Subject: Rw: Planning Committee 7th July, 20202 -Item 1 Application Number: 2019/2730/FUL Ward: Uplands - Bay Area Location: Hillside Nursing & Residential Home, Ffynone Road, Uplands, Swansea, SA1 6DE . For The attention of Cllr Paul Lloyd and Planning Committee

Dear Councillor Lloyd and Members of the Planning Committee,

As a resident of long standing in the Ffynone Conservation area I object most strongly to this application and I urge the Committee to reject this application or at the very least to defer consideration to enable the proper planning procedures to be adopted by your Committee. The points I wish to draw to your attention are as follows:

1) I and other residents are not satisfied that a decision regarding this significant proposal affecting the Conservation Area and listed buildings is being made without giving Committee Members an opportunity to visit the site.

2) There have been over 30 written submissions some of which very detailed from neighbours/objectors, I do not consider that their views have been given proper weight in the report presented to Committee .It is vital that images submitted by objectors of the application site from Bryncerrig and Richmond Road are brought to the Committee's attention prior to the meeting.

3) I query the fairness of the process which has denied myself and other objectors the opportunity to address Committee directly.

4) I also feel that to grant approval of a 2 storey development in the conservation area will set a precedent for further planning applications.

5) In the report it states that 'during the pre- application process officers have sought to reduce the effect of the new massing by reducing the eaves and ridge levels with a shallow pitch slate roof. As a result, the height has been reduced by taking 20cm off the eaves and 1.1m off the ridge of the extension and 40cm off the lift tower roof'. I draw your attention to the fact that this modification is minimal and will not greatly affect the massing effect of this significant development.

6) With regard to the very serious effect of the development on Bryncerrig, the Committee needs to view the pictures of Hillside taken from that property and the dominance of the current building let alone the proposed development. Contrary to what is stated in the report, this will be intrusive and clearly visible and the boundary vegetation is made of deciduous trees and shrubs which do not offer the residents 'year round' privacy.

In summary, I urge the Panning Committee to give its urgent attention to deferring its consideration to a later date so that (i) residents objecting can attend to address the Committee and (ii) a site visit is arranged for Councillors.

I believe it would be a denial of natural justice if these two simple requests were to be refused.
In view of the gigantic scale of the application of several years ago (a huge development costing millions and taking over two years to complete) and which severely indented the amenity and privacy of Bryncerrig and other properties in this valued conservation area, I put it to Committee that the present application is crassly offensive and AMOUNTS TO AN APPLICATION TOO FAR.

Yours sincerely

M. J. Batchelor
19, St James' Gardens.

Bethan Jones (Regeneration)

From: shadrach steffan
Sent: 06 July 2020 11:49
To: Planning Services
Cc: Democratic Services (Committees); Peter May (Councillor); Irene Mann (Councillor)
Subject: Hillside Nursing Home 2019\2730\FUL

Dear Planners,

As we are not allowed to attend and speak at tomorrow's meeting can the below please be read out to the Committee members

Having read the final report regarding the development of Hillside nursing home there are several points I would like to raise.

The report references "Neighbor and Ward members consults were done". I have never meet with any representative from Hillside nursing home and no pictures or examples of my loss of privacy have been displayed. I have emailed Huw Griffiths to consult and never received a reply. Therefore, I feel this statement is not correct and misleading for the committee.

The site is already massively below current parking standards which will further put strain on the busy road of Richmond road. This has not been addressed in anyway way with the plans.

Hillside nursing home is already massively over developed. How will the work be carried out in a safe manner with nowhere to store materials or waste other than a busy public highway.

The application has already accepted there is a privacy issue as the plans were amended to provide a reflective coating on the windows. This does not resolve my privacy rights as myself and my family will lose all privacy to our bedrooms, lounge and garden. This is also descripted in the report that the mews style block will provide natural surveillance of the street. I have the right to privacy and this natural surveillance is a breach of that with my property being most affected by all windows of the rear to Richmond road entrance.

Along with the description of mews style block this then sets a president for future developments in the conservation area for more mews style blocks to be built. This is a extremely disappointing in a conservation area and will severely impact the street view of the area.

There are several points we have made in our objections which have not been included in the report and feel are significant.

With the above points being made I ask that the committee defer any decision until a site visit can be made by the committee to see the massive scale of development Hillside nursing home is proposing.

Kind Regards.

Mr & Mrs Shadrach

28 Hillside Crescent

Uplands,

Swansea

SA2 0RD