**CYNGOR TREF PONTARDDULAIS TOWN COUNCIL**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING FINAL MINUTES**

**29th July 2025**

**7 pm**

**PRESENT:** Cllr. Gary Chambers (GC) – Chair; Cllr. Huw Roberts (HR); Cllr. Wayne Jones (WJ); Cllr. Andrew Owen (AO); Cllr. Jane Harris (JH)  
**APOLOGIES:** Cllr. Rhian Harris (RH); Cllr. Kevin Griffiths (KG)  
**OBSERVING:** Cllr. Phillip Downing (PD) – left meeting prior to vote on item 1.

**Questions from the public relating to items on the agenda. None**

1. **2025/159** [**2025/1588/OUT**](https://property.swansea.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=SZHW90EVLZ400&activeTab=summary)  
   **Land Adjoining Glynhir Road Pontarddulais Swansea SA4 8PU**[**Proposed residential development for up to four dwellings and associated works**](https://property.swansea.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=SZHW90EVLZ400&activeTab=summary)  
   The members of the committee present resolved unanimously to submit the following comments and object to the application:

In addition to the committee’s comments on the previous related application:

“Members of the Planning Committee are aware that this area of land has been flooded previously in several occasions and the river defenses currently in place are not sufficient. The Flood Consequence Assessment does not appear to take this into consideration as at point 9 it states there has been no previous flooding.   
   
The committee request that protection of the boundary hedge be a condition of planning if this application is approved. They note the hedge cannot be retained intact and provide access to driveways simultaneously. Further, this protection must be a planning condition to mitigate for the detriment to the street scene as well as the provision of wildlife corridors.   
   
The committee request that any replacement of meadowland or hedgerow, if required, be native species.   
   
The committee is aware of frequent bat sightings across this area of land and believes it to be a bat crossing. They therefore request a bat survey be undertaken prior to a Full application should this be approved.   
   
Does the plan provide sufficient outside space for each dwelling?”

The Council would like to draw the Planning Committee’s attention to the Flood Assessment, point 6, which is inaccurate. Members present have witnessed significant flooding in close proximity of the site over the past 20 years.   
Further, given climate change is an evolving situation and places which have never flooded are now flooding increasingly, it is impossible to categorically state that any flooding of the site will not impact future householders. We do not believe this report to provide compelling evidence to overturn the Council’s previous decision to refuse.

Secondly, the Green Infrastructure Statement (GIS) states the hedge will be protected in its entirety with a 2m buffer and there is no requirement for mitigation or compensation measures. The applicant clearly shows a negative impact on the hedge as it is removed in its entirety along most of the front boundary. It further places the onus on the subsequent householder to maintain the rain gardens and other mitigating factors to address the additional surface water created by placing houses on this area of land. The GIS statement is inaccurate and cannot be relied upon to support this application.

This planning committee urges the Council to re-affirm their objection to development on this site.

1. **[2025/161 2025/1189/FUL](https://property.swansea.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=SWM5IIEVJZK00&activeTab=summary)  
   21 Twyniago Pontarddulais Swansea SA4 8HX   
   Rear ground floor extension. Roof extension by raising the ridge and extension over the rear flat roof extension**The members of the committee present resolved unanimously to submit the following comments and object to the application:  
   The proposed dwelling will be discordant in the street scene. While members acknowledge there are a variety of dwellings along this road, those in the immediate vicinity are similar small single-story bungalows. Raising the ridge height of this bungalow in this way, with multiple roof lights in an irregular pattern will negatively impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties.  
   Members believe the extension is too large to be subservient to the original dwelling as the finished property appears to be greater than double the size.   
   The rear two-story extension height has not been stepped down from the increased ridge of the original property creating a discordant rear elevation.  
   There is no indication of an increase to the number of off-street parking spaces to accommodate the increased size of the property.  
   The addition of a second story creates unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbouring properties and the addition of a Juliet balcony with adjoining full height glass panels adds to this.  
   Concerns were also raised over whether any survey of the existing foundations had been undertaken to ensure they have capacity for supporting an extension of this magnitude.

**Meeting Closed: 20.35**