

Mr & Mrs. P. J. Handley
Northwood House
Penllyn
Cowbridge CF71 7RQ

Mrs Y. J Pritchard
Planning and Transportation Dept
The Vale of Glamorgan Council
Dock Office
Barry Docks, Barry
Vale of Glamorgan CF63 4RT

1st August 2014

Also by email to: developmentcontrol@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk

Dear Mrs Pritchard,

Re: Town & Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended)
Application No. 2014/00840/FUL/YP
Location: Development plot facing the road, west of Primrose Cottage, Penllyn

We write in connection with the above outline planning application submitted for the construction of one detached 3 bed dwelling and garage west of Primrose Cottage, Penllyn, Vale of Glamorgan.

We strongly object to the application and believe a number of material considerations mitigate against any presumption of planning permission being granted, a number of which are set out below:

- **Adverse impact on the Highway (1)** - We believe the development will have a significant and adverse impact on the narrow country lane highway given the additional traffic generated by the proposal in terms of both the construction phase and the permanent use, as well as the poor physical vehicular access to and from the site, which has inadequate vehicle turning provision.
- **Adverse impact on the Highway (2)** - We believe the development will have a significant and adverse impact in relation to the access across the narrow driveways of both Primrose Cottage and Pear Tree Cottage, with the frontage of each of these cottages being a mere 6—7m from the narrow access driveway. We also have concern over increased risk of harm to those using said driveway and to the increased traffic congestion around Primrose Cottage, Pear Tree Cottage and Forrest Cottage (directly opposite proposed access).
- **Adverse impact on the Highway (3)** – We strongly disagree with the Anderson and Associate claim that *“the persons’ living in this property maybe a couple that have already had their golden wedding anniversary”*. Penllyn is a rural village with no general store, no shop, no medical facilities, and no regular public transport service. It is an affluent community with the vast majority of residents having a minimum of 2 motor cars. This proposal is for a detached 3 bedroom dwelling, therefore the likely occupier will be a middle class, professional couple, with maybe 2-3 children. Therefore there may be up to 5 motor cars in their family. This will have a significant and detrimental impact in relation to the access across the narrow driveways of Primrose Cottage and Pear Tree Cottage. We also have concern over increased risk of harm to those using said driveway, to the increased traffic congestion around Primrose Cottage, Pear Tree Cottage and Forrest

Cottage, to the danger created for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians using the narrow driveway and to those using the public right of way that runs parallel to the narrow driveway.

- **Adverse impact on Emergency Vehicle access** – The narrow driveway access across Primrose Cottage and Pear Tree Cottage is already congested. A further development in the area would significantly enhance the congestion and have an adverse impact on the ability for emergency vehicles, such as ambulance and/or fire engine to reach the properties of Primrose and Pear Tree cottages. Furthermore we have concerns on the very limited and restricted access that would be allowed for any emergency vehicles to access the proposed new development.
- **Utilities / Services Accessibility:** - There are no utility services to the proposed site. It is our understanding that the proposed dwelling would have the services of a septic tank. We question where such a septic tank would be sited as, a) the plot is of a very limited foot-print size and, b) the plot is flanked by established dwellings to its front and to both sides. If the septic tank is to be sited in the small rear garden, would there be enough space between the proposed dwelling and the septic tank (under EU regulations)? Furthermore, given that access to the proposed dwelling is across the narrow driveway of Primrose and Pear Tree cottages, how would the septic tank be emptied and the foul sewage disposed of, as there is no safe ingress and egress for a tanker lorry.
- **Intensification** -The proposed dwelling would constitute and undesirable intensification of residential development and would reduce to an unacceptable level the amenities and privacy enjoyed by neighbouring properties in general.
- **Loss of privacy** - We believe that there will be considerable and unacceptable loss of privacy due to the proximity of the proposed development to our property at Northwood House, Penllyn, as it is planned to be a mere 9m or so from our property, which has x3 rooms with windows (at ground level) and x2 skylights (at upper floor level), which would reduce to an unacceptable level to levels of both amenity and privacy enjoyed by our property.
- **Adverse effect on right to light** - Our garden is south-west facing, therefore, should the development be allowed, the sun will be blocked out for the majority of the day from our garden, and there will also be a loss of light to the x3 rooms that have windows on the south facing 'pine end' adjacent to the proposed two story development.
- **Insufficient Building Plot Size** - We do not believe that the plot is suitable for the development proposed and it will not provide sufficient open space around the proposed dwelling. (Please also see point of note re: sighting of septic tank and the restricted access for emptying same at 'Utilities / Services Accessibility' as previously outlined above).
- **Tandem Building** — We believe that the proposed application will constitute a tandem development that will have an adverse impact on both Primrose and Pear Tree cottages and to the surrounding area (properties, amenities and highway).
- **Adverse impact on the amenity of the area** - The site should be preserved as open space back-land, and any infilling would be out of character and out of keeping with the rural village. Accordingly any such development would significantly harm the visual and environmental amenity of the area, including important gaps, vistas, frontages and open spaces. There would also be

significant harm to the relationship of the area to adjacent or linked green areas, which add to the character of the locality and or relieve the monotony of the built form, including loss of trees and other natural features.

In addition to the planning objections we have raised above we should be grateful if the following general observations on the decision process could be taken into account.

Loss of mature trees and ecology — The land has a number of mature trees which would have to be felled. There are also various plants, hedgerows and undergrowth, that are home to small animals and bats, all of which should be protected.

Committee Decision - Given the level of local objection it is important that individuals are given the opportunity of making oral representations to the Planning Committee either personally or through the local ward member. Accordingly we request that the application should not be determined by officers under delegated powers, but should be determined by Committee. As such we respectfully request that the same be determined by Planning Committee.

Site Visit - Given a number of the objections relate to the physical restraints of the site in accommodating the proposed development, as well as the adverse highways and amenity impacts, a site visit of the Planning Committee will be essential for it to have a real feel for the issues first hand before any determination. As such we respectfully request that the Planning Committee carry out a site visit to determine same.

Conclusion: It is our belief that the proposed development would constitute an unacceptable form of backland development, which would result in unacceptable harm to the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings. Furthermore the proposed development would be detrimental to highway safety, by virtue of the intensification of use of the existing substandard access and the likely conflicts between pedestrians, and vehicular traffic due to the presence of a public footpath that runs adjacent to the site. Together with those objections raised herein, we believe that there are a number of other objections and reasons that may be raised, and hope that the written recommendations by officers' within the forthcoming report to Committee will be that of refusal.

Yours sincerely

Philip Handley

Mr & Mrs. P. J. Handley