

9. Highways and traffic congestion. The Report describes highway issues related to site access and internal lay-out (pages 60 to 62). It does not appear to address the critical issue of congestion on the A48 and at Culverhouse Cross, particularly during the peak morning period when there are long tail-backs of stationary or slow-moving vehicles often stretching to the west of Bonvilston. The A48 and the Culverhouse Cross roundabout are already operating over capacity.

In formulating the LDP and determining the site allocation at St Nicholas, the Council very seriously misinformed itself concerning the capacity of the A48. This capacity was calculated at three points between Cowbridge and Culverhouse Cross, all of which are in the national 60 mph speed limit. No account was taken of the 40 mph speed limit from west Bonvilston to west St Nicholas; the 30 mph speed limit through St Nicholas; and the inevitable delays at the traffic lights at Sycamore Cross and Duffryn Lane as well as at other uncontrolled junctions.

The Transport Statements submitted in support of the Application refer only to the extra vehicle movements resulting from the proposed development. Even taken in isolation, these additional vehicles will cause greater congestion. When taken together with other started and proposed developments at Cowbridge, Colwinston, Ystradowen, Bonvilston and the Waterstone site along with traffic increases arising from other projects such as the widening of Five Mile Lane, the congestion on the A48 and at Culverhouse Cross will become unsustainable. The congestion at Culverhouse Cross will be further exacerbated by the current housing construction at ITV and Wenvoe. The Council and, as appropriate, Cardiff City Council and the Welsh Government have no plans to alleviate this unsustainable congestion.

10. Open space. The original proposal by the Applicant was for 79 houses and provided significant areas of open space which, together with the Waterstone application, amounted in total to 0.48 hectares. In the latest proposal now presented for approval by the Committee, most of the open space has been removed in order to cram 100 houses into a densely crowded site. Only a small LEAP area and a tiny LAP area have been provided. The exact size of the LEAP area is not clear from the latest site plan but it appears to be no larger than a garden in some of the existing properties adjacent to the site. It is certainly not large enough for the many children who would reside in the 100 houses to play football or other ball games. There appears to be no explanation in the Report on where the children will find necessary open space for ball games. The availability of the field at St Nicholas School does not appear to have been established and, even if it were available, it would involve the children having to walk or cycle through the narrow and dangerous roads in the centre of the village (item 6 above) to reach the field.

11. Education facilities. The arrangements for education facilities are described on pages 68 & 69 of the Report. The projected demands for 9 nursery, 25 primary and 23 secondary places appear to be substantial under-estimates for a development of 100 houses. There is no nursery in St Nicholas. The Report confirms that there are no available places for primary pupils at St Nicholas School. The Report appears to suggest that most nursery and primary pupils would travel to Peterston-super-Ely or Pendoylan Schools. Both villages are over three miles away by road, most of which is through narrow country lanes which already have more traffic than can be reasonably accommodated. Two double journeys by car would be required each school day for those parents with cars. There is no direct bus service for parents without a car.
12. Principle of development. The conclusion on the principle of development at St Nicholas (pages 47 & 48) relies heavily on background papers produced by the Council in support of the LDP, including the Sustainable Settlements Appraisal, the Stage 2 Detailed Site Assessment and the Stage 3 Sustainability Appraisal. Some of the key assumptions, statistics and conclusions contained in these reports so far as they related to St Nicholas have been strongly challenged in written representations and in the Public Hearings in the LDP process. Until a conclusion has been reached by the Inspector on these issues, no reliance should be placed on the contents of these background papers to the extent that they have been challenged.
13. Inconsistency. Attention is drawn to the attached extract dated 9 January 2016 from the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 17 December 2015 concerning planning application number 2015/00689/OUT by Trehill Homes Limited ("the Trehill Application") relating to land south of the A48 at St Nicholas. The Minute sets out six reasons why the Trehill Application would have been refused. I submit that each of those reasons applies with equal force to the Application. As the Committee has confirmed that the Trehill Application would have been refused, these reasons alone should be sufficient to refuse the Application. The recommendation of the Department for approval of the Application is inconsistent with its recommendation (endorsed by the Committee) on the Trehill Application.

Before any consideration of determination in favour of the Application, I urge the Committee to arrange a site visit. The Committee should consider how the proposed development on green fields would irreversibly destroy the character of this ancient village. The members should also view the narrow roads around the church, if possible around 3.30 pm on a normal school day, and the proposed two access points onto the A48.

The Department argues in the Report that various identified individual issues do not provide adequate grounds for refusal of the Application. However, I have summarised above some of the many strong objections to the Application. Taken together, I submit that they constitute very powerful grounds for refusal of the Application and I request that the Application be refused.

Vale of Glamorgan Council - Redrow Planning Application – 3 October 2016

Please circulate copies of this letter as a late representation to all members of the Committee in advance of the meeting on 6 October 2016.

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of the sender.

**Tim Knowles**

9 January 2016

Vale of Glamorgan Council

Minutes - Planning Committee - 17 December 2015  
Extract

**2015/00689/OUT** Received on 18 June 2015  
(p82)

Trehill Homes Limited, C/o Agent  
Asbri Planning Limited, Unit 9, Oak Tree Court,, Cardiff Gate Business Park,,  
Cardiff., CF23 8RS

**Land south of A48 and west of Old Rectory Drive, St. Nicholas**

Outline application for residential development and associated works

RESOLVED -

(1) T H A T Members of the Planning Committee noted the conclusions within the report and agreed that these form the basis of the Council's case in the current non-determination appeal and that the application would have been refused for the reasons set out below:

1. The proposed residential development is outside the defined settlement boundary of St. Nicholas and there is no overriding justification or material consideration to outweigh the in principle policy presumption against such development. As such the development would be contrary to Policies ENV1 - Development in the Open Countryside and HOUS2 – Additional Residential Development of the adopted Vale of Glamorgan Development Plan 1996, as well as Planning Policy Wales (Edition 7) July 2014.
2. The residential development would have an unacceptable visual impact on the character and amenity of this undeveloped rural landscape and would be harmful to the special qualities of the Duffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes Special Landscape Area in this location. As such the development of this sensitive rural area and landscape would be contrary to Policies ENV4 Special Landscape Areas, ENV27 – Design of New Developments and ENV10 Protection of the Countryside of the adopted Vale of Glamorgan Development Plan 1996 – 2011, as well as Planning Policy Wales (Edition 7) July 2014.
3. The residential development would result in the loss of an area of open countryside that plays an important role in providing a strong rural character and setting to the St Nicholas Conservation Area in this location, over which there are currently significant views from the Conservation Area towards the Severn Estuary. Accordingly, the development is considered to neither preserve nor enhance the setting of the Conservation Area, in conflict with the Council's Adopted Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, policies ENV17 – Protection of the Built and Historic Environment and ENV20 - Development in Conservation Areas of the adopted Vale of Glamorgan Development Plan 1996 – 2011, as well as Planning Policy Wales (Edition 7) July 2014 and W/O Circular 61/96. The development will also conflict with the duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

4. The development would overload the public waste water treatment works for which no improvements are planned at present and the developer has failed to provide any information that indicates that the development will not adversely affect or overload the public sewerage system and as a consequence the development is contrary to Policies ENV27 Design of new developments and ENV29 Protection of Environmental Quality of the Vale of Glamorgan Adopted Unitary development Plan 1996-2011.
5. In the event that the evidence establishes that the grade of the agricultural land is grade 2 or 3a, the development would result in the unnecessary loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land, contrary to policy ENV2 – Agricultural Land of the Vale of Glamorgan Adopted Unitary development Plan 1996-2011, Planning Policy Wales (Edition 7) July 2014 and Technical Advice Note 6 on Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities.
6. The proposed housing development would generate the need for additional school places which cannot be met by existing spare capacity and the development cannot make appropriate provision for education facilities to serve the development through Planning Obligations, without undermining the Council's ability to deliver strategically important development sites within the area. Accordingly, the application is contrary to criterion (vi) of Policy HOUS8 of the Vale of Glamorgan Adopted Unitary development Plan 1996-2011, the Council's approved Planning Obligations SPG and the advice in paragraph 12.1.1 of Planning Policy Wales (7<sup>th</sup> Edition) July 2014.

(2) T H A T, in the event that the appeal decision for the residential development site on land to the south west of Weycock Cross is received prior to the consideration of the appeal subject of this report, Members agreed that the Council's evidence when prepared takes account of that appeal decision and that officers be given delegated authority to amend the Council's stance in respect of the above listed reputed reasons for refusal.

Reason for decision

(2) To ensure the Council's officers take account of all material considerations relevant to the appeal at the time of preparing and giving evidence, that are relevant to the appeal.

**Payne, Adrienne J**

---

**From:** Planning  
**Sent:** 25 September 2016 07:55  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** New comments for application 2015/00249/FUL

RECEIVED
26 SEP 2016
Regeneration and Planning

New comments have been received for application 2015/00249/FUL at site address: Land to the East of St. Nicholas

from Ms mechelle collard [REDACTED]

**Address:**  
2 broadway green st nicholas ,cf5 6sr

**Comments:**  
Removing the bungalow 'Emmaville' would change the character of the village. The construction of 100 houses is completely unacceptable due to the extra traffic this would produce, the nearest supermarket although not a long distance away (approx 2 miles) is down a very steep hill. No One could carry their shopping back up the hill. Therefore all 100 houses would need a car (or 2 cars). This will produce even more traffic coming through the village. At peak times eg 8am the traffic is backed up through Bonvilston to the 5 mile lane junction already, to add another 100 cars at least is irresponsible. There already large urbanisations in the Vale eg Barry and Cowbridge and houses should be built in these towns first where there are the facilities to support new residents. With new houses at Culverhouse cross, Wenvoe and Colwinston already being built it is difficult to understand why another 100 are needed in St Nicholas.

**Case Officer:**  
Mr. Steven Rennie

D.E.E.R
RECEIVED
ACTION BY: <i>SR211R</i>
NO: <i>14</i>
ACK: