|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mr S.D. Butler, Planning Officer, The Vale of Glamorgan Council, Docks Offices,Barry Docks, Barry CF63 4RT | Councillor Michael Garland and Mrs Lorraine Garland3 Plover Way,Lavernock Park,LavernockCF64 5FU |
|  |  | 4th July 2016 |
| Ref: Planning Application: | 2015/00843/FUL |
| Sully Sports and Social Club, South Road, Sully |
| Hybrid application proposing development of Sully Sports and Social Club, including demolition of existing clubhouse and buildings and construction of new clubhouse, three. grassed pitches, one. all-weather pitch, floodlights, new bowling green, local retail building, touring caravan site and building, car parking and associated engineering, access and landscaping works (full detail) and proposals for construction of up to 200 dwellings, with associated parking, engineering, access, play space and landscaping works (outline detail). |
|  |  |
| Dear Sir,Following the submission of amended plans and documentation by St Modwen/Sully Sports and Social Club in regard to this Planning Application, we are re-submitting our objections.We wish to object to the above Planning Application for the following reasons. |
| 1. | The application site sits outside of the defined settlement boundary of Sully, and lies on the boundary of the rural hamlet of Swanbridge, and as such falls within the open countryside for the purposes of the adopted Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011.The erection of dwellings in the countryside and within rural villages will not be permitted. If the countryside is to remain undeveloped and its attractive appearance protected, new residential development outside these settlements should be strictly controlled.Within the submitted documents, there is no justification provided for the buildings in terms of their requirement for either agriculture, forestry or any supporting rural enterprise and also it would not amount to the re-use of adaptation of an existing building to assist the rural economy.The proposed developments do not protect the area's unique natural countryside environment and would therefore have an unacceptable impact on the countryside. |
| 2. | The site lies within a region of the sensitive East Vale Coast and forms part of the ‘undeveloped coast’ and any development here (including the array of floodlights, grandstand and mesh screening) would be visually intrusive to the coastal scene.  |
| 3. | The proposal would result in the loss of a significant area of open space which contributes to the appearance and setting of the locality, and would lead to a significant increase of the deficit of ‘open space’ within the community. |
| 4. | The proposed development will provide coalescence between the village of Sully and the rural hamlet of Swanbridge and to Penarth, which should not be permitted. |
| 5. | There are ‘protected species’ living on this site, such as red and amber listed birds, bats and slow-worms, etc, that currently live on the site. The proposal would have an adverse effect on the natural environment and would not protect, conserve or enhance biodiversity in the area.  |
| 6. | The proposal will have an adverse effect on drainage and sewage in the area with the Cog Moors Waste Treatm.ent Works already working at over 100% capacity. Not forgetting that there are also development proposals for 500/650 houses at Cog and 235 houses at Cosmeston/Lavernock. |
| 7. | Traffic generation from the site (housing, retail, sports, caravan site, car boot sales, etc), will also have a significant adverse effect not just on the immediate area but on the surrounding towns and villages, especially on the B4267 corridor through to Penarth, and, the Merrie Harrier, Baron’s Court and Cogan junctions.Subsequent traffic emissions will not only impact on public health but will have environmental implications too.The Transport Assessment Analysis carried out by the developer would appear to be unsound, as it was only carried out on one day and at an ‘off-peak’ time, and therefore background traffic flows shown are considerably lower than normal. They have also not taken into account traffic growth in the area from the proposed developments in the surrounding area which will also have an adverse effect on the highway infrastructure. |
| 8. | Employment opportunities in the locality are limited. Sully is currently a commuter village and whilst there are bus services along the B4267 they are fairly irregular, while the nearest railway stations at Barry and Penarth are also some considerable distance away, and, therefore reliance on the car will again be inevitable.  |
| 9. | Due to close proximity of the proposed car parking facilities, sports fields and floodlighting, etc, to Beach Road, there will be an adverse effect from traffic pollution, noise pollution and light pollution (overspill from floodlighting) to the residents of properties in Swanbridge that are adjacent to this area.There will also be and adverse impact on the character of the locality, including its visual amenity, or on features of nature conservation importance. |
| 10. | In consideration of the emerging Local Development Plan:- |
|  | i | There is no allocation for housing at Sully Sports Fields in the LDP. |
|  | ii | The proposed development is outside the settlement boundary of Sully, and as such any proposed development could not be said to be ‘sensitive rounding off or ‘infilling of’ the settlement boundary. |
|  | iii | The site lies within the countryside and ‘undeveloped coast’ location.  |
|  | iv | The site lies within and area of a proposed ‘Green Wedge’ MG18(6) Sully to Lower Penarth in order:-.a) To protect undeveloped land from speculative developmentb) To prevent urban coalescence between and within settlements. c) To maintain the setting of built up areas, andd) To ensure that development does not prejudice the open nature of the land.The proposed development is contrary to this policy. |
|  | v | The proposed development does not protect, enhance the built, natural, and coastal environment and is therefore contrary to Policy SP 1 (6) in the LDP. |
|  | vi | The proposed new development will impose undue pressure on schools, community facilities and health facilities and therefore contrary to Objective 5 of the section Vision And Objectives (LDP).  |
| 11. | i | A previous planning application on this site 1991/01212/FUL was rejected by the Local Authority for the following reasons;-1. Unacceptably damage the amenity of the landscape and coastal frontage.
2. Extend the residential limits of Sully towards Penarth creating urban sprawl and thereby setting a precedent for undesirable development in the countryside and unreasonably damaging the sensitive landscape
3. Would result in a loss of significant area of open space which contributes to the appearance and setting of the locality
4. The site is not allocated for residential development in any Local Plan. Sufficient land has been allocated or approved in the Borough to meet foreseeable requirements.
 |
|  | ii | The above application also failed on Appeal(72/20) to the Welsh Government in 1993 on the grounds of;1. Creating coalescence between Sully and Penarth.
2. Urban sprawl intruding into a designated “countryside conservation area” causing ‘fusion’ between Sully and Swanbridge.
3. The closeness of the clubhouse to nearby houses.
4. The conspicuity of the development due to its closeness to the coastal path.
5. An unnecessary residential development which would be intrusive on the coastal frontage.
 |
| In conclusion, by reason of its siting and surrounding context, and the absence of an agricultural/forestry/rural enterprise justification, the proposal represents an unjustified and unacceptable form of development in the open countryside, which would detract from the site's undeveloped character and rural context, and the wider character of the surrounding countryside and the ‘sensitive’ East Vale Coast. It would extend the residential limits of Sully towards Penarth contributing to urban sprawl and set a precedent of unacceptable development in the countryside and undeveloped coastal zone, resulting in a loss of open space and recreational areas, and damage the sensitive amenity landscape and biodiversity of the locality.The development is therefore contrary to Policies ENV1 - Development in the Countryside, ENV6 – East Vale Coast, ENV10 - Conservation of the Countryside, ENV11 - Protection of Landscape Features, ENV27 - Design of New Developments, HOUS3 - Dwellings in the Countryside, and Strategic Policies 1 & 2-The Environment of the Vale of Glamorgan Adopted Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011; Supplementary Planning Guidance on Sustainable Development-; and national guidance contained in Planning Policy Wales (edition 7, 2014), TAN6-Planning for Sustainable Communities,TAN12-Design and TAN 16-Sport Recreation and Open Space. The application should therefore be rejected. |
|  |  |

Yours Faithfully

Councillor Michael Garland and Mrs Lorraine Garland