Mr C Williams
1 Winsford Road
Sully
Penarth
Vale of Glamorgan
CF64 5SA

Mr S D Butler
Vale of Glamorgan Council
Dock Office
Barry Docks
Barry
CF63 4RT

RECEIVED

1 4 JUL 2016

Regeneration and Planning

	The second secon
D.E.E.R	
RECEIVED	
ACTION BY:	
NO:	
ACK:	

5 July 2016

## **OBJECTION**

PLANNING APPLICATION 2015/00843/FUL.
SULLY SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB, SOUTH ROAD

I most strongly object to this whole planning application for the reasons listed below:

## 1. LDP Policy MG18(6).

Sully Sports Field is clearly on the edge of the village, and this development by its very nature blurs the boundary between the boundary of the village and the countryside, and approval of this application could lead to the incremental loss of open land an ultimately could be the first step toward a joining of Sully and Lavernock. This scheme would almost certainly have a detrimental impact on the landscape, playing fields and the overall amenity available to the villagers.

## 2. LDP Policy MG24 (2)

This policy states that the special environmental qualities of the Glamorgan coast <u>must</u> be preserved and enhanced. Approving a development of this nature

would be a direct contravention of this policy. The policy states that development should only be allowed if it is deemed necessary for agriculture, nature conservation, low impact tourism or coastal access. There is nothing within this HYBRID application that meets any of these conditions.

## 3. Highways and Road Safety

Traffic surveys included within the application do not fully represent the entirety of the housing developments within the locality. The analysis only included 350 units (not the potential 500) at the proposed residential site at Cog. They also do not include the development on Cross Common Lane, Dinas Powys. So the overall assessment is already flawed and a proper analysis considering the total of all the proposed housing developments should be undertaken to arrive at a realistic result.

There are no traffic mitigation measures included within the proposal. This lack of mitigation gives the impression that the existing junctions onto South Road around this area of Sully operate satisfactorily. This is currently certainly not the case and with the increased volume of traffic that would arise if this development was to be approved traffic mitigation measures would definitely be required.

4. The draft LDP includes the section VISION AND OBJECTIVES and objective 5 states that the Local Authority will support the retention of community facilities and services and seek to ensure that any new development, particularly housing does **NOT** impose undue pressure on schools, community facilities and health facilities.

It is difficult to see how 200 houses in addition to the 350 /500 already proposed at land west of Swanbridge Road and another 235 at Cosmeston would **NOT** impose undue pressure on schools, community facilities and health facilities within the village.

5. LDP Strategy - Policy SP1 states that it will protect, enhance the built, natural, and coastal environment - if the Council really is fully committed to this strategy then this application must surely be rejected.

1 4 JUL 2016

Regeneration and Planning

6. The Sully Sports and Social Club site has been subject to planning applications in the past most notably in 1993. The application then was refused by the Local Authority and was further rejected at an appeal. The same reasons for the refusal of a similar proposal remain equally relevant now, even more so given the increase in traffic volumes as the traffic in the last 23 years since 1993.

For all the above reasons I most strongly object to this entire application and urge that it be completely rejected.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Yours sincerely

Mr C Williams

RECEIVED

1 4 JUL 2016

Regeneration and Planning