Mr Andrew Healey,
39 Winsford Road,
Sully,
Penarth,
CF64 5SB

Tel: [redacted]

Date: 29th June 2016

Planning Department,
Vale of Glamorgan Council,
Dock Office,
Barry,
CF64 4RT

Planning Application Objection Letter: 2015/00843/FUL – Sully Sports & Social Club & 200 houses:

Having reviewed the documents for this application on the Vale of Glamorgan website, I am writing to strongly object to this application for a number of reasons.

I have spent some time reading through the various documents on-line, the initial 'Statement of Community Involvement Report' from May 2015, & various resident's letters in particular, & whereas I think all my concerns have been raised by others, I would like to further comment as follows:

1. Schools:
   I have 2 young children (4 & 2 Years old) & one of the main reasons for moving to Sully, was for the primary school & Stanwell catchment area for secondary education. With these extra 200 houses, I expect there to be an additional say 500+ children requiring school places, & I cannot physically see how Sully Primary school or Stanwell will cope with this extra volume. This is without even considering the Cog Road development aswell I might add.
   The school concern was raised a few times in the report, but appears to have been brushed aside with 'possible funding for a school extension' or 'other arrangements' as answers. This is unacceptably vague, & if funding doesn't become available, what will be the other arrangements? I can only imagine a catchment area change, which will greatly affect where I have chosen to send my children.

2. Traffic & Safety:
   Having read the revised TA Audit by Capita, the conclusion still seems to confirm that the current road system is adequate & doesn't require any changes. I would expect extra car volumes to be in the region of 400-600 cars, if you assume each household will have 2 or 3 per house, which is not uncommon these days.
   It is simple mathematics that extra cars will add further strain to an already busy & dangerous road network, whether a 131 page traffic assessment has been completed or not.

   South Road is a perfect example, & even a minor roadwork crossing with temporary traffic lights, a stopped bus, or a delivery van to the shop/post office causes tailbacks in either direction. There have been several occasions during peak times, where temporary traffic lights for underground service repairs, have caused tailbacks as far as Cosmeston Lakes & to the McDonalds Roundabout.

D.E.E.R
RECEIVED
ACTION BY:
NO:
ACK:

RECEIVED
01 JUL 16
Regeneration
and Planning

School times are a model indication of increased traffic volume in Sully, with people parking on residential streets & blocking access to & from South Road.
I would note that school traffic is only a temporary surge in extra cars for a few hours at a time. The 200 houses would not only increase traffic volumes in excess of school times, but these volumes would remain at a constant.
Even though parking is proposed as part of the new retail part of the application, people will invariably still pull in & park on South Road, as they do now at the shop, if the dedicated parking spaces are full. As noted above, a single parked car can have an immediate effect on the flow of traffic along South Road.
Quoting the Capita Traffic Assessment Conclusion Section 4 '4.1.11: Trip rates & generation are satisfactory'. I'm not sure to whom this extra trip & traffic volume generation are satisfactory to?

Conclusion Section 4 of the Capita Traffic Assessment notes '4.1.6: TA accident analysis shows that there are no issues involving the design of the highway, & collisions have been predominantly down to driver error'.
I am currently on the Sully residents emailing list, & there are weekly messages highlighting near misses on South Road at the pedestrian crossings when cars fail to stop, & excessive speeding. I regularly walk my son to school, & even as things are currently, I don't feel 100% safe walking on the pavements along South Road. I typically turn off down Clevedon Avenue, & to walk to the school along Smithies Avenue which is much quieter. The excess traffic that will be generated on South Road, is surely just going to increase the odds of a serious accident occurring soon.

3. <u>Visual Impact:</u>
Another reason for moving to Sully was for the community & quiet village character. The proposed location of the houses will have a huge visual impact & disturb sea views, aswell as remove the green field which we regularly use for walking & playing. The fields are also a great place for family events such as fetes, football tournaments, car shows etc, which will be lost if this application goes ahead.
I understand that conditions & circumstances for planning have changed since the 92-93 planning application refusal, but the reasons for the objections surely still stand? (1991/01212/OUT: Damage to landscape & setting of the village; loss of open space; contributing to urban sprawl).
Other points which I think also support another refusal include:
   - that this plot of land isn't included in the Draft LDP
   - is located outside the settlement boundary
   - is against PPW's requirement to LPA's to 'search for previously developed land', which this plot is clearly not.
   - I also refer you to Policy MD5 in the supporting application documents: 'Re-use previously developed land & prevent spread into open countryside'.

Sully also seems to be lucky in the fact that every property is reasonably unique, & this will be ruined by the addition of 200 mass produced houses, albeit with the 3 or 4 slightly differing styles that these large developments offer. (E.g. Pencoedtre Village by Lidl).

RECEIVED
Regeneration and Planning

4. Demographic & Social Rent:
   It was interesting to note that there was no 'unemployed' representation at the Resident's meeting on the 12th May 2015, & I think this shows that Sully is primarily an employed &/or retired community. I imagine like my Wife & I, people have worked very hard to be able to afford to move to Sully, & knowing that approx 56No houses of the proposal will be earmarked for social rent, it is infuriating that potentially 'unwilling to work individuals' may effectively be 'given' a brand new house with sea views, & a 5 minute walk to the Captain's Wife & new social club bar. I may be over reacting a little & I know not everyone in social housing is guilty, but I have witnessed this 1st hand having moved out of a primarily housing association area, where drug dealers/users & benefit claimers were the majority.
   I would expect household refuse to become an issue as time goes on, as very little pride of ownership seems to come hand in hand with some social renters. I imagine the beach & coastline will slowly become awash with empty cans & rubbish.
   I would hate to see the area become degraded, which would eventually lead to existing house prices dropping – & although this isn't apparently a 'material planning consideration', it should not be overlooked & brushed aside.

5. Construction Period:
   One document supporting the application, indicates that construction will take approx 7 years! Whereas I understand H&S & Environmental Impact will be kept to a minimum, the age old issue of traffic volumes during this period will affect the village. One set of temporary traffic lights at present causes significant tailbacks – every day for 7 years will be intolerable & affect people's commutes to/from work & school.

In Summary:

Whereas I agree that the social club needs attention to prevent it being lost altogether, & the caravan site & retail would be beneficial to the economy of Sully, I am dead against the housing side of this proposal as I have stated above. If the main aim of the scheme is to enhance & revive the Sully Sports & Social Club, do so, but without the housing.

I understand that the housing side of the scheme is aimed to help fund the club regeneration, but Sully will not be the same place if the houses are approved. There was a Saving Sully Group meeting on Thursday 28th May 2015 which my Wife attended, & there appeared to be a general consensus that if each household in Sully were to contribute a small amount each, this may help revive the existing club. Has this avenue been approached, or has an alternative source of funding been looked into to improve the club in isolation from this application?

I hope some of my comments can be taken on board & considered in the decision making process.

[redacted]
Civil Engineer (BEng HONS)

RECEIVED
Regenerati
and Plannin

D.E.E.
RECEI
ACTIO
NO:
ACK