

Planning Application Objection Notes: P/DC/SDB/2015/00843/FUL – Sully Sports & 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.

Firstly, I unfortunately missed the consultation meeting on Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> May as I was out of the country. However, I would note that I didn't receive an invitation for this event by post as noted in the 'Statement of Community Involvement Report'. As I was away, I would have asked for a family member to have attended on my behalf, & voiced my concerns.

Either way, I have spent some time reading through the various documents on-line, the 'Statement of Community Involvement Report' in particular, & whereas I think all my concerns have been raised by other residents, I would like to further comment as follows:

1. Schools:

I have 2 young children (4 years & 18 months) & 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 very 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:

Having read the traffic assessment, the conclusion seems to confirm that the current road system is adequate & doesn't require any changes. Reading Transport Document TAN 18 (2007), may I note it states 'Extra traffic generated may bring forward the need for transport improvements in the vicinity & beyond'.

Again, extra car volumes I would expect to be in the region of 400-600 cars, if you assume each household will have 2 or 3 per house. South Road is already very busy, & even any 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 & the McDonalds Roundabout.

School times & car boot sales on a Sunday, are also a model indication of increased traffic volume in Sully, with people parking on residential streets & blocking access to & from South Road. It seems that a survey on a car boot sale Sunday was missed due to the weather. I would suggest Atkins carry out a survey again whilst the car boot sale is on &/or during any underground service repairs, as these are perfect examples of the extra traffic behaviour Sully experiences.

I would note that school & car boot 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/car boot 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. It is simple mathematics that the extra cars will cause an issue, whether traffic assessments have been completed or not.

3. Visual Impact:

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, as well as remove the green field which we regularly use for walking & playing.

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. the residential area behind Lidl which all looks identical).

4. Demographic & Social Rent:

It was interesting to note that there was no 'unemployed' representation at the meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup> May, & 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 56% of the proposal will be earmarked for social rent, it is annoying 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 1<sup>st</sup> hand having moved out of a primarily housing association area, where drug dealers/users & benefit claimers were the majority.

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 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 28<sup>th</sup> May 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.

Mr Andrew Healey

