Serious concerns include:

1. The report into the slope stability documents that there have been recent landslides, there is evidence of ground movement and high risk of further ground movement. The report call for further investigation with monitoring of groundwater levels over a prolonged time. With this winter’s high rainfall and predicted extreme weather patterns in the future, it is essential that these investigations are carried out as a priority. Not only will the cliff have to withstand an additional thirty apartments but also the significant engineering and building works involved in the construction of the apartments. If, as reported, the council is unwilling to undertake this study, it must be aware that liability will rest with the council for any compensatory costs arising from relocation of residents due to cliff instability.

2. I would also query the predicted number of car journeys to and from the apartments into Penarth town. Though distances are within an accepted level, the report fails to consider that there is a very steep hill between the proposed site and the tow, necessitating the use of a car for those who would find difficulty accessing the town by foot. In addition, the traffic report also states that one car space per apartment would be sufficient. However, with most affluent households having more than one car (the target group of this development), the additional cars would spill out on to Paget Place. Also, as residents of Northcliffe Apartments would have a significant area of their car park used in the construction of an access road, they too would need the road to park. This would add to congestion and further limit what has already become difficult and potentially dangerous access through Paget Place. In addition, the condition of the roads around the area is already very poor with pot holes and uneven surfaces. This would be made worse with construction lorries accessing the site and the subsequent higher volumes of traffic.

3. There is a Tree Preservation Order on that site dated 12th October 2015. I can not understand how the developers or council can simply over-ride this order. To remove these mature trees would also affect groundwater levels and destabilise the cliff further.

4. The property developers have stated that given the ‘luxury’ nature of the planned apartments, it would be inappropriate to include a proportion for social housing. Not only is this an outrageous comment to make, I was under the impression that this was a statutory requirement. The developers also note that the flats would be unsuitable for families. How do the developers propose that they could refuse access to families with children? At a time when house building is being targeted at creating more affordable housing and family homes, it seems perverse to be considering a development which would exclude both of these groups. Also, isn’t this area with Penarth Heights, Penarth Marina and the new developments around the Bay, already reaching saturation point with ‘luxury’ apartments.

Thank you for your time and consideration.