**Planning Application: 2017/00541/FUL**

Further to my objection regarding the previous application and as a close resident to the proposed site I wish to register the strongest objection to the proposed plans.

As follows:

Cliff Stability – Terrafirma Report

The letter of amendment from LRM Planning Ltd for the Developer discussed the viability appraisal stating that the site is ‘challenging’ and given the instability of the cliff in the immediate area this is understandable. The Council will no doubt consider the recent deterioration of the area around the Old Billiard Room, close to the site, after the fall there in April 2016 which is leading to concerns for public safety. Given that the developer’s ‘desk report’ produced by Terrafirma highlights the ‘large scale historical failure in the slope previously obstructed by vegetation’ and the indication of evidence of ground movement with **a high risk of subsidence** the question of has to be asked whether the Council would be liable for making good any resulting further cliff falls /public liability or whether these would be passed to the developer?

As a property owner living above the bank close to the proposed development, I am extremely concerned that the proposed plans are not addressing the very real issues presented.

Site Access

Northcliffe Drive, which is a private road, features an extremely narrow lane that leads to the current property on the proposed site. While this is not identified as the main route proposed to the site, unless this route is blocked off there is the potential for an unacceptable level of traffic using the lane. As this is road is privately owned by the residents of Vista Court flats, it is unsupported by the local authority and maintenance is paid for by the residents of Vista Court. Unless access was blocked off, it is also likely that pedestrians would use this route, which would impact on issues such as litter and noise as well as security for residents in Vista Court.

Road Safety

The main access via Paget Place would also present issues. The current situation regarding parking is not good. There appears to be insufficient parking in Mariner’s Heights and Northcliffe flats and this has resulted in parking on Paget Place throughout the day. This is added to during the summer when people visit the barrage and leave their cars up above in Paget Place often parking so that a clear view of the road is impossible when trying to enter it.

Plans identify 30 spaces for residents and six more for visitors. With plans for 2/3 bedroom flats, it is highly likely that most residents will own more than one car, but no provision is made for this. Also, unless the residents in the new development are all retired, it is highly unlikely that just 15 cars would be leaving at rush hour rather than the majority.

I notice that the Transport report conveniently omitted any safety aspects regarding the nearby Headlands School. The survey considered the situation during rush hour in the morning, but failed to identify the current problem near the school where through traffic is usually down to single file due to double parking both sides of the road by taxis and buses dropping children off - and as there is a bend in this part of the road this is particularly dangerous.

Environmental Issues

As mentioned previously the recommended ‘Ecology Report’ is still outstanding and so my concerns remain as follows:-

The environmental survey is not reliable given that it was undertaken late October when the many butterflies and dragonflies and other summer creatures that I see in the area have already disappeared.

The ecological assessment states the ‘loss of all, or nearly all habitats’. As a close resident I know that there are different species of resident owl on the site; and with the planned loss of the habitat one must consider where they will go. A large number of trees were felled above Penarth Marina close by the site last year; and there appears to be insufficient regard to the habitat of birds in this particular area.

The plans include felling around 38 trees and replacing the ‘loss of protected trees by new’ but ‘mostly on the periphery’. One of the trees (T40) is shown as being healthy and having up to 40 years life left, but it is to be felled. The replacement trees (around the edges) will be small saplings for some time to come and will not be a suitable replacement habitat for the many wild birds in the area.

In conclusion, while the environmental report states that at 0.91 ha the scale of the development is not considered significant, I would suggest that in the event of a landslip as identified in the geological report, the effect on the surrounding environment and anyone in that proximity would be very great indeed.

Loss of natural views

In addition to the points above, the previous application was unsuccessful on the grounds that the buildings would detract from the Victorian buildings below it and would not be in keeping with the area. This very valid point must be taken into consideration by the Planning Department this time around.