

Head of Planning and Transportation | DEVELOPMENT CONTROL.

The Dock Office

Barry Dock

Barry CF63 4RT

D.E.E.R
RECEIVED
ACTION BY: SDB / YF
NO: 5.
ACK:

RECEIVED
19 JUL 2017
Regeneration and Planning

Planning Application 2017/00541/FUL

I am totally against the Planning Application as previously along with many other residents and neighbours in Paget Place. The supposed new application is worse than the previous one and it has seemed timed to be produced when there are now new councillors which I hope will be advised by the previous older councillors. They are hoping to hood wink the new ones that this development is viable.

The previous vote to the shareholders of Northcliffe was unfair as it would only affect the Dyfed end and still they think they can offer compensation.

The contributory roads out of Penarth are already congested since the development of Penarth Heights. To build a further 30 flats would mean another 30 to 50 more cars using the same congested roads. The existing bus service only runs Monday to Saturday between 08 30 and 1800 one every hour and not always on time due to congestion.

The local catchment area for Schools are already over subscribed.

In order for this to go ahead they want to build an entrance/exit road from Northcliffe Lodge via Dyfed end of Northcliffe estate on to Paget Place. I vehemently oppose to building yet another entrance/exit onto Paget Place where there is already three access roads within 200 yards and there are two bus stops where they intend the road to exit. There is a severe bend by Headlands School which bears down on to Northcliffe entrance and twice daily taxis that deliver the children block the road as far down as Mariners Heights there has been accidents here and near misses as people try to move around the bend using opposite side of the road. Another exit would be sheer lunacy and another accident waiting to happen.

For this development to go ahead would mean the destruction of trees which would increase the already instability of the ground. Their destruction would remove stability given by their roots which in turn would make the land more open to water build up and soil erosion. The water runoff from this could undermine the present fragile structure of the foundation of the cliff erosion and adding to the already existing instability of the ground due to previous landslips at the Dyfed end of Northcliffe Estate and there is significant continuous erosion at the point where Northcliffe Lodge and Northcliffe Estate adjoin.

The Tree survey undertaken by Treescene Ltd has mistakenly categorised many trees as "Category C" another independent survey seems to have been dismissed and or another one been used for and unbiased survey. There have been many sink holes found on the Northcliffe Estate in the Car Parking areas further investigation is needed.

The development would have a negative impact on the existing wildlife there is a colony of breeding Bats in these trees and they are protected species. I do not understand that the Ecologist report states there are no bat presence when Two councillors have seen this with their own eyes plus many of Dyfed Residents can back this up on a nightly basis. Why has this information been ignored. There are also nesting Jays ,Swallows and Owls.

The Box like flats are ugly and do not fall in line with the coastal view of "Bear Head Penarth" they would be obtrusive.

Also there is no mention of affordable housing as in the report put forward by Liz Burnett this has also seems to have been ignored even the S106 contributions would place a burden on the council and tax payers.

I do hope that the new councillors will look thoroughly into this and not get bullied into agreeing with the developers. Please see all supporting paperwork.

Yours Sincerely



MRS R H DAVIES

1 DYFED

Subject: 2015/01449/FUL Northcliffe Lodge, Northcliffe Drive, Penarth

Victoria,

I would be grateful if my objection to the proposed development could be forwarded to the relevant officer for consideration at Planning Committee on the 5th.

2015/01449/FUL Northcliffe Lodge, Northcliffe Drive, Penarth

Having publicly supported local residents in their opposition to this development since 2014 and before being a member of the Planning Committee I am not able to confirm impartiality and will therefore be unable to participate in the committee discussions or decision.

I have a number of major concerns in relation to this application. Material considerations would echo those expressed by Penarth Town Council, that it is an over dominant form of development that could threaten the future of the listed buildings, Custom House and Marine Building and have a damaging impact on the local bat population and a large number of mature trees.

I was surprised that the ecology report down-plays the level of bat activity in the area. Having stood on a balcony in the Northcliffe, on a number of occasions as bats emerged at dusk, the level of activity was far greater than that experienced at a confirmed summer roost for 30 bats. The suggestion that trees are of poor quality if their life expectancy is of less than 40 years is also questionable. I am specifically concerned that existing parking provision in the Northcliff development appears to be included in the parking allocation for the application. I would therefore ask that the total parking provision on both sites is clarified as the overall deficit in parking may be far higher than indicated

Most planning decisions are made 'on balance' having weighed up a range of factors in relation to planning policy. The report of the planning officer reviews each factor in isolation before coming to an overall recommendation. While respecting the independence and professionalism of the officer I would argue that this application should also be reviewed in its entirety as it is then that it can be seen as an unsustainable development, approval of which would be to the detriment of the town and which appears to contravene the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act.

The proposed development will have a sizeable impact on local facilities and public services. As stated in the planning officer's report the expected S106 contribution for a site of this size to mitigate that impact would be:

- 40% affordable housing on site which equates to 12 dwellings
- Education provision would require the developer to pay a contribution of £299,046.52 towards education facilities.
- Community facilities within the ward require an off-site contribution of £29,655.
- Public Open Space, the Council would usually expect an off-site contribution calculated upon the basis of £2,320 per household not catered for by the Public Open Space delivered on site, equalling £69,600
- Sustainable Transport provision, would usually require a financial contribution which equates to £60,000 to improve sustainable transport provision within the vicinity of the site.

The developer has argued that the economic viability of the development is such that these contributions are not possible and there is a suggestion of only £270,345 for affordable housing which would equate to approximately one house at Penarth property prices and £29,655 for community facilities. I would argue that the deficit in expected S106 contributions places a massive burden on the Local Authority and local Council Tax payers who will be required to fund the deficit in affordable homes and education facilities. Similarly funding would have to

There are occasions when flexibility in S106 contributions is reasonable, for instance when the development is preserving an historic building or when it provides 100% affordable housing. I would argue that this is not the case in this application.

Principles of sustainable development include consideration of social, environmental and economic impact. More recently the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act adds to those the consideration of culture.

As outlined in the submission to the District Valuer this development will deliver economically advantageous outcomes for the developer. Conversely it will have substantial negative social and environmental impact yet fails to provide sufficient mitigation to offset that harm.

I would ask the committee to review the application as a whole and vote for refusal.

Regards

Councillor Lis Burnett MSc FRSA
Penarth Town and Vale of Glamorgan Councillor
St Augustines Ward
Vale of Glamorgan Council / Cyngor Bro Morgannwg

Visit our Website at www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk
Ewch i'n gwefan yn www.bromorgannwg.gov.uk

[Find us on Facebook / Cewch ddod o hyd i ni ar Facebook](#)
[Follow us on Twitter / Dilynwch ni ar Twitter](#)

Correspondence is welcomed in Welsh or English/Croesawir Gohebiaeth yn y Gymraeg neu yn Saesneg.

*Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.
Ystyriwch yr amgylchedd. Peidiwch ag argraffu'r neges hon oni bai fod gwir angen.*

I am writing to you in opposition of the planning application received from Celtic Developments regarding Northcliffe lodge.

As a professionally qualified arborist, and resident of Northcliffe, I have seen first hand the quality of the trees surrounding this area as well as the TPO's attached to a number of trees in this area.

It is of my professional opinion that the tree survey that was undertaken by Treescene Ltd. has mistakenly categorised many trees as

"Category C Those of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm"

However, many of these trees have an expected life expectancy of more than 20 years and of up to 40 years. Many of which are a protected species such as the Yew (*Taxus bachata*) or trees of historical value such as the Oak (*Quercus robur*) and certain fruit trees.

There are over 64 trees and 11 groups of trees in this area, some of which I agree should be removed due to poor health and by doing so will increase the quality and health of the surrounding trees.

I believe that the removal of trees from this site would be detrimental to the ecological, historical and visual value of the land.

I wish to refer you to the official British Standards documents BS3998 for Tree work recommendations and BS5837 for trees in relation to construction recommendations that all professionals in Arboriculture

should adhere to and of which the Vale of Glamorgan should have copies of and should carry out all works in accordance with these British

Standards



**PART THREE PLANNING CHARGE
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971**

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER

RE: Flat 1 Block Dyfed, Northcliffe, Penarth

The property being the subject of the search is affected by the Penarth Urban District Council Tree Preservation Order 1971 as made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1971.

Date of registration 01.04.1974

Report Reference: 34896
August 9, 2004