



LRM Planning Limited
22 Cathedral Road
Cardiff
CF11 9LJ

T: 02920 349737

Date: 30th August 2017
Our Ref: SH/17.127

Stephen Butler
Principal Planner
Regeneration and Planning
Vale of Glamorgan Council
Dock Office
Barry Docks
Barry
CF63 4RT

Dear Steve,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Land off Cardiff Road/Cross Common Road, Dinas Powys
Approval of all matters reserved including Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale
attached to the Outline Permission (Ref: 2015/00392/OUT)
Application No. 2017/00746/RES

I refer to the above, our recent meeting and various consultation responses received to date. Herein, we provide responses and additional/revised information further to the comments received to date. These are covered under appropriate headings as follows and should be self-explanatory.

Layout changes

Further to the meeting held at your offices on Thursday 3rd August, various changes have been made to the layout in light of your comments. These are summarised as follows:

- A new house type and configuration at Plot 29 such that the dwelling overlooks the public open space (POS). This has also included a reconfiguration of the south-eastern boundary to the POS, such that it is less heavily engineering and a little more natural.
- Similarly, there is now a new housetype at plot 47, which better relates to the POS.
- Reconfiguration of head of access road (adjacent to plots 34-39 to provide 'square' and contrasting surfacing to the road. Part of this road, from the POS onwards, has been minimally realigned, such that it is slightly further north.
- Above amendment means plot 34's parking provision must now take the form of a single garage rather than a double garage.
- Car ports proposed to plots 11-13; 15-17; and 47-49.
- Plots 11-18 amended from two shorts terraces and a pair of semi-detached units, to two terraces of four.
- Indicative visitor car parking shown adjacent to old bridge across Cross Common Road.

- Car parking arrangements for plots 21 and 22 revised – reallocation of car parking and replacement of double garage with single to assist with vehicular manoeuvring.
- In line with the above, the house types have been amended a little, such that there is now one fewer Bonvilston unit; two additional Tenbury units; two fewer Bamfords; and one additional Burlington (new house type for this scheme); and the '4 bed' affordable unit replaced by an Idris housetype (also new to the scheme). These changes affect plots 29, 45, 46 and 47.

Highways

It is pleasing to note that the Highways Officer does not offer any objection, but equally it is understood that certain changes are required to make the scheme acceptable from a highways perspective.

Accordingly, in line with the annotated plan provided by the Highways Officer, and further to conversations between the developer and the Highways Officer, the following changes have been made. It should be noted that there is some replication to the changes outlined above, which we considered necessary such that under any re-consultation, the extent of changes are clear to all departments/officers.

Lee Howells' comment	Developer Response
<i>Parking numbers based on bedroom no's to be provided. Inclusive of visitor element and size of bays</i>	Please see the Planning Layout which shows the bay numbers. For the visitor element, we had over provided for this on the southern portion of the site however we note that the old bridge is now closed so we have drawn on the layout for a possible two extra visitor spaces which we could formalise here. The size of the bays are all 2.6m x 5.0m, which conforms with the VoG standard.
<i>No onsite turning facility for rigid vehicles</i>	The current width of the area is 6m wide which is sufficient for cars. Rigid vehicles would either need to reverse into the driveway or could use the proposed visitor spaces above. There is insufficient space to widen the shared drive without losing garden area.
<i>Parking/access issues site + Hebron Hall</i>	We note your comments regarding the TROs and update our layout to show these.
<i>Front access to plots 9 and 21</i>	We note your concerns about parking on Cross Common Road and would agree to remove the front access but as we are proposing to implement the TRO'. Amending the plots to move the front access paths would have an adverse effect on the street scene. We therefore propose to implement the TRO but retain the front access paths.



<i>Turning facility for plots 21/22</i>	We have reduced one of the double garages to a single garage which provides adequate space for a panel van to turn around.
<i>Carriage way width to be 2m/5.5m/2m</i>	Noted. The carriageway complies
<i>Increase deviation/horizontal alignment of road</i>	Amending the highway to have the horizontal feature required would have an adverse effect on the layout. We therefore propose to make changes to the vertical alignment in the form of raised area as shown on the layout.
<i>Blockwork note required</i>	Noted but as we have introduced a raised table we felt that retaining the block paving would further help with the previous comment.
<i>Narrowing width 2m/4.5m/2m</i>	We have widened the carriageway from 4.0 to 4.5m however we do not feel that the 2m footpath on both sides is required and would take up space which is currently being provided as POS. You will note from the Edenstone Homes site at Aberthin that a 1m/4.8m/2m carriageway has been accepted, so we trust this is acceptable here.
<i>Forward visibility splays</i>	Please see the engineering drawings by Phoenix Design.
<i>Garage/driveway plots 34 to be adjusted</i>	Please see revised layouts.
<i>Shared surface area with squares</i>	Following discussion with James Kathrens (Edenstone Homes) we have updated the plan to show a square in front of plots 34/35. The entire area will be block paved with bull nose kerbs not sets. This is reflected on the revised plans and the Highway construction details previously submitted
<i>Vision splay for pedestrian/cycleway facility</i>	Vision splay added, which requires the cutting back of minimal trees/hedge.
<i>Parking for plots 11-18 needs to be split. Max 5 then gap of 1 bay width for planning and landscaping</i>	There is insufficient space to provide the full parking provision and landscaping widths required. we therefore propose to use a Carport design which limits the number of continuous parking bays to a maximum of four in succession, which we believe will address this concern

The above amendments are shown through the revised plans submitted herein, which are listed at the foot of this letter.



Ecology

The holding objection from the Authority's Ecologist is noted, but it is considered that the concerns raised are in the process of being address through the provision of additional reporting and survey work by Celtic Ecology. Accordingly, additional information on dormice and bats will be submitted forthwith.

South Wales Police Design Out Crime Officer ('DOCO')

We are glad to note that the DOCO does not offer any objection, but consider it pertinent to briefly address the comments raised, as follows:

	Design Out Crime Officer comment	Development team response
1	<i>"All rear gardens should be secure by 1.8m min fencing, walling and gating (2.1m where boundary is with Public Open Space (POS) reason to prevent burglary and theft."</i>	All separating fences are 1.8m on all sides. The social housing plots all have 2.1m high fences in this instance as per Secured By Design ('SBD') standards.
2	<i>"All main entrance doors should comply with PAS24 standards reason to prevent burglary."</i>	All units will be provided with SBD standard doors.
3	<i>"All ground floor windows should comply with PAS24 standards. Reason: to prevent burglary."</i>	As point 2, above.
4	<i>"There should be a scheme of work submitted to authority for approval in terms of lighting. Reason: to prevent crime and enhance safety."</i>	The lighting design has yet to be undertaken but the proposals will detail the lighting of the adoptable highway through the site (shown on the Section 38 drawing (ref. 10157-S38) submitted with the application). All other areas will be unlit but all plots will have PIR to the front and the garages. All houses will also have PIR lights to the rear.
5	<i>"Service meters should be fitted close to front elevations in accessible places. Reason: to prevent distraction type crime."</i>	All meters will be located either to the side or front of the property on driveways.
6	<i>"Public Open Space area is poorly designed as it is not well overlooked from housing and as such would not create a safe area for children to play in unsupervised. Reason: public open space should be over looked to provide guardianship and enhance personal safety. "</i>	Please see the revised layout which now features plots fronting directly onto the POS.
7	<i>"South Wales Police recommend all developments are built to Secured by Design (SBD) standards as this has been shown to reduce crime risks by up to 75% further information can be found on www.securedbydesign.com"</i>	Noted. All social housing units will meet SBD standards, whilst private sale units will meet the vast majority of SBD requirements and will all conform to Building Regulations standards.



Dinas Powys Community Council

It is noted that Dinas Powys Community Council objects to the application for various reasons. The first matter to make clear is that the principle of the development, and indeed the quantum and the primary access arrangements are all established and agreed by virtue of the granting of outline planning consent. This immediately makes some of the objection comments from the Community Council null and void. The specific issues raised are addressed in turn here, alongside our comments by response.

	Community Council comment	Development team response
1	<i>"The Cross Common Road / Cardiff Road junction is inadequate. The poor vision splay from the Barry direction is unsatisfactory."</i>	Dealt with and agreed under outline consent, and specific application to improve access under reference 2015/00928/RG3.
2	<i>"The Murch Road / Cardiff Road / Millbrook Road junction will need improvement to cope with additional traffic. We refer to the adopted LDP which indicates that this junction will be at or over capacity as a result of the LDP."</i>	This junction is remote from the site so it is not incumbent upon the developer to resolve any perceived problems associated with it. Notwithstanding that, the s106 agreement will result in a pool of £100,000 that will be put towards Sustainable Transport services, the specific spending of which is at the discretion of the Local Authority. Furthermore, condition 14 of the outline consent requires approval of a Travel Plan, which has been prepared and will be submitted imminently as a separate application.
3	<i>"The Pen-y-Turnpike Road / Leckwith Road junction will need improvement to cope with additional traffic. We refer to the adopted LDP which indicates that this junction will be at or over capacity as a result of the LDP."</i>	As point 2, above.
4	<i>"The Merry Harrier junction is already at capacity. We refer to the adopted LDP which indicates that this junction will be at or over capacity as a result of the LDP."</i>	As point 2, above.
5	<i>"This proposal is premature. No further substantial development should proceed until the Dinas Powys by Pass is constructed due to the inadequate nature of the A4055 and local roads."</i>	As points 1 and 2, above.
6	<i>"We are also concerned that this development will provide additional undue pressure on parking in an area where there are already significant problems since the development of the new junction. The provision of access into the housing development from Cross Common</i>	The submitted layout provides car parking to all dwellings on site in accordance with the adopted Local Authority parking standards of one space per bedroom per property (up to a maximum of three per dwelling). Visitor car parking can be absorbed on the estate roads,



	<i>Road will further reduce the amount of parking available to residents and generate further problems for coaches and large vehicles accessing the facilities at Hebron Hall."</i>	<p>which are designed to accommodate incidental additional parking. This is shown indicatively on the site layout drawing.</p> <p>In addition, the developer is willing to provide restricted parking through double yellow lines along the site entrance (adjacent to new junction and in area near to Hebron Hall), as agreed with the Local Authority Highways Officer. Details of the extent of this can be provided, if the Authority requires.</p>
7	<i>"We request that...additional parking provision is provided to compensate for the loss of on road parking for properties on Cross Common Road."</i>	As point 6, above.
8	<i>"We request that...access for larger vehicles to Hebron Hall will be improved / not compromised."</i>	The new junction arrangement, as constructed by the Local Authority, will have been designed to be used by larger vehicles, in accordance with accepted standards. No further work is planned to the Hebron Hall access, which is outside of the site boundary, accordingly it will not be compromised. It is also considered that the introduction of parking restrictions, as address at point 6, above, will assist in ensuring no adverse impact to this junction.
9	<p><i>"If the application is approved, we also request that the following comments are taken into account:</i></p> <p><i>Danger of flooding – the area is too close to the flood plain. There is only room for 40% of runoff water from the proposed development</i></p>	We are not clear where this figure of 40% has been derived from, but again, the issue of flooding has been assessed and agreed through the outline application. Though it is recognised that the land to the west of the site is in the floodplain, the site itself is in Flood Zone A, i.e. that considered not to be at risk of flooding. The drainage strategy for the site is controlled by condition 6 of the outline consent. The drainage design has been advanced by the development team and seeks to allow for a 1 in 100-year flood event, in accordance with relevant legislation.
10	<p><i>"If the application is approved, we also request that the following comments are taken into account:</i></p> <p><i>Housing is too close the A4055 with its huge queues of traffic at peak times resulting in a build-up of toxic gases."</i></p>	Development adjacent to a highway is an accepted norm, and the Authority did not consider Air Quality Assessment to be required under the outline consent, where such an issue would have been considered and, if required, addressed. Noise surveys have been produced relating to this relationship with the highway and appropriate mitigation is proposed.



11	<i>"If the application is approved, we also request that the following comments are taken into account: See figures of November 2014 traffic count."</i>	This can be made available if required.
-----------	--	---

Revised Plans

As set out above, the changes have resulted in a series of revisions to the previously submitted drawings. The latest drawings are listed here. You will note that the majority of these are new plans, with a small number of plans remaining unaltered and two having been superseded. It is hoped that this table will assist you in maintaining a list of the current plans for consideration. We also include the Drawing Register to aid in this process.

Drawing number	Drawing name	New version submitted (yes, unless indicated otherwise)
1628 100 rev.A	Planning Layout – Full Colour	
1628 100 rev.A	Planning Layout – No Colour	
1628 101	Red Line Plan	No
1628 102 rev.A	Storey Heights Layout	
1628 103 rev.A	Materials Layout	
1628 104 rev.A	Enclosure Layout	
1628 105 rev.A	Affordable Layout	
1628 106 rev.A	Street Scenes – Sheet 1	
1628 107 rev.A	Refuse & Cycle Strategy	
1628 108-1 rev.A	External Works Layout - Sheet 1	
1628 108-2 rev.A	External Works Layout - Sheet 2	
1628 109 rev.A	Hard Landscaping Layout	
1628 110	Single Garage	No
1628 111	Double Garage	No
1628 112	Twin Garage	No
1628 113 rev.A	Sections	
1628 114	Triple Timber Car Port	
1628 115	Street Scenes – Sheet 2	
1628 150 rev.A	Bamford – AS	
1628 151 rev.A	Bamford – AS	
1628 151-1	Bamford – OPP	
1628 152 rev.A	Bonvilston – AS	



1628 153 rev.A	Bonvilston – AS	
1628 153-1	Bonvilston – OPP	
1628 154	Bonvilston	<i>*Superseded*</i>
1628 155 rev.A	Broughton – OPP	
1628 156 rev.A	Broughton – AS	
1628 156-1	Broughton – OPP	
1628 157 rev.A	Carcroft – AS	
1628 158 rev.A	Carcroft – AS	
1628 158-1	Carcroft – OPP	
1628 159 rev.A	Farnham – AS	
1628 159-1	Farnham – OPP	
1628 160 rev.A	Farnham – AS	
1628 160-1	Farnham – OPP	
1628 161 rev.A	Tenbury – AS	
1628 161-1	Tenbury – OPP	
1628 161-2	Tenbury – OPP	
1628 162	Ogmore	<i>*Superseded*</i>
1628 163 rev.A	Ogmore – AS	
1628 163-1	Ogmore – OPP	
1628 164 rev.A	Wye – AS	
1628 164-1	Wye – OPP	
1628 165 rev.A	Idris	
1628 166 rev.A	1 Bed Apartment - Floor Plans – AS	
1628 167 rev.A	1 Bed Apartment – Elevations – AS	
1628 168	Burlington – AS	
PA01C	Landscaping - Sheet 1	No
PA02C	Landscaping - Sheet 2	No
10157-001 rev.A	Engineering Layout	
10157-102 rev.B	Refuse Vehicle Tracking	
10157-105-1	Highway Construction Details (Sheet 1 of 4)	No
10157-105-2	Highway Construction Details (Sheet 2 of 4)	No



10157-105-3	Highway Construction Details (Sheet 3 of 4)	No
10157-105-4	Highway Construction Details (Sheet 4 of 4)	No
10157-S38	Section 38 Plan	No
P2635	As Built Road – Survey	No
2504-1	Survey Sheet 1	No
2504-2	Survey Sheet 2	No
2504-3	Survey Sheet 3	No

I trust the above is clear, but should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,



Steffan Harries
Principal Planner
LRM Planning Ltd

cc Edenstone Homes

Enc.

