



## Upper Cosmeston Farm Housing Development Community Survey

### Planning Objections Report

Compiled by the Cardiff South & Penarth Lib Dems

10 November 2020

**Alex Wilson** – Lib Dem AM Candidate 2021 for Cardiff South and Penarth

**Sally Stephenson** – Lib Dem AM Candidate 2021 for Vale of Glamorgan

**Rodney Berman** – Lib Dem Regional Senedd Candidate 2021



# Press Release

The Welsh Government has submitted planning application No. 2020/01170/OUT to the Vale of Glamorgan Council for the proposed residential development at Upper Cosmeston Farm, off Lavernock Road in Penarth.

In line with statutory regulations, the Vale of Glamorgan Council requires any observations/objections pertinent to the application to be submitted via the Council's online register within 3 weeks of submission and therefore before the 13th of November.

Review of the planning application identified some considerable shortfalls in the supporting evidence and this led to a survey commissioned by the Penarth Lib Dems to understand the level of sentiment in the community and to tease out any substantial issues with the planning application.

The findings of the survey are being reported and constitute the formal community objection to the Planning application (2020/01170/OUT), it represents the collective views of a 153 survey respondents and concerned individuals with specialist knowledge.

## Planning Application Details

The planning application details (2020/01170/OUT) with associated documents and reports are available to view on the Council planning register website:

<http://vogonline.planning-register.co.uk/PlaRecord.aspx?AppNo=2020/01170/OUT>

The online submission form for registering objections can be found here:

<http://vogonline.planning-register.co.uk/plancomment.aspx?AppNo=2020/01170/OUT>

In summary the report identifies the following key issues:

## Increased Traffic and Congestion

- The proposed development fails to meet its own stated requirement for reduced travel under the Wales Spatial Plan and TAN18.
- The traffic assessments are misleading and set up to underestimate traffic volumes by at least 20%.
- The provision for a 480 pupil Primary School on site to reduce morning car journeys to 72 is misleading and flawed if the school is a Welsh Speaking or ALN School as currently proposed.
- The application fails to assess the impact of the development on the Merry Harrier and Baron's Court junctions despite a requirement by the local highways agency to do so.
- The forecast queue on Lavernock Road is over 320 vehicles and on Westbourne Road over 200 vehicles with no meaningful or thought out mitigation in place.
- The junction between Lavernock Rd and Dinas Rd is forecast to be over-capacity, the mitigation plan of lights re-phasing is not realistic.
- The housing development includes up to 1,539 car parking spaces, a fact that undermines all submitted traffic assessments and reduced travel targets

## **Environmental Pollution**

- The planning application confirms presence of pollutants in the ground water including: Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs ), Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPHs) and Cyanide but fails to provide a mitigation plan for their removal or containment, concluding it would be too costly.
- The planning application confirms the presence of Asbestos on site. On the disposing of asbestos in landfill the Environmental Agency prescribes no ground disturbance but the application fails to address how the risk of disturbed airborne Asbestos will be mitigated or how it will be funded.
- The planning application confirms the need to outgas methane from the covered landfill site but fails to address how this will be done or how it will be funded.
- The application confirms the site as a former cattle pyre dating from the 1960s foot and mouth epidemic but fails to address how the associated risks will be mitigated or funded.

## **Loss of Green Space**

- The proposed development fails to meet its own stated requirement for sustained development and protection of biodiversity and the Environment (Wales) Act 2016.
- The Planning Application states that the proposed development will have a significant negative adverse effect on biodiversity and protected species, but fails to address how this will be mitigated or how any mitigation would be funded.
- The Planning Application uses a now out-of-date National Playing Field Association (NPFA) 6 acre standard to allocate new play space provision for children.

## **Loss of Heritage**

- The planning application submitted reports from exploratory digs of the area but found nothing of particular note. This directly contradicts the digs carried out by local archaeologists that found considerable medieval material of interest.
- The area historically sustained a medieval population of 200+ with evidence of commercial activity through the port at Swanbridge.
- The old Farm House is listed in the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Wales (RCAHMW) and is presently subject to review by CADW.
- The planning application fails to provide details of what will become of the old military defences: Observer Corps Bunker and Search Light Post.

## **Other**

- The application provides for a 9 or 6 storey building and draws a lot of negative emotion from the community.
- There is a perceived conflict of interest between the Welsh Government planning application, Cardiff Council that owns the land, and the Vale of Glamorgan that approves the applications and concerns that the VOG Planning Committee may not judge the application objectively.

# Table of Contents

Press Release.....	2
1.Introduction.....	5
2.Increased Traffic and Congestion.....	6
2.1.Detailed Assessment of Traffic and Congestion.....	6
2.2.Transport Mitigation.....	7
2.3.Forecast Traffic Movements.....	7
2.4.Highway Network Assessment.....	8
2.5.Parking Provision.....	9
2.6.Traffic Network Summary.....	9
3.Loss of Green Space.....	10
3.1.Loss of biodiversity and adverse effects on protected species.....	10
3.2.Loss of the existing tree and shrub cover along the Cliff Top.....	11
3.3.Provision of child play area.....	11
3.4.Green Space Summary.....	11
4.Environmental Pollution.....	12
4.1.Pollutants identified in the report.....	12
4.2.Environmental summary.....	13
5.Heritage.....	14
5.1.Archaeological detail.....	14
5.2.Archeological summary.....	14
6.Community Services.....	15
6.1.Community services summary.....	15
7.Conclusion.....	15

Appendix A: Survey Results Summary

Appendix B: Survey Respondents' Comments

# 1. Introduction

The Welsh Government has submitted planning application No. 2020/01170/OUT to the Vale of Glamorgan Council for the proposed residential development at Upper Cosmeston Farm, off Lavernock Road in Penarth.

In line with statutory regulations, the Vale of Glamorgan Council requires any observations pertinent to the application to be submitted via the Council's online register before the 13th of November.

Initial review of the planning application identified some considerable shortfalls in the supporting evidence. In order to gain better understanding of the scale of the misreporting and its implications, the Penarth Lib Dem group commissioned a survey to confirm what the current residents in the Vale of Glamorgan believe are the main issues associated with the new housing development, and how it may impact their everyday life with a view of formulating a response to the Council that can ensure the application is correctly assessed.

This report summarises the findings from the Survey and collates the evidence and arguments provided by the local community to highlight the confirmed shortfalls in the submitted application.

This report constitutes the formal community objection to the Planning Application and represents the views of 153 survey respondents and concerned individuals. The survey separates the objections into five broad areas and this report raises an objections argument aligned to them:

- Increased Traffic and Congestion
- Increased Pressure on Local Services
- Loss of Heritage
- Loss of Green Space
- Environmental Pollution

## 2. Increased Traffic and Congestion

The majority of survey respondents do not believe the reports findings that there will be a negligible to very low impact on traffic congestion. It is felt that the report is masking the scale of the traffic problems the community will face, by using modelling assumptions that favour the Cardiff Council's application to show no impact, or by putting forward mitigation actions that are unrealistic and will not be fulfilled.

The key concerns extracted from the survey are:

- The roads are already heavily congested in Penarth, Sully and Dinas, with increased housing in Cosmeston, Cog, Barry Docks and Scholar's Park (Dinas) the traffic is expected to increase considerably compared to the current situation and with it, pollution levels. This is not recognized in the reports.
- The report does not address or mitigate the current traffic bottleneck between the Merry Harrier Junction and Baron's Court junction, where all traffic from Penarth, Sully and Dinas have to pass through in order to exit for the City and beyond. Delays of up to 30 minutes were experienced at rush hour pre Covid.
- The reports fail to address or mitigate the problem of flow from residential areas onto the main roads (with the exception of Lavernock/Westbourne Rd where a 300 car queue is expected if no traffic lights are fitted) but residents already report long delays at rush hour to get onto Sully Rd from feeder roads spanning lower Penarth to Sully.
- Although Active Travel is given as a mitigation to increased car journeys, the planning application provisions for parking of 1 car per household, suggests the modelling assumptions for take up of active travel are unrealistic.
- The reports fail to address how the Penarth town centre will cope with the increase in vehicles wanting to access local shops. Parking and traffic flow are a problem at the moment, but no provision is made to mitigate against the projected increase in car journeys to the centre.
- The reports fail to address how the increased costs for maintaining the road network will be met.
- The reports assume that the local primary school will service the local community, however if the school becomes a special needs school or a Welsh Speaking School as currently proposed, the traffic assumptions will be negated. More car journeys will result as people drive into and out of the area for the schools they need to reach.

### 2.1. Detailed Assessment of Traffic and Congestion

There are a number of specific issues about the Transport Assessment submitted by the applicants:

- There are no meaningful measures proposed to mitigate the impact of the development or deliver sustainable development.
- The forecast traffic movements are underestimated by at least 20%.
- The primary school of 480 pupils is only forecast to attract 72 cartrips in the AM peak period.
- The forecast queue on Lavernock Road is over 320 vehicles and on Westbourne Road over 200 vehicles.
- The development includes up to 1,539 car parking spaces.

### 2.2. Transport Mitigation

The Wales Spatial Plan sets out the objective to reduce the need for travel and change travel behaviour. Planning Policy Wales aims to reduce single occupancy car use. TAN18 sets out the requirement to

manage parking provision and encourage development near other related uses. This is all set out in the Transport Assessment, but the proposed development fails on all of these points.

The site is isolated – the Transport Assessment reports in Table 3.1 that the only facilities within 2km are The Harvester Restaurant and Glamorganshire Golf Club – and does not provide an appropriate mix of uses to reduce the need to travel. The Transport Assessment does not commit to any measures to change travel behaviour, everything is ‘may’ or ‘could’ or ‘will be investigated’. Simply extending NCN Route 88 into the proposed development is inadequate mitigation – the applicants own surveys demonstrate that even with this connection, the car vehicle trip rate from Cosmeston Drive, which is already connected to NCN Route 88, is 20% higher than the trip rate which has been assessed in the Transport Assessment. The proposed development includes no meaningful commitments to reduce single occupancy car use, as demonstrated by the proposal to include up to 1,539 parking spaces, and the complete absence of any complimentary land uses close to the site to which trips could be related to.

The Nextbike proposal is reliant on a docking station at Penarth rail station (para 4.1.18). There is no explanation on why this is the case, and given that this is outside of the control of the applicant then no weight can be attributed to this form of mitigation. Similarly, the proposal to enhance cycle parking at Penarth rail station. This is outside of the control of the applicant and there is already covered cycle parking at Penarth rail station and recently installed cycle parking outside Penarth rail station, and no details are provided as to how the proposed development would actually improve the facilities here.

There is not actual commitment to a car club. There is no certainty that Enterprise Car Club would be interested in this development, and no information is provided in terms of how much a car club would cost, how it would be funded, and for how long it would operate.

No detail is provided on how bus provision will be enhanced. To increase the frequency of Service 94 may require at least two additional buses (given the headway), which would cost circa £300k per annum to operate. No information is provided as to what level of contribution the development would make to improving bus services, and how this would actually be delivered. The provision of bus stops is ‘being investigated’ (para 4.1.27).

No meaningful mitigation measures are committed to in the Transport Assessment.

### **2.3. Forecast Traffic Movements**

The Transport Assessment states that it is ‘impossible to accurately predict’ (para 7.12.4 and para 8.1.11) traffic flows in 2029. Whilst this may be the case for this Transport Assessment, this is not the position for most applications, and reasonable evidence and data can be used to make forecasts into the future. Where uncertainty arises, it is best practice to undertake sensitivity tests. However, the Transport Assessment does not rely on reasonable evidence and data, and does not include any sensitivity tests. This is a major failing.

The applicant has undertaken a survey of the adjoining housing development on Cosmeston Drive. The trip rates from Cosmeston Drive are likely to be the most comparable trip rates to the proposed development. The survey demonstrates the Cosmeston Drive trip rates are circa 10% higher than the calculated trip rates. However, instead of adjusting the TRICS trip rates up by 10%, the applicant has actually reduced the trip rates down by 10%, thus underestimating the residential trip potential by 20%.

In addition, an internalisation factor has been applied to account for the primary school. This may be reasonable if the primary school were an English-language primary school, which are oversubscribed in Penarth. However, there are serious questions raised in relation to this as our understanding is that the primary school may be a Welsh-language primary school or a ALN school, which will have a completely different catchment and trip profile to an English-language primary school.

The primary school trip forecast shows 107 vehicle arrivals and 72 vehicle departures in the AM peak (we assume 35 of these trips are teachers). This means a school of 480 pupils generates only 72 vehicle trips in the AM peak. We would recommend the applicant undertakes a survey at Evenlode primary school in Penarth (the nearest primary school to the site) to provide a reasonable comparison and sense check of this forecast.

## **2.4. Highway Network Assessment**

The applicant has failed to assess the Merrier Harrier Junction, despite the request of the local highway authority and the recommendations of the independent audit of the Transport Assessment. This is an oversight.

The applicant also reports a queue of over 320 vehicles on Lavernock Road and over 200 vehicles on Westbourne Road in the development scenario. No mitigation is proposed to address this. The applicant makes reference to the potential to provide a right-turn lane, a roundabout or traffic lights, but no potential layouts or cost estimates are provided, or any forecast of what level of mitigation any of these proposals would provide. The highway layout is constrained in this location and is doubtful any of these measures could actually be delivered. The Transport Assessment also suggests a 'localised traffic management scheme'. What does this actually mean?

The applicant makes reference to 'lane simulation' (para 7.8.2) in terms of the assessment of Lavernock Road / Westbourne Road Junction, but each arm of this junction is a single lane approach, and no explanation or detail is provided as to exactly how 'lane simulation' has been applied. Only a simple e-mail from TRL has been provided.

The Transport Assessment also forecasts the Lavernock Road / Dinas Road Junction to be over capacity, and this is with the model set up with the pedestrian signal to be called every other cycle based on on-site observations (para 7.10.4). The junction is immediately outside Stanwell high school and very close to Evenlode primary school, and in the AM peak the pedestrian phase is called constantly as children access the schools. The modelling work needs to be corrected to reflect this, and no doubt the results will change from that included in the Transport Assessment, and forecast queuing will increase.

The proposed mitigation is to run the junction as a two-stage signal. However, there appears to be insufficient queuing capacity for right-turners in such a set up and no layout or safety audit has been submitted to demonstrate this is feasible. What is the local highway authority's view of this proposal?

The Transport Assessment makes reference to a MOVA system improving capacity by 10% - 15% compared to the model output. Please could we see the evidence to support this judgement?

## **2.5. Parking Provision**

The Transport Assessment states that the development will include up to 1,539 parking spaces. The inability or reluctance of the report to fix or reduce the parking numbers below this maximum level reflects the inadequacy of the mitigation proposals and the lack of confidence of the applicant that the proposals will deliver sustainable development.

The only meaningful mitigation is the connection to NCN Route 88, although providing this connection will simply make the site comparable to Cosmeston Drive which currently has a higher car vehicle trip rate than the average site in TRICS and therefore cannot be considered sustainable.

No onward connection to the west towards Sully is proposed, and this means circa 20% of trips forecast in the Transport Assessment are completely ignored.

There is no commitment to improve bus services, provide Nextbikes, or provide a car club, and the proposed development cannot be considered sustainable, hence the proposed approach to parking.



## **2.6. Traffic Network Summary**

The proposed development is a car-centric development and the application fails to implement appropriate mitigating measures making the assessment work flawed and resulting in a development that does not present a sustainable development.

In order for the planning application to meet the needs of the community the following need to be considered:

1. Make a firm commitment and financial contribution to improve bus services to benefit existing and future residents.
2. Make a firm commitment and financial contribution to improve the road network to alleviate current congestion.
3. Provide a connection of NCN Route 88 between Penarth and Sully – this would make a meaningful difference and could deliver a mode shift in trips in the local area.
4. Make a firm commitment and financial contribution to the Penarth Headland Link.
5. Commit the local primary school to serve a local catchment, thus internalising trips and removing some existing trips from the network.

### **3. Loss of Green Space**

The survey respondents felt very strongly about the importance of keeping a green wedge between Penarth and Sully as its biodiversity supports, a variety of wild life and plants that are enjoyed by the local community who actively use the area for leisure. In particular the following concerns were raised:

- The displacements of wildlife has not been appropriately mitigated by the submitted reports in particular the loss of roosting sights for swallows, house martins and bats.
- Inadequate provision has been made to protect the cliff top / Wales Coastal footpath and its associated tree and scrub cover.
- The submitted planning application does not apply the most recent standards for allocation of open play spaces, instead uses inefficient and outdated NEAP/LEAP/LAP standards.
- The application report notes the development site is unlikely to flood. This ignores the regular flooding of the lower level land spanning Sully Road where it impacts traffic flow. The development is expected to retain less of the run-off water and will result in more water entering the drain systems. No mitigation is provided.

#### **3.1. Loss of biodiversity and adverse effects on protected species**

The Planning Application states that the proposed development will have a significant negative adverse effect on biodiversity and protected species. It states that these adverse effects will be addressed by mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures. These are not described in the planning application but are to be addressed at the Reserved Matters stage of the planning application process. The Welsh Government in accordance with its duty for sustainable development, and to protect and enhance biodiversity, should provide more details of the mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures at the Outline Planning stage to ensure proper consideration is given to its duties before planning approval is granted and commitment to the development is made. The planning application notes that the site has moderate potential for bats and has a good assemblage of bird species. The Welsh Government fails to demonstrate and ensure that their duty to protect and enhance biodiversity will be fulfilled at this critical stage of the planning process.

The species breeding in the area is the typical common or garden birds normally associated with such habitat such as Blackbird, Song Thrush, Robin, Wren, Dunnock, Chaffinch, Goldfinch, House Sparrow, Great Tit, Blue Tit, Woodpigeon, Magpie and Swallows in the old Farm House.

Lesser known species in summer would be Common Whitethroat, Chiffchaff, Willow Warbler and Blackcap although not all of these necessarily breed. In winter there can be large numbers of finches using the weedy fields to feed, comprising in the main, Goldfinch, Chaffinch and Linnet and there are often Meadow Pipits and Skylark mixed in with these.

During the bird migrations period in spring and autumn more unusual species can appear as they stop off to feed on passage. The planning application makes some provision for wildlife corridors and green areas with planting, however this will not compensate for the loss of the large feeding fields and will result in a displacement of the bird populations.

#### **3.2. Loss of the existing tree and shrub cover along the Cliff Top**

The planning application identifies that the proposed development will be visible from Penarth Esplanade and the cliff top/ Wales Coastal footpath. The existing clifftop vegetation is an important screen and landscape feature which provides a significant feature enclosing the proposed development and defining the current southern boundary of the built up area of Penarth. It also provides an important

wildlife corridor and habitat for birds, reptiles and mammals. The planning application does not describe how this important area of vegetation is to be protected, conserved or managed in the long term. No provision or commitment is made to ensure retention of this important habitat faced with the removal of vegetation so as to enhance the seaward views from the new houses. This erosion of habitat over time is evidenced by the removal of the cliff edge trees and shrubs which used to line the cliff top footpath opposite the existing houses. That vegetation appears to have been removed to open up the seaward views from the existing properties along Whitcliffe Drive and the Paddocks. The importance of this vegetation and habitat should be addressed and measures incorporated into any planning permission to ensure its protection and management in the long term.

### **3.3. Provision of child play area**

The Planning Application uses a now out of date National Playing Field Association (NPFA) 6 acre standard to allocate new play space provision for children. This old standard of fragmented provision is proven to be inefficient in both design, capital and revenue terms for today's climate of limited local authority and land resource. The inefficient standard will put pressure on the already stretched education and social care budget, leaving the community parks across the Vale with an ever diminishing annual revenue budget in a setting where the budget does not meet the maintenance requirements of existing park facilities. The planning application fails to consider this impact on future costs and should be reviewed.

### **3.4. Green Space Summary**

The planning application fails to identify adequate mitigation, compensation or expenditure plans for the displaced wildlife or the protection of the wildlife corridor and cliff top habitat. In so doing the Welsh Government are negligent in their duty for sustainable development and protection of biodiversity.

In order for the planning application to meet the needs of the community the following need to be considered:

1. Make a firm commitment and financial contribution to facilitate the translocation of birds, reptiles and mammals from affected areas.
2. Make a firm commitment and financial contribution to maintain wildlife corridors and the cliff top tree and shrub cover.
3. Address longer term maintenance costs for the proposed park and open facilities with supporting firm commitment and financial contribution.

## 4. Environmental Pollution

The survey respondents, on the whole, had serious concerns about the pollution from the old landfill and quarry sites, some remembering what the sites looked like in the 1970s. The reports confirmed pollutants have been identified on site but failed to address with concrete actions how the risks they pose to the community would be mitigated. All of the following concerns have been raised:

1. The outgassing of methane from the covered landfill site with associated Vents, Spinners or Burners and at worst having to endure the "rotten egg" smell as can be experienced on the old landfill site by Tesco.
2. The disturbance of the polluted soils may release unwanted materials into the environment, namely Asbestos, TPHs, PAHs, cyanide and arsenic polluting local water courses.
3. The site includes the location of a "cattle pyre", dating back to the 1960s foot and mouth epidemic.

### 4.1. Pollutants identified in the report

The planning application has identified Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (referred to as PAHs ) and Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (referred to as TPHs) present on site, these are carcinogenic chemicals and the Welsh Government has recognised historically that they may also cause damage to foetuses, impair the development of young, and harm adults.

The planning application has identified Asbestos materials present on site. On the disposing of asbestos in landfill, the Environmental Agency prescribes no ground disturbance, but the application fails to address how the risk of disturbed airborne Asbestos will be mitigated or how it will be funded. The application also fails to provide a residents' risk assessment.

The planning application identifies zone C as the landfill site and is designated to become community allotments and orchards. The reported site surveys seem to have not conducted test pits and bore holes, raising concerns for any cultivation in this area. Further assessment of the risks and mitigation is required.

The planning application has identified the development includes the location of a "cattle pyre" that dates back to the 1960s foot and mouth epidemic. No effort is made to identify the risks or have them mitigated.

The Environmental Protection Act 1990 requires local authorities, current owners or the original polluters to identify contaminated land and take appropriate action to mitigate risks and ultimately to clean up the affected sites. It could be seen as a conflict of interests between the Welsh Government, Cardiff Council and Vale of Glamorgan Council where it is expedient to approve the planning application in order to release the land and disburse responsibility for the clean up that would fall, under the terms of the 1990 Act, to the Council as the original polluters.

## **4.2. Environmental summary**

The planning application identifies many pollutants and toxins on site but fail to address the risks they pose to the community and how they would be mitigated.

In order for the planning application to meet the needs of the community the following has to be considered:

1. Carry out a detailed community risk assessment leading to identifying meaningful mitigating actions and to reduce the risk to acceptable regulatory standards
2. Commit to report any risks and the mitigating actions to the community through an open public engagement process that is additional to the minimum statutory Planning Application requirements
3. Make a firm commitment and financial contribution implementing any required mitigating actions

## 5. Heritage

The planning application is described as a "White Wash" with reported studies not reflecting the community's understanding of the historical worth within the lands designated for development. Cardiff Council exploratory digs of the area found little to report on, and is therefore in disagreement with local archaeologists who conducted their own excavations and found considerable medieval material. The area historically sustained a medieval population of 200+ with evidence of commercial activity through the port at Swanbridge. The old Farm House is listed in the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Wales (RCAHMW) and CADW is currently reviewing the site.

The survey respondents felt the following had heritage value:

- Medieval Farmhouse, Barn and lands
- Military defences: Observer Corps Bunker, Search Light Post
- The Middle Jurassic Lias Cliff formation containing fossilised remains

### 5.1. Archaeological detail

The planning application submitted reports from exploratory digs of the area but found nothing of particular note, this directly contradicts the digs carried out by local archaeologists that found considerable medieval material of interest including a 13<sup>th</sup> century coin, a lead loom weight, many pottery pieces and a possible medieval structure.

The area historically sustained a medieval population of 200+ with evidence of commercial activity through the port at Swanbridge. The old Farm House is listed in the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Wales (RCAHMW) and is presently subject to review by CADW

The planning applications fails to provide details of what will become of the old military defences: Observer Corps Bunker and Search Light Post

### 5.2. Archeological summary

An independent archaeological report concludes that the planning application archaeological surveys are flawed in as much as the Welsh Assembly Government commissioned survey, on the basis of preliminary studies, elected not to conduct exploratory digs in the fields closest to the Cosmeston Medieval Village. This omission resulted in a failure to identify the considerable quantity of medieval material present on site.

The old Farm House is listed in RCAHMW and is currently subject to an application with CADW for listing as a Grade 2 building. The farmhouse, that dates back to the post medieval period, is identified in the application as the only example of this type of architecture in the area. Period features of interest include a large gable-end fireplace complete with chamfered wooden mantel-beam, a large chamfered wooden floor corbel and a concealed stone spiral staircase.

In order for the planning application to meet the needs of the community the following needs to be considered:

1. Full assessment of the independent archaeological reports and consultation with CADW with respect to the heritage value for the area.
2. Make a firm commitment and financial contribution towards any agreed action identified with CADW.

## 6. Community Services

The planning application only provisions for play areas and a primary school (that may be a special needs or a Welsh-speaking school), this is considered by most of the respondents as being woefully inadequate with the following concerns being raised:

1. Health Centres and Dental surgeries: Current Surgeries in Penarth and Sully are overstretched.
2. Schools: Current Schools are at overcapacity, a Welsh speaking or Special Needs Primary School would do nothing to alleviate the problem. Respondents also felt that the provisioning of a Primary School within the planning application was not concrete enough to support the application as the provisioned "106 funding" is not a commitment to build, referencing historical cases where a promise to build new schools was never fulfilled (Rhoose).
3. Shops: Local stores are required to limit car journeys, including Pharmacy, Post Office, Mini Marts.
4. Community: No provision is made for a Community Centre, Library or Youth Services.

### 6.1. Community services summary

The planning application identifies that the only facilities within 2km of the development are The Harvester Restaurant and Glamorganshire Golf Club. A primary school is proposed with no committed funding and may yet become a Welsh-speaking or ALN school. Parks and an improved cycle route is proposed. These are insufficient in supporting a local increase in population.

In order for the planning application to meet the needs of the community the following has to be considered:

1. Commitment and funding to increased provision of healthcare facilities.
2. Commitment and funding for provision of shops, library and community hall.
3. Commitment and funding for improved access to town centre facilities.
4. Commitment and funding for a primary school that services the new residents (not ALN).

## 7. Conclusion

The survey respondents and the authors of this report feel that the proposed Upper Cosmeston Housing development as described in Vale of Glamorgan planning application 2020/01170/OUT is inappropriate for the local community and the documentation submitted in support of the application is fundamentally flawed and therefore submit this report as a community objection to the planning application.

The report has taken the community survey results and attempted to review the planning application submission against the findings. The work is not complete as the 3 week deadline for objections constrained the time available for deeper scrutiny. With more time it would be possible to firm up the arguments, correct any deficiencies in interpretation and produce an improved submission.

The authors hope this is a constructive report and will allow for meaningful debate to take place and inform all interested parties on how best to proceed.