

1 Church Row
St Nicholas
Cardiff CF5 6SP

FAO: Jessica King
Dock Offices
Subway Road
Barry CF63 4RT

6 September 2020

Replacement school at St Nicholas CiW Primary School

Dear Ms King

I have previously stated my objection to this proposal earlier in the process. However I am now writing to state that although I realise the need for a replacement building I still object on the grounds of the building within a conservation order and the provision of enlarged educational facilities on this site.

The objection should be considered within the following observations.

It is my understanding that the Vale of Glamorgan Council are not following their published guidance in this case. Advice indicates that the height of the building should be in keeping with the surrounding buildings which are domestic in nature and proportions. Therefore a new building of 9 meters in height would not be in proportion to an "average" house which is much lower in comparison.

In a drop in session held at the school it was intimated that the building would be stone clad, which the plans do not address. It is proposed that the build is brick faced which is again not in keeping with the conservation area.

The Vale of Glamorgan Local Development Plan 2011- 2026 supplementary planning guidance 2018 on page 5 indicates that proposals should "Respond to the local context and character of neighbouring buildings.." and should "Provide a safe and accessible environment for all users, giving priority to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users." The Transport Assessment included in the PAC states that this is not currently achievable and therefore, by increasing the size and age range of the school in the proposal will also not be achievable.

Furthermore, the guidance states that a development should "Have no unacceptable impact on ...nor cause or exacerbate existing traffic congestion to an unacceptable degree..." Currently, the need to transport pupils from out of catchment, indeed out of County already impacts on and contributes to congestion in the village to an unacceptable degree. It creates unnecessary planning for residents wishing to leave or return to their property at certain

times of the day. Indeed I have been subjected to verbal assault when leaving my property to commute to work on several occasions and have been unable to return to access my property after work at other times in the year. I feel strongly that access to the site has not been addressed in the documents presented for public scrutiny, nor the residents (and tax payers to the Council) views and impact on the enjoyment of their property been considered.

Paragraph 4.2.3 states (a) development should have "...no unacceptable impact on the amenity and character of the locality by way of noise, traffic congestion and parking". The proposal will detrimentally affect the environment surrounding the site, resulting in increased parking by those waiting to collect pupils not only at the times identified in the Transport Assessment report but at additional times which have not been addressed, namely the start and finish times for children attending the nursery at either morning or afternoon sessions, further adding to the congestion especially if older siblings attend the mainstream classes in the school.

The Planning Policy: Conservation Areas in the rural Vale states in paragraph 3.3.1 that new development "will respect its historic context in scale, form, materials and design..." My observation is that the design is a cut and paste version of other 21st Century schools being built throughout the Vale and other local authorities. The proposals do nothing to enhance the visual aesthetics of the village nucleus and no amount of landscaping can address this, the proposals include the removal of several trees fronting the site.

Paragraph 3.5.1 of the Council's policy states that "...few of the villages find it easy to accommodate motor vehicles..." and continues to state that new plans should "...need to respond and respect the scale, and intimacy which has evolved..." The plans proposed in the PAC do not address this. Furthermore, paragraph 3.7.1 states that "...Brick is a recent building material in the Vale..." and continues with paragraph 3.7.2 "Materials must be appropriate to the locality and sympathetic to the buildings in the conservation area." The materials proposed for the build do not support the locality nor respect the materials used within the conservation area in the village. The Council are not adhering to their own advice by not ensuring that "The layout and design of new development should acknowledge the context..." in the village.

In part 4 of the Council's publication, the principles of taking into account the surrounding buildings and how this reflects the scale and layout of the village. The plans proposed do not reflect the scale of the buildings within the conservation area. Page 38 states a key issue to be the protection and maintenance of stone boundary walls which increased traffic flow will not achieve. A current school policy indicates that a member of staff will be available to monitor traffic and pupil safety at the beginning and end of the school day. However as this is rarely observed, I have very little optimism that school staff will be proactive in the implementation of traffic flow proposals described within the PAC documentation. Indeed, when a discussion was requested to address this issue, I was informed that this was not the duty of school staff to undertake this activity. Therefore, I have no reason to believe this will be the case in practise in the future.

Within the LDP, the Council outlines the provision of Educational Facilities. Appendix 8 considers Conservation Areas. Within this document, on page 59 is a statement which indicates land to the east of Bonvilston as a site for a new school. However, there seems to be no further reference to this site in other documentation. Has this site been considered as suitable for a replacement primary school to serve the St Nicholas catchment? If not, why not?

The proposed replacement building does not address the Council's stated objectives in the LDP to managing transport reliance on the private car, by encouraging and promoting active travel or the use of public transport. The Transport Assessment produced within the PAC information already highlights challenges to traffic flow in and around the village at peak times currently. If the number on roll (NOR) is increased to 210, plus the additional travel requirements of two nursery drop off and collection times (AM & PM) the air quality surrounding the school plus the congestion resulting will only add to the situation. Paragraph 6.10.3 indicates that the bus route along the A48 is considered "...more problematic..." as "...congestion and volume of traffic makes buses sit in the same traffic as cars..." As the majority of pupils currently on roll travel this route daily, adding more pupils would further add to the already identified congestion.

Policy MDI – Location of new development. The policy states that development should "Have access to or promote the use of sustainable modes of transport." As the proposal includes educational provision for pupils under the age of 12, the PAC does not address how this can be achieved by pupils travelling out of county for their educational provision. Paragraph 7.2 in this document states that "development is carefully managed" and "does not have an unacceptable impact on existing infrastructure..." Whilst detailed planning has addressed access around the site, no mention is made of the impact on the nucleus of the conservation area in the village if this proposal proceeds.

The Transport Assessment indicates provision of 17 parking spaces for the proposed 24 FTE staff. It takes no account of parental parking for major school events such as concerts or parent – teacher consultations. The school currently provides a parent funded minibus. However, there is no guarantee that this will continue to be viable in the future. The provision is there currently because of the numbers of pupils travelling from out of County to access primary phase education.

At no point in the process so far has the proposed size of the school been explained or justified. It is observed that currently all 21st Century schools that are proposed or recently built are of this size. I have not seen robust evidence to support this demand within the school's current catchment.

In conclusion, I firmly object to the proposal on these grounds.

Yours sincerely,

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Sally Carnall