



County Hall
Cardiff
CF10 4UW
Tel: (029) 2087 2000

Neuadd y Sir
Caerdydd
CF10 4UW
Ffôn: (029) 2087 2000

LATE REPRESENTATIONS

Committee PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date and Time of Meeting WEDNESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2016, 2.30 PM

9 **Late Representations** *(Pages 1 - 20)*

This page is intentionally left blank

LATE REPRESENTATIONS SCHEDULE
PLANNING COMMITTEE – 10TH FEBRUARY 2016

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 14/02157/MJR
ADDRESS	LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF LLANTRISANT RD
FROM:	Case officer
SUMMARY:	<p>A Planning Committee site visit took place Wednesday 3rd February 2016, commencing at an agreed meeting point. Planning Committee viewed the site from a number of locations in the area.</p> <p>The petitioner and all those who submitted written objections were notified in advance either by royal mail or email and a code of practice for site visits enclosed. Emails were sent 28th and 29th of January, and letters sent first class 29th January.</p> <p>4 letters of objection were received objecting to the short notice given, the timing of the site visit (being a working day and outside of rush hour) with one advising that an objector hadn't been notified, and requesting that the site visit be re-arranged.</p>
REMARKS:	<p>I would comment as follows: The objector had been notified by royal mail. The Chair of Planning Committee confirmed the site visit would go ahead as scheduled and the objectors notified. It was also explained that the site visit is not an opportunity to make representations in support or against an application.</p>

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 14/02157/MJR
ADDRESS	LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF LLANTRISANT RD
FROM:	Case officer
SUMMARY:	<p>Further to the related site history set out in section 3 of the report, a further application has been registered following completion of the report which falls within Strategic Site C. This is application 16/00106/MJR submitted by BDW South Wales for</p> <p>OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION (ALL MATTERS RESERVED APART FROM STRATEGIC VEHICULAR, CYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS INTO THE SITE) FOR THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 300</p>

	DWELLINGS ON SITE TO INCLUDE OPEN SPACE (INCLUDING CHILDREN'S PLAY SPACE), LANDSCAPING. SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE, VEHICULAR ACCESS, PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE ACCESSES AND RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENGINEERING WORKS.
REMARKS:	That this be noted.

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 14/02157/MJR
ADDRESS	LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF LLANTRISANT RD
FROM:	Cllr Paul Mitchell
SUMMARY:	<p>I would like to speak at Committee and on the following:</p> <p>My primary objection still remains on traffic grounds as outlined in 7.2 (i) in the report – which are already well rehearsed - in that unless significant enhancements are made to the infrastructure such as the pinch-points at Waungron Road and Llandaff then the incremental increases in traffic flows including the development at Pentrebane Road. will not be sustainable on such heavily peak-time congested roads. I remain particularly unconvinced by the assertion on page 63 of your report that <i>“The package of mitigation measures which will be delivered through the S278 and S106 agreements will address a significant bottleneck on the A4119 corridor through the provision of a major signalised junction, bus lanes and bus priority measures. These measures will enhance the operation of public transport along the whole corridor and their benefits are not restricted to the site itself.”</i></p> <p>I am pleased that my concern 7.2(ii) about the proposed creation of a route being opened up into cul-de-sacs of Vista Rise and Sundew Close have been appeased but I still have concerns (see below) as laid out in 7.2(iii) with creation of 'possible links to further developments' that point to the farm and land south of the reservoir being developed in the longer term.</p> <p>Therefore, should you be minded to approve this application, I would ask you to consider the following observations and requests:</p> <p><u>A. PETROL STATION MINI ROUNDABOUT:</u> The original proposed Llantrisant Road A4119 T-junction by the petrol station I believe would have created significant hazards for emerging vehicles at off-peak or reverse peak</p>

times as the stretch of road has vehicles at high speed particularly westward-bound vehicles.

The proposed mini-roundabout solution will still significant need speed controls in place either side of this proposed junction as in the N37-IS-141304 VECTOS Junction Evolution Note. I believe the raised table will be helpful to reducing speed but the crossing at the edge of the table still concerns me as the long left essentially blind curve means a speeding motorist unsure of the layout would be upon the crossing at speed regardless of the table.

I also welcome the restriction on the number of houses that this junction will serve.

I therefore call upon the committee to fully consider whether sufficient traffic control methods are proposed between the Danescourt Way roundabout and this revised roundabout junction to reduce this temptation to accelerate westwards - including through and from the proposed Heol Aradur pedestrian crossing (SK108).

The N36-IS-141304 Designers response recognises the approach speed issues and believes that the development will provide an urban frontage onto this stretch of road to reinforce the perception of an urban environment to drivers. Although the problem has been recognised, if the urban quality of this stretch of the road is not enforced then there will be accidents at the new crossing and junctions.

B. SCHOOL SITE SIZE

Whilst I note and welcome the proposed Green Infrastructure/Dark Zone Master Plan, two LEAPS and the proposed community centre, I was disappointed that the reduction in the primary school size to 1.4Ha has remained due, according to the report, to Health and Safety issues with a high-pressure gas main. I therefore call upon the committee to satisfy themselves that this site size is adequate for the proposed 2-form entry intake of the school bearing in mind the proposed further developments.

C. ACCESS TO VISTA RISE, SUNDEW CLOSE AND ASHDENE CLOSE

I remain concerned about the residents of Sundew Close and Vista Rise whilst the site master plan sketch envisages housing at the end of Vista Rise (restricted to two stories thankfully), I remain concerned that unwelcome pedestrian access into Sundew and Restways from the Reservoir site and so-called Dark Zones may become a problem in the future. I would therefore ask to the committee to require a

survey of my constituents to ascertain their views including the finer details of the 'Dark Zone' plantings and tree locations with respect to the security of their properties and the restriction/prevention of unwelcome pedestrian traffic from or through the development into their respective closes with a resulting negative impact on their security and privacy.

For example: Access Parameter Plan 2 (IL1129/09-24.2 (RevJ) point (p) suggests that "Reasonable endeavours should be used to provide a footpath/cycleway link between the existing development at Vista Rise and the site from a point between points 1 and 2.

Your report today also contains Conditions to be Discharged that revisits this assumption headed "**ACCESS TO THE REMAINDER OF STRATEGIC SITE C AND VISTA RISE:**

16. Details in relation to the reserved matter ACCESS submitted for any Reserved Matters site on land south of Llantrisant Road that adjoins the remainder of Strategic Site C or existing dwellings accessed off Vista Rise, in compliance with condition 1 shall include, but not be limited to, a detailed strategy and implementation programme for the provision of means of access up to the boundary of that Reserved Matters site to serve development beyond the boundary of that Reserved Matters site.

The details submitted shall include, but not be limited to, cross sections of the roads, footpaths and cyclepaths where they intersect with any dark zones identified in the approved SGIMS (under condition 23) and which shall also show green infrastructure and lighting proposals. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Reason: To ensure effective links to the wider strategic site and existing communities."

I would strongly resist this repeated proposal. Whilst connecting communities may seem a worthwhile and laudable 'endeavour' on paper I suggest that this is only done WITH the full consent of residents – which I suspect, as people value the privacy and seclusion of their closes, will not be forthcoming.

Unless every resident tells you otherwise I would therefore ask for a recommendation that this endeavour not be pursued if not agreed by the residents.

D: LINKS TO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

Point (l) (lower case L) in the Access document above

states “*Provision should be made for at least one future vehicular, footpath and cycleway link to land to the south of the application site from a point between points D and E.*” Again, I would ask for this provision to be REFUSED particularly for any vehicular access. If any development takes place to the south of this site I would not want a through road opened up to create the inevitable rat run. A cycle way and footpath for this traffic to access Plasmawr Road would be acceptable but not future vehicular access.

I therefore ask for a recommendation that vehicular access be refused and emphasised that any possibility of a rat run connecting Waterhall Road and Llantrisant should be ruled out.

E. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS AND SITE NOISE

Proposal (i) in the Access Document states “*Provision should be made for the potential for local access through hedges H22 and H25 to allow for internal vehicular movements within the site*” – I would welcome clarification as to what this means and whether residents in Ashdene, Waterhall Road and the estates could be exposed to the inconveniences of site traffic – in which case I would further ask you to restrict this on behalf of my constituents.

The report today includes: “*PLANT NOISE 45. The rating level of the noise emitted from fixed plant and equipment on the site shall not exceed the existing background noise level at any time by more than 5dB(A) at any residential property when measured and corrected in accordance with BS 4142: 1997. Reason: To ensure that amenities of occupiers of other premises in the vicinity are protected.*”

I therefore ask for a recommendation that ‘internal vehicle movements’ be properly defined and monitored to ensure that the consequent construction traffic movement and noise does not unduly impact upon the amenities of local residents especially those in Vista Rise who will be particularly close to house construction.

F. DARK ZONES AND SECURITY

RECOMMENDATION 8 currently states: “*Prior to undertaking any tree works or tree removals, further advice should be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist.*” Whilst I welcome the Dark Zone being sited to buffer many of the local residents from the new houses the full security implications and natural light impacts of the plantings on existing houses must be considered. I fear ill-considered natural and planted cover could provide secluded vantage

points for vandal and thieves to observe or access the rears of existing properties.

I therefore ask for the following to be added to the recommendation: “Furthermore, the placement of trees and vegetation along the eastern site boundaries to be mindful, via full consultation, of the views, wishes, privacy and security concerns of the residents of Vista Rise, Sundew Close and Ashdene Place. Due consideration must be given to the projected mature heights of trees so as to ensure that residents are not unduly deprived of natural light and sunlight that they currently enjoy.”

G. CANTONIAN HIGH SCHOOL

I refer to section 5.8 and apologise for not immediately grasping its implications (or rather lack of) for the local English-medium comprehensive where I am a governor.

CLLR MITCHELL INSERTED PARAGRAPH 5.8 OF THE REPORT INTO HIS REPRESENTATION BUT THIS IS OMITTED HERE TO AVOID DUPLICATION.

I apologise for reproducing the above but Cantonian has been severely under-capacity and under-capitalised for many years and although I am hopeful a review will obtain one or two feeders I fear it will remain under-capacity and essentially I would want this school considered as a feeder and feel that contributions should go to upgrade an existing school in the short term and any future comprehensive(s) built with improvements to Cantonian in mind.

I therefore ask for a recommendation that the above statement be urgently reassessed to implicitly provide Cantonian with a feeder school to ensure its growth and viability and to implicitly direct the secondary element of the above calculations to Cantonian to address the lack of capital investment in the school for the last decade or so.

H: SECTION 106 NORTH-SOUTH DISPARITY

I note in the responses on page 45 and 46 of your report a bid for s106 to improve Radyr Cricket Club whilst on page 46 states: *“developments nature as an entrance to the wider Plasdwr development, it is still of some concern that the request for at least 1 area of relatively level open space that can be used for active recreation open space of at least 60x40m has been addressed by a token 40x25m area identified adjacent the school. This is still an issue that should be addressed during a future reserved matters*

	<p><i>application to achieve a reasonably sized area.”</i></p> <p>I draw your attention to pages 63 and 64 relating to S108 matters and ask you to note the disparity in s106 allocations favouring Heol Isaf when Waterhall Road, Pwllmelin Road and Plasmawr Road are equally if not more impacted by the development. Waterhall Road needs verge improvements including bollards not to mention a Toucan crossing to serve the school and to enable isolated elderly residents to access bus stops. Plasmawr Road is bedevilled, in my view, by poorly-designed speed humps and accompanying ruts along its southern stretch and needs an upgrade to include at least one table. I cannot find any references to these requirements in the document.</p> <p>Furthermore, Fairwater Rugby Club is struggling with poor parking and facilities, waterlogged pitches and the nearby adjacent brook needing dredging. The Fairwater Sports Trust is in the process of registering as a charity and urgently needs s106 to upgrade its pavilion and to provide a MUGA. The Fairwater Allotment site is crying out for a new western boundary fence to stop access and vandalism.</p> <p>I also find the entry on p162 confusing. <i>“5.14 A number of elements that the developer is not providing (e.g. MUGA/teen equipment and allotments) will be provided off-site. Within the Section 106 Agreement a financial contribution of £82,000 has been agreed towards allotments, with a combined figure for pitches and MUGA.”</i> How will this money be allocated?</p> <p>I would therefore ask for a recommendation that the section 106 directed to community and transport issues within wards should proportionally reflect the number of dwellings and boundary along Llantrisant Road and be subject to consultation with ward members with, for the ward of Fairwater and Pentrebane, due consideration of the local community and transport needs outlined above.</p>
<p>REMARKS:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PETROL STATION MINI ROUNDABOUT - The Council, as Local Highway Authority, will review the need for additional speed control measures as part of the s278 process, including a reduction in the existing speed limit. 2. SCHOOL SITE SIZE - This is addressed in the report. Schools Organisation Planning Manager has agreed to the max 1.4ha site and condition 5 is recommended to ensure the site is no less than 1.35ha.

	<p>3. ACCESS TO VISTA RISE, SUNDEW CLOSE AND ASHDENE CLOSE - This is addressed in the report (paras 5.19 and 8.67). NB. A potential link to Vista Risa is proposed and not to Sundew or Ashdene Close. The reservoir falls outside of the application site for all applications that relate to Strategic Site C and no links are proposed through it.</p> <p>4. LINKS TO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT - This matter is addressed in the report para 5.19. The vehicular, pedestrian and cycle link proposed between points D and E and the footpath/ cycleway link between points 3 and 4 are to land to the south of the application site. Any potential links from that land through to the existing highway network from that land will be considered as part of application 14/02733MJR.</p> <p>5. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS AND SITE NOISE – ‘Internal vehicular movements’ simply means internal access (which is a reserved matter). A Construction Environmental Management Plan is recommended (condition 19) to control construction impacts, including traffic routing and times.</p> <p>6. DARK ZONES AND SECURITY - Proposals in respect of the dark zone will be submitted and analysed at RM stage and in discharge of conditions requiring a Strategic Green Infrastructure Management Strategy (23) and landscaping details (21) and will take residential amenity into consideration.</p> <p>7. CANTONIAN HIGH SCHOOL – The Schools Organisation Planning Manager responds as follows:</p> <p>Cllr Mitchell’s concerns are noted. However, the application has taken account of the numbers at Cantonian currently and the wider strategic picture with regard to the provision of secondary school places in this locality and the wider area (as set out in the committee report para 5.8). There are several strategic sites within the LDP to factor in on the West of Cardiff that will impact on the take up of places in the Cantonian catchment and neighbouring high schools which form part of the consideration of this application. This, together with catchment area changes as required and other relevant developments in Education, means that places will be required to provide for the existing resident population leaving no scope for inclusion as part of this application. Until a new high school is established the existing schools would likely have increased take up and</p>
--	---

	<p>this will need to be managed carefully to prevent any negative impact on the schools concerned.</p> <p>8. SECTION 106 NORTH SOUTH DISPARITY - Paragraph 5.14 relates to the “Churchlands” application (ref 14/02891MJR) and is not relevant.</p> <p>There are legal requirements for the obligations contained in section 106 agreements, the purpose of which is to provide site specific impact mitigation to make individual developments acceptable in planning terms. Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 provides that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; (b) directly related to the development; and (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Local ward members have the opportunity to identify considered local priorities for s106 through their roles in providing responses on planning applications. The section 106 process is carefully monitored by the relevant Planning Officers and Head of Planning to ensure that whilst the precise circumstances of each case will vary, the legal tests are met and any s106 request is policy compliant. The decision on planning applications, including agreement of the Heads of Terms of S106 obligations, are made by Planning Committee or under the Council’s approved scheme of delegations. Whilst a S106 contribution of £300k for improvements to Heol Isaf is recommended to Planning Committee, the need for additional highway improvements will be considered as part of the consideration of the other applications that form part of Strategic Site C. With regards community facilities, £122,000 has been secured for community facilities in the local area and is recommended to Members. The identification of improvements needed at Fairwater Rugby Club and Fairwater Allotment site by Cllr Mitchell has been forwarded to the Housing & Neighbourhood Renewal Group for future consideration.</p>
--	---

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 14/02157/MJR
ADDRESS	LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF LLANTRISANT RD
FROM:	Case officer
SUMMARY:	Paragraph 8.34 should refer to the Grade II listed building as Upper Barn, Radyr Farm, in line with para 8.35.
REMARKS:	To correct a typographical error and for the avoidance of doubt.

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 14/02157/MJR
ADDRESS	LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF LLANTRISANT RD
FROM:	Owner/occupier of 203 Pentrebane Rd
SUMMARY:	<p>Objects on grounds summarised below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of agricultural land 2. Harm to noise and air pollution 3. Harm to health 4. Harm to biodiversity 5. Oversupply of houses and harm to local community 6. Dwelling design should allow for inclusive access. 7. Concerns building regulations require an 8% cut in emissions rather than planned 40%, making it more profitable for developers to build in wales. Query as to whether the houses will be built with the new fire sprinkler system. 8. Traffic impact, including impact from construction traffic. 9. Provision for one primary school only will increase school traffic. 10. The Council should develop their inner city deprived areas first.
REMARKS:	Re item 7, the requirement to introduce sprinklers is a building control matter. The remaining issues are addressed in the report.

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 14/02157/MJR
ADDRESS	LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF LLANTRISANT RD
FROM:	Pollution Control (Contaminated Land)
SUMMARY:	Responding to the matter of the sink holes reported by Cllr Mc Kerlich, Pollution Control advise as follows:

	<p>Whilst the site is not underlain by limestone, the southern part of the site would appear to be underlain by the Marginal Facies of the Mercia Mudstone Group (Llanishen Conglomerate). This is dolomitic and has a history of solution cavities. The potential presence for these may be the reason why sink holes have appeared, which has likely been exasperated over the recent months due to the amount of rainfall experienced. (It also explains the historic limekiln and small infilled quarries in/around the comprehensive school). A copy of the old Site Investigations on the school confirm this (1996) is referred to, with ESP's foundation recommendations including the need for reinforced foundations because of the potential for solution cavities.</p> <p>Pollution Control formally advise: <i>The recent information has identified the potential for subsurface voids within the underlying bedrock, in the area around the development site.</i></p> <p><i>The Developer has submitted site investigation data for drainage assessment only. Consequently this consisted of locally targeted shallow exploratory holes, predominantly into the superficial geology.</i></p> <p><i>The potential for voids at the development site could be more conclusively assessed by undertaking exploratory investigations extending into the bedrock and the geotechnical assessment of the potential risks and any measures required to ensure the safe development of the site.</i></p> <p><i>This could be ensured by the use of a condition. Alternatively, in addition to the 'contamination and unstable land' advisory notice, (R4) the Developer should be advised that records indicates a history of/ potential for subsurface voids in the area. In doing so, they are made aware of this in relation to their responsibilities regarding the safe development and occupancy of the site.</i></p>
<p>REMARKS:</p>	<p>The standard 'contamination and unstable land' advisory notice is already attached under recommendation 4. An additional advisory notice is attached to advise the developer of the potential for sub surface voids in the area, so that they are made aware of this in relation to their responsibilities regarding the safe development and occupancy of the site.</p> <p>The following additional advisory notice is recommended: RECOMMENDATION 15: That the Developer be advised</p>

	that records indicate the potential for subsurface voids in the area and that they should be fully aware of this in relation to their responsibilities regarding the safe development and occupancy of the site. For the avoidance of doubt, the responsibility for the safe development and occupancy of the site rests with the developer.
--	--

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 14/02157/MJR
ADDRESS	LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF LLANTRISANT RD
FROM:	Planning Division, Welsh Government
SUMMARY:	<p>Further to the call-in request received by Welsh Government (referred to in para 6.1 of the report), the Planning Division have provided the following update:</p> <p><i>We are currently awaiting confirmation from the Minister that he is content with our recommendation; we are unable to issue our decision letter until we are in receipt of this. I hope to be able to issue our decision letter prior to the committee but I cannot guarantee this.</i></p> <p><i>The committee can proceed to make a decision without the outcome of the call in request being known to them. The Welsh Ministers can consider call in at any time up until the final decision notice is issued. The call in request should not be considered as a third party representation as it is not a matter for the LPA, it is solely a matter for the Welsh Ministers to consider.</i></p>
REMARKS:	That this be noted.

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 14/02157/MJR
ADDRESS	LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF LLANTRISANT RD
FROM:	Cllr McKerlich
SUMMARY:	<p>Following last week's site visit a resident sent me this and I will make a brief reference to it when I speak tomorrow:</p> <p>You may want to view this recent BBC story about SUDS causing flooding in Devon. You'll note that the developer is Redrow.</p> <p>http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-devon-35318276</p>
REMARKS:	That this be noted.

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 14/02157/MJR
ADDRESS	LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF LLANTRISANT RD
FROM:	Natural Resources Wales
SUMMARY:	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the proposed conditions for application 14/02157/MJR Land North and South of Llantrisant Road, Cardiff. Whilst we welcome the inclusion of the conditions, we offer the following comments:</p> <p><u>Condition 19: Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)</u> We advise the condition to also refer to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. any pre-construction protected species surveys required (e.g. for bats – see below); ii. any protected species mitigation required to be implemented as part of the scheme; iii. the arrangements for ecological supervision during the development of the site and relevant contact details; iv. the arrangements for ecological site inductions for contractors working on site; and, v. what contractors should do in the event that protected species are encountered during the course of development works. <p><u>Condition 22: Works to tree T71</u> We refer you to our previous advice which confirmed the pre-construction survey should be an emergence survey. This is in accordance with published guidance. We therefore advise an amendment to the wording of this condition to remove the reference to an aerial tree climbing survey.</p> <p><u>Condition 23: Strategic Green Infrastructure Management Strategy</u> We advise section (c) is amended to include reference to contingencies and mechanisms to address any failure of any habitat enhancement or establishment, or protected species mitigation that might occur. (I.e. suggested re-wording '<i>Proposals for monitoring and reviewing the success of habitat enhancement and establishment, including contingencies and mechanisms to address any failure of habitat creation/enhancement or protected species mitigation that might occur, and details of the frequency and timing of reviews and updating the SGIMP</i>').</p> <p><u>Condition 31: Floodlighting</u> We note the proposed condition 31 relating to floodlighting.</p>

	<p>This condition must accord with condition 23(e), the lighting strategy for the site. We advise an amendment to condition 31 to read <i>'No floodlighting shall be installed on a Reserved Matters site until a floodlighting scheme that is compatible with the overall agreed lighting strategy for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.....'</i>.</p> <p>We hope you find these comments are helpful.</p>
<p>REMARKS:</p>	<p>Condition 18 (i) this matter is addressed by condition 22 requested by NRW (ii-v) these matters can be addressed under the scope of the existing condition, as worded. NRW will be consulted as part of the discharge of the condition and no change is recommended.</p> <p>Condition 22 – Reference to an aerial tree climbing survey has been agreed by the County Ecologist and no changes are therefore recommended.</p> <p>Condition 23 – Reference to contingencies and mechanisms to address failure of habitat enhancement / establishment can be addressed within the scope of the existing condition, as worded. No changes are recommended.</p> <p>Condition 31 – The need for a consistent approach is accepted and it is recommended that the condition 31 be amended as follows: FLOODLIGHTING No floodlighting shall be installed on a Reserved Matters site until a floodlighting scheme for that Reserved Matters site, that is compatible with the outline lighting strategy agreed under condition 23, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the scheme shall be implemented as approved. Reason: To avoid disturbance to sensitive receptors.</p>

PAGE NO. 135	APPLICATION NO. 14/02891/MJR
ADDRESS	CHURCHLANDS LAND NORTH AND EAST OF LISVANE, LISVANE, CARDIFF
FROM:	Case Officer
SUMMARY:	Recommendation 2 contains a drafting error.
REMARKS:	Amend Recommendation 2 to read: "This development falls within a radon affected area and may require basic radon protective measures, as recommended for the purposes of the Building Regulations 2000" (as requested by the Operational Manager, Environment (Contaminated Land))

PAGE NO. 135	APPLICATION NO. 14/02891/MJR
ADDRESS	CHURCHLANDS LAND NORTH AND EAST OF LISVANE, LISVANE, CARDIFF
FROM:	Case Officer
SUMMARY:	Correct roman numeral numbering to conditions 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 33, 34, and Recommendation 3
REMARKS:	13 (i) - (iii) 14 (i) - (iii) 16 (i) - (x) 19 (i) - (iii) 20 (i) - (ii) 33 (i) - (iii) 34 (i) - (ii) Recommendation 3: (i) - (iv)

PAGE NO. 135	APPLICATION NO. 14/02891/MJR
ADDRESS	CHURCHLANDS LAND NORTH AND EAST OF LISVANE, LISVANE, CARDIFF
FROM:	Cllr Walker
SUMMARY:	Submitted 6 no. photographs at the Committee Site Visit on 3rd February 2016 on behalf of local residents to illustrate parking and access problems during peak times at the junction of Pentwyn Road, Ty Draw Road and Corpus Christi

	High School.
REMARKS:	Refer to the consultation response of the Operational Manager, Transportation, in paragraphs 5.26 - 5.46 and the Transport analysis in paragraphs 8.81 - 8.101.

PAGE NO. 135	APPLICATION NO. 14/02891/MJR
ADDRESS	CHURCHLANDS LAND NORTH AND EAST OF LISVANE, LISVANE, CARDIFF
FROM:	Lisvane Cricket Club
SUMMARY:	<p>There is some provision for sports within the Churchlands application though these currently have the following deficiencies from a cricket perspective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The cricket pitch is too small. The ECB recommends a minimum size of 128.04m by 111.56m; (ii) Cricket requires perfectly dry conditions for matches to go ahead and the shared location within the site's Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) and the proximity to the Nant Glandulais is of concern; (iii) No car parking is shown on the plans; (iv) There is no club house or pavilion with changing facilities <p>They recommend a phased development to include a larger pitch, clubhouse and parking facilities within Churchlands. A later phase east of the Nant Glandulais (outside the Churchlands application) to include a second pitch, a bridge over the watercourse, and a scoreboard.</p> <p>They also highlight the possibility of a shared sports facility with Lisvane Panthers, and a shared indoor facility with Lisvane Panthers and Corpus Christi High School. Initial discussions have taken place.</p>
REMARKS:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The applicant has confirmed that the cricket pitch outfield area on the illustrative masterplan measures 92.36m by 97.56m (Junior U13 9 Pitch), taken from Sport England's "Comparative Sizes of Sports Pitches" which accords with the England and Wales Cricket Board; (ii) Refer to paragraph 8.43 where it is confirmed that formal recreation provision will be free from flooding

	<p>except in a 1 in 30 year event. The Operational Manager, Parks and Sports, is satisfied that the pitches will be usable, except in extreme events. No car parking to serve the formal recreation provision is shown on the illustrative plans.</p> <p>(iii) Refer to paragraph 8.47</p> <p>The applicant also responds: “Whilst the application in this respect is in outline, the pitch has been proposed as is throughout the entire Churchlands 1 application process (i.e. since September 2013) as well as the Churchlands 2 application process. If anything the pitch appears smaller in the Churchlands 1 masterplan (which is soon to be approved by the Minister) and to which Lisvane Cricket Club raised no objection. Lisvane Cricket Club’s suggestions would be outside the remit of the Churchlands 2 parameter plans that are being reported to Committee and have resulted from the significant discussions that have taken place during the last couple of years, and upon which the Council’s Parks Department based its recent formal response which confirmed that it is happy with the proposed POS provision within the development and, indeed, there is actually an over-provision of POS.”</p> <p>Refer to paragraphs 5.11 – 5.25 for the consultation response of the Operational Manager, Parks and Sports in which it is confirmed that the open space provision, including formal recreation, is acceptable to the Council (paragraph 5.13).</p> <p>Members are also respectfully advised that additional open space provision, including recreation provision, will be required as part of the future development of the wider Strategic Site. It may be that a suitable site for an adult cricket pitch can be accommodated within future developments.</p>
--	---

PAGE NO. 135	APPLICATION NO. 14/02891/MJR
ADDRESS	CHURCHLANDS LAND NORTH AND EAST OF LISVANE, LISVANE, CARDIFF
FROM:	Mr J Gilbert, 2 Pontfaen
SUMMARY:	<p>Pleased that there will be a Committee site meeting on 3rd February 2016.</p> <p>Refers to his previous representations regarding the</p>

	inadequacy of using the Pentwyn Road junction for the development. Recommends that the Committee Site Visit is rescheduled for 15:30 to enable Members to see the chaos in the surrounding roads and the gridlock experienced at busy times. It would be neglectful of Committee not to see what the residents and passing traffic have to endure.
REMARKS:	The Committee Site Visit took place on 3rd February 2016 from 13:45 and finished at approximately 15:30. Members observed the existing Pentwyn Road / Ty Draw Road junction at the beginning of the site visit for approximately 45 minutes.

PAGE NO. 135	APPLICATION NO. 14/02891/MJR
ADDRESS	CHURCHLANDS LAND NORTH AND EAST OF LISVANE, LISVANE, CARDIFF
FROM:	Ms Bunkhlao, 1 Sutton Grove, Pontprennau
SUMMARY:	<p>Observes that the Committee Site Visit is arranged for the quietest part of the day. In order for the committee to understand and fully appreciate the traffic issues this area currently experiences then any inspection should be held between either 8:00-09:00 or 15:30-17-00 weekdays.</p> <p>Expresses concern how traffic from the new development will be filtered into the town centre. The new junction at Ty Draw Road and Pentwyn Road is likely to become very congested and Cyncoed Road, which already has traffic calming measures, becoming a bottleneck. In addition, Hampton Crescent East, Hurford Place and Blackoak Road are likely to become rat runs.</p>
REMARKS:	<p>The Committee Site Visit took place on 3rd February 2016 from 13:45 and finished at approximately 15:30.</p> <p>Concerning traffic matters, refer to the consultation response of the Operational Manager, Transportation, in paragraphs 5.26 - 5.46 and the Transport analysis in paragraphs 8.81 - 8.101.</p>

PAGE NO. 135	APPLICATION NO. 14/02891/MJR
ADDRESS	CHURCHLANDS LAND NORTH AND EAST OF LISVANE, LISVANE, CARDIFF
FROM:	Mr Edmunds, 8 Pontfaen
SUMMARY:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The Minister is inclined to approve the Inspector's recommendation from the Planning Inquiry. The approval letter has not yet been issued. Strong representations by MPs, AMs and Councillors may cause a change of heart or impose strong conditions that would safeguard the interests of residents; (ii) The very bad highway infrastructure will blight property values; (iii) Highway access is inadequate and includes dangerous hazards that threaten safety; (iv) Location of the application as 'Land adjacent to Lisvane' is inaccurate; residents of Pontprennau would not be alerted; (v) Will cause traffic congestion with existing uses i.e. Corpus Christi High School, Spire Hospital and local supermarkets; (vi) Gwern Rhuddi Road will not cope and its chicanes increase the risk of accidents; (vii) Fidas Road cannot cope with existing traffic.
REMARKS:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The appeal against the first application, 'Churchlands 1', has not yet been determined by the Minister (ref: 13/02000/DCO). The application before Committee must be determined on its planning merits; (ii) The impact of the development upon property values is not a planning consideration; (iii) Refer to paragraphs 8.85 and 8.99; (iv) The location of development is described as 'Land North and East of Lisvane' and is considered to be a sufficiently accurate summary of the location. In addition to publicity by neighbour letters and press notices, 17 no. site notices were placed at key locations around the application site, including 3 no. notices at the southern junction and edge of Pontprennau; (v) Refer to paragraphs 5.26 - 5.46 and 8.81 - 8.101; (vi) Refer to paragraph 8.98; (vii) Refer to paragraphs 8.94 and 8.95.