



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, 19 MAY 2021, 1.30 PM

Please see attached Late Representation Schedule received in respect of applications to be determined at this Planning Committee

Late Reps Schedule – 19 May 2021

This page is intentionally left blank

LATE REPRESENTATIONS SCHEDULE
PLANNING COMMITTEE – 19TH MAY 2021

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 20/02634/MNR
ADDRESS:	LAND AT RHYDLAFAR DRIVE, ST FAGANS, CARDIFF
FROM:	Applicant's agent.
SUMMARY:	The advice that the agent has been given by Welsh Water is that the easement for the water main is 10m, not 20m. This is backed up by a copy of an email that they received from Welsh Water's Network Development Engineer stating that the easement zone can be assumed as 5m from the centre of the pipe, that the car park will not be directly over the main therefore will not affect it, and that the gabion wall can be placed at the edge of the easement zone. Welsh Water advise that the pipe should be accurately located by means of trial holes.
REMARKS:	Welsh Water's advice on the extent of the easement given to the agent appears to conflict with that provided to the Local Planning Authority. However, the proposed building would not be within either the 10m or 20m water main easement and, furthermore, this is an issue that is dealt with under other legislation, which is not over-ridden by planning permission.

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 20/02634/MNR
ADDRESS:	LAND AT RHYDLAFAR DRIVE, ST FAGANS, CARDIFF
FROM:	Applicant.
SUMMARY:	Request that ARP's drainage strategy 210201r1c be included as part of the approved documents listed in condition 2. Request that condition 4 be a pre-occupation condition rather than a pre-start condition, given the time involved.
REMARKS:	As Welsh Water have no objections to the drainage proposals and surface water drainage details will have to be approved separately under the SAB process, the drainage strategy can be included in the list of approved documents in condition 2. Provided the junction improvements are completed before occupation, there is no objection to the re-wording of condition 4 to allow the details to be provided after the commencement of development, given that the details also have to be agreed with the Highway Authority. There will be no difference in outcome.

It is recommended that conditions 2 and 4 be worded as follows:

2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

1766-90 – Location Plan.

1766-111 (REV N) – Proposed Site Plan.

1766-201 (REV M) – Proposed Floor Plans.

1766-202 - Roof Plan.

1766-300 (REV E) – Proposed Elevations.

1766-301 (REV B) – Proposed Visual.

Waste Management Strategy prepared by Peacock + Smith.

Transport Statement prepared by Asbri Transport document ref: T20.122.TA.D1

Ecological Technical Note prepared by Celtic Ecology dated 30/09/2020

Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy prepared by ARP Associates reference 2102/01r1c

Reason: To ensure satisfactory completion of the development and for the avoidance of doubt in line with the aims of Planning Policy Wales to promote an efficient planning system.

4) Details of the junction between the proposed access road and the highway, including pedestrian crossing facilities, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved details shall be implemented prior to the development being put into beneficial use.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and highway safety and to ensure that the use of the proposed development does not interfere with the safety and free flow of traffic passing along the highway abutting the site, in accordance with policy T5 of the Cardiff Local Development Plan.

The following standard recommendation can also be included on the decision notice with reference to surface water drainage:

RECOMMENDATION:

Since January 7th 2019, all new developments of more than 1 house, or where the construction area is 100 square metres or more, require sustainable drainage to manage on-site surface water. Surface water drainage systems must be designed and built in accordance with mandatory standards

	<p><i>for sustainable drainage published by the Welsh Ministers.</i></p> <p><i>These systems must be approved by the local authority acting in its SuDS Approving Body (SAB) role before construction work begins. The SAB will have a duty to adopt compliant systems so long as they are built and function in accordance with the approved proposals, including any SAB conditions of approval.</i></p> <p><i>It is recommended that the developer engage in consultation with the Cardiff Council SAB team as the determining SuDS Approval Body (SAB) in relation to their proposals for SuDS features. To arrange discussion regarding this please contact SAB@cardiff.gov.uk</i></p> <p><i>Further information is available on the Council's website: https://www.cardiff.gov.uk/ENG/resident/planning-and-suds/suds-approval-body/</i></p> <p><i>The legislation set by Welsh Government can be reviewed at: https://gweddill.gov.wales/topics/environmentcountryside/epq/flooding/drainage/</i></p>
--	--

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 20/02634/MNR
ADDRESS:	LAND AT RHYDLAFAR DRIVE, ST FAGANS, CARDIFF
FROM:	St Fagans Community Council
SUMMARY:	<p>1. The Community Council draw attention to The National Health (Wales) Act 2006 Chapter 2, Section 183 which states that Health Boards, when planning new services or changing existing ones, must consult with persons to whom those services are being or may be provided. Their view is that this has not happened and they are disappointed to find that the application is being recommended for approval when the Act has not been complied with.</p> <p>2. They also believe the application to be deficient in many respects, and are disappointed by some of the statements in the Planning Officer's report recommending approval. For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - paragraph 5.1.4 states that on-site parking has been agreed with the 'local community'. Who is this 'local community' as we do not know of anyone who has agreed anything regarding parking? - paragraph 5.1.6 appears to acknowledge that there will be parking issues by stating that restrictions will be introduced

	<p>on Rhydlafor Drive. This will simply move the problem to adjacent roads. The impact on residents of both Pentyrch and Rhydlafor are being ignored. Rhydlafor Drive is a pick up point for schools and 3 buses are regularly parked - despite the claims in the Transport Statement this does create visibility issues both for car drivers and pedestrians.</p> <p>- paragraph 8.11 states that the main issue is the lack of public transport links between Pentyrch and Rhydlafor. The lack of public transport is one of the issues, it is far from being the only issue.</p> <p>- paragraph 5.1.2 states that there will be a contribution of £15,000 towards a 'community transport vehicle' to counter the lack of public transport between Pentyrch and Rhydlafor. What will the actual cost be of this service, and what will the service actually provide? And for how long?</p> <p>3. This is a small site, with no room for future expansion. It is clear that the new developments in north west Cardiff are a significant factor in this application but it seems more to focus on the 'now', rather than the future.</p> <p>4. The Aarhus Convention requires that stakeholders are given the opportunity to express their views on issues with an environmental impact and their views must be taken into account. St Fagans CC believe that this applies to this application.</p> <p>- They support the comments and requests made by Rhydlafor residents.</p> <p>- They request that this application is rejected and that the applicant is required to undertake the consultation specified by the National Health (Wales) Act 2006'.</p>
<p>REMARKS:</p>	<p>1. This is not a material planning consideration. The requirements of the National Health (Wales) Act 2006 are entirely separate from planning legislation. The granting of planning permission would not enable the development to go ahead if there were some other legal impediment.</p> <p>2. With regard to the Officer's report : Paragraph 5.1.4 – The applicant's agent has advised that the on-site parking provision was agreed with local residents but has not stated who those residents might be. It is clear that many residents are concerned about on-street parking in the area: this paragraph in the report is intended to explain why the proposals include an over-provision of on-site car parking</p>

(55% higher than the maximum permitted by the adopted planning guidance) would which would normally be unacceptable.

Paragraph 5.1.6 –

The waiting restrictions on Rhydrafar Drive are required to protect the visibility splays at the new site access, in the interests of safety.

Paragraph 8.11 –

This paragraph does not imply that the lack of a public transport link is the only issue of concern. It is the most commonly cited reason for objecting to the application. All the issues raised by objectors are set out, and addressed, elsewhere in the report.

Paragraph 5.1.2 –

Details of the full cost of the service, what it will provide and how long it will operate for, are matters that will be considered by the Council at a later stage, taking into consideration the needs of the local population. At present, the Public and Passenger Transport Team are satisfied with the payment by the developer of £15,000 towards this service.

3. The proposed health centre is not intended to serve all the new residential developments in north west Cardiff – health care facilities are planned for, and are legally required to be provided, within the Plasdwr development. This centre may be used initially by residents of these areas until the new health care facilities are constructed.

4. The Aarhus Convention - officially known as the “Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters” – is not a material planning consideration. The Convention provides for:

- the right of everyone to receive environmental information that is held by public authorities. Applicants are entitled to obtain this information within one month of the request and without having to say why they require it. In addition, public authorities are obliged to actively disseminate environmental information in their possession;
- the right to participate in environmental decision-making. Arrangements are to be made by public authorities to enable the public affected to comment on proposals for projects affecting the environment, these comments to be taken into due account in decision-making, and information to be provided on the final decision and the reasons for it;
- the right to review procedures to challenge public decisions

	<p>that have been made without respecting the two aforementioned rights or environmental law in general.</p> <p>In this case, the public have been consulted on the planning application in accordance with the relevant legislation, and their views are being taken into consideration in the determination of the application. The final decision, and full details of how that decision was arrived at, will be in the public domain.</p> <p>Finally, the Council cannot reasonably refuse a planning application on the grounds that other legislation may not have been complied with, and cannot compel an applicant to undertake any consultation other than that required by planning legislation.</p>
--	---

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 20/02634/MNR
ADDRESS:	LAND AT RHYDLAFAR DRIVE, ST FAGANS, CARDIFF
FROM:	Representative of Pentyrch Save Our Surgery / Chairperson Pentyrch Neighbourhood Watch
SUMMARY:	<p>1. Current Location</p> <p>The current site of Pentyrch surgery, which is one of 6 shortlisted sites for a new surgery for Pentyrch (5 of which are all in Pentyrch), is within easy access e.g. walking or cycling, for all those who use the surgery and nearby privately owned Pharmacy. It is recognised that it needs upgrading and the Health Minister for Wales in 2017 made funding available to do precisely this whilst at the same time retaining the surgery in Pentyrch.</p> <p>2. New Location/Accessibility – Rhydlafer</p> <p>There is just one country lane which gives Pentyrch residents access to the proposed new site in the village of Rhydlafer some 2 miles away. The Planning Application in one of its many inaccuracies and false claims, clearly states travel between the two is without difficulty. The truth is that this long, dangerous, inclined country lane is a narrow, unlit, 60mph lane with 3 blind bends and no pavements. There is no public transport. As a consequence anyone who does not have ready access to a vehicle or, who is a non driver will be totally disenfranchised.</p> <p>The surgery also has patients that live in Gwaleod y Garth who can currently access the existing Pentyrch surgery via the 136 bus service. Closing the surgery and moving it to</p>

Rhydlafer would, even if a bus service were possible between Pentyrch and Rhydlafer, mean having to catch two buses each way.

The notion that a token £15,000 Section 106 funding referred to in section 5.1.2 on page 11 of the Planning Officer's Report, would even scratch the surface of solving these transport problems is fantasy land.

At present the vast majority of patients are residents of Pentyrch. What dedicated vehicle can be purchased / rented, driven, fuelled, insured, repaired and maintained for a one off payment of £15,000 and for how long? What happens when the £15,000 is spent? With 6 consulting rooms and other treatment rooms open 7 days per week from 08.00 to 18.30 likely patient numbers would be circa 372 patients per day. If £15,000 were used to fund a small bus operating on only (rounded up) week days the £15,000 funding over 2 years would be just £30 per day. This drops to just £12 per day over 5 years.

The impact on the road and environment would be totally contrary to the aims of Cardiff's LDP. In 2017 the Minister for Health in Wales made Pentyrch Surgery one of 19 health centres that would benefit from a £68m fund designed to make the needed improvements to our surgery whilst keeping the services in Pentyrch.

3. Parking

Whilst it is not clear, the Report suggests that there may be 10 new, extra parking places at the surgery. If true this would help, but what has not been recognised is that in addition to 6 x 10 minute appointments per hour per Consulting room plus, those attending treatment rooms or the Pharmacy, there will be circa 22 staff and other visitors. There is no plan in place that we are aware of to ensure all surgery staff can travel to and from work without using patient parking spaces or on road parking. This will inevitably mean a large increase in vehicles parked along a narrow road with 3 sweeping bends which already struggles to accommodate a regular bus stop service and three additional school buses per day.

Section 5.1.6 of the Planning Officer's Report refers to Section 106 funding of up to £5000 towards the advertising and installing of additional waiting restrictions to deter on road parking along Rhydlafer Drive. This will be wasted and ineffective expenditure unless there is constant monitoring of

parking and action taken against offenders. Any parking along the Drive will reduce road width and increase the likelihood of accidents. It will also increase the already high risk of collisions around the staggered junction of Llantrisant Road, Rhydlafer Drive and Crofft y Genau Road.

4. Cardiff LDP

The LDP already provides for a new health centre at Plas Dwr which is a short distance by vehicle from Rhydlafer along Llantrisant Road. The LDP also provides for the opening of another health centre on Crofft y Genau Road some 2 – 300 yards away from the proposed Rhydlafer health centre. Were all these health centres to open as intended, residents in those catchment areas would be awash with surgery facilities whilst those living in Pentyrch would lose theirs, this at a time when 25% of Pentyrch's population is over age 60.

There is nothing in the developer's plans that remotely reflect the aims and objectives of Cardiff's LDP especially in regard to Pentyrch residents. If the surgery doubles in capacity as the surgery hopes for, all the above problems will increase in a corresponding manner.

5. Consultations/Submissions from others

The Planning Officer's report rightly includes the strong representations from the two Community Councils who are affected by the Planning Application. Both Councils oppose the Application. There are also two residents groups namely one from Rhydlafer and Pentyrch Save Our Surgery (which is not referred to but made a detailed submission) opposing the Application. There has also been a petition opposing the Application and submissions from 98 individuals. Of the 19 individual submissions supporting the Application some are questionable as to their origin given their content. Very few if any relate to assessing a Planning Application. Most concerns over the existing surgery deemed to 'justify' a move to Rhydlafer, could all be easily accommodated by choosing any one of the other 5 shortlisted sites which are all in Pentyrch. These sites would not have been shortlisted had they not been viable options.

Mark Drakeford MS and Kevin Brennan MP both refer to the importance of consultation with the local population to minimise potential challenges for communities. It is a fact that there was zero contact/consultation with Pentyrch citizens before decisions were made to close Pentyrch and

	<p>to relocate it to Rhydlafer albeit retaining the name of Pentyrch Surgery. This is contrary to Section 183 of the NHS (Wales) Act 2006. This is a matter being pursued elsewhere.</p> <p>Our local County Councillor has made no attempt to make contact with residents in order to either discuss or assess the mood of citizens regarding the closing and relocation of our surgery and inevitable closure of our Pharmacy whereas. Pentyrch Neighbourhood Watch conducted an independent survey of citizens which in the space of just 10 days attracted over 200 responses 79% of which opposed the closure and move. It was this survey that led to the birth of Pentyrch Save Our Surgery.</p> <p>We urge you to reject the Planning Application before you. It is at the expense of the many that live in Pentyrch and Rhydlafer. It fails to address the requirements of the LDP. There are 5 other shortlisted options available which can achieve these ideals.</p>
<p>REMARKS:</p>	<p>1. Current Location</p> <p>This issue is addressed in the committee report. If the funding provided by the Health Minister for Wales in 2017 is earmarked specifically for a surgery in Pentyrch village itself then that is presumably where it will have to be spent. This is not a material planning consideration.</p> <p>2. New Location/Accessibility – Rhydlafer</p> <p>The issue of the road between Pentyrch and Rhydlafer is discussed in the committee report and subsequent responses to late representations. The committee report does not state that ‘travel between the two is without difficulty’.</p> <p>It is intended that the community transport service (described elsewhere) will also link to Gwaelod Y Garth. The matter of the S106 contribution is discussed in the committee report and subsequent responses to other late representations.</p> <p>3. Parking</p> <p>It is made clear in the report and on the plans that the development will provide 28 car parking spaces. The ‘10 additional spaces’ refers to the fact that there are 10 more spaces than permitted by the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p>

	<p>Parking issues are fully addressed in the committee report and subsequent responses to other late representations. It cannot be assumed that people will ignore the waiting restrictions. Matters of highway safety are discussed elsewhere.</p> <p>4. Cardiff LDP</p> <p>The proposals for a healthcare facility at Plasdwr are discussed elsewhere in the committee report and late representations. There are no proposals for a new health centre on Crofft-y-Genau Road.</p> <p>5. Consultations/Submissions from others</p> <p>The Rhydlafer Residents' Group is specifically mentioned in section 7 of the committee report and all the points made by 'Pentyrch Save Our Surgery' are included in the summary of objections.</p> <p>Regarding the submissions in support of the application, these have been received in response to public notification of the application, just as the objections have, and are analysed in the report in the same way.</p> <p>The inability of the Council to insist that a different shortlisted site is chosen for the application is discussed in the committee report. The local planning authority has to consider the proposals that are before it, whether or not there are other 'viable options'.</p> <p>The issue of consultation with the local community is discussed elsewhere. The Council has no powers to prevent the Health Board closing a surgery. This is not a material planning consideration.</p>
--	--

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 20/02634/MNR
ADDRESS:	LAND AT RHYDLAFAR DRIVE, ST FAGANS, CARDIFF
FROM:	Rhydlafer Residents Group.
SUMMARY:	Letter summarising the ongoing concerns and objections of the Rhydlafer Residents Group. Reproduced in full below:
	<p>Dear Planning Committee Member,</p> <p>This letter summarises the ongoing concerns and objections of the Rhydlafer Residents Group to the proposed relocation of Pentyrch surgery to Rhydlafer Drive (Application</p>

20/02634/MNR). Section 7.1 of the planning officers report purports to summarise public objection to the proposals. Local residents, however, deem it to be an inadequate representation of the concerns and difficulties which will be created by this development. We will give a three-minute oral representation at the Planning Committee, but this letter should be read in conjunction with such representations.

Summary of concerns/ objections

1. Rhydlafar is simply the wrong location to serve Pentyrch residents:

- Pedestrian access and cycling to the proposed site is a pipe dream. To reach the site from Pentyrch, one must travel 2 miles along Church Road, a long, steep and narrow country lane with several blind bends, no lighting, no pavements and no speed restrictions.
- There is no public transport between Pentyrch and Rhydlafar. Given the staggered nature of GP appointments, this cannot be rectified on a long-term basis by the provision of £15,000 Section 106 monies to provide public transport to Pentyrch patients. This figure will be insufficient for 12 months, let alone for the long-term. How will any such bus link be operated? How long will unwell patients have to wait for collection or return? What happens after the £15,000 is spent? There will be no public transport, and no ability to walk or cycle along Church Road. It is therefore naïve to believe that Pentyrch patients will be able to access their surgery other than by car. For the planning officer to state that the provision of a meagre £15,000 resolves the problem is intellectually dishonest. As the planning committee, we look to you to ask Ms Howard to explain this fundamental flaw in her analysis.

2. The planning officer is under the impression (para 8.3.1) that the site will be easily accessible for many other potential patients; this again is untrue.

- The residents of Creigiau, Radyr, Taffs Well and Danescourt are predominately patients at the surgeries already located in their own villages, and are happy with their GPs.
- Rhydlafar residents are registered with the Radyr GP and do not intend to change.
- In reality, the proposed surgery is an overspill surgery for the new Plasdwr residents. But health provision for Plasdwr was fully considered as part of the Plas Dwr planning application and resulted in agreement for the provision of 5,100 m² of community and health care facilities which was sufficient to meet the requirements of the council and the UHB. This means that there is no additional requirement for the Rhydlafar site.
- For the planning officer to assert easy accessibility of the

proposed surgery for the residents of Plasdwr is a misrepresentation of the truth. The current housing build is predominantly at the Pentrabane and Radyr end of Plasdwr. It will be some years before that development reaches the northwest and western end of the development and by this time the medical facilities within Plasdwr will be established.

- Further, to walk from the new housing developments to the site would entail an unenviable walk along the very busy Llantrisant Road, with its narrow, non-continuous pavements, requiring pedestrians to cross Llantrisant Road at its most dangerous stretch, the Croft y Gennau junction, which was the site of yet another serious accident, when a car burst in to flames on the 23rd April 2021.

3. The only real way of accessing the proposed surgery is by car, not by foot, not by bike nor by public transport. This will create unacceptable parking problems.

- Parking and road safety will inevitably become a daily hazard for local residents and for those who wish to use the surgery. The proposed site is in a wholly residential rural area, without even walking access to a shop. The area consists of only 150 residential homes and a small building used as a private day nursery. This community is an isolated one - to purchase a pint of milk, residents must drive to Radyr or Pentyrch or Creigiau.
- The developers own Transport Statement shows that directly comparable medical centres generate parking demand for 40 vehicles at any one time. The current parking provision for this development is just 28, 3 of which are for disabled users and 3 are blocked parking bays for staff use. In reality, this leaves 22 bays for patients and the pharmacy. How many bays will be used by doctors, nurses, support staff and the pharmacy when the proposed development has 6 consulting rooms and 2 treatment rooms? The reality is that the site is so isolated that most staff will have to drive to work. This leaves few spaces (perhaps 14?) for patient and pharmacy use.
- It is inevitable that this site WILL result in an excess parking problem on surrounding residential roads. These residential roads were never designed for overspill parking. Each house was purpose built with a minimum of 2 parking spaces. This could lead to roads being inaccessible, particularly for delivery and emergency vehicles and will lead to unfair frustration for residents. This issue has been completely ignored by the planning officer and she makes no provision to deal with this problem.

4. The proposed site will lead to an inevitable increase in vehicular access to the site resulting in a greater danger for pedestrians and school children.

- Every day 3 school buses are required to transport children to and from school. Around 30-40 children, aged 11-17, must cross Rhydlafer Drive to access school transport. Even if a pedestrian crossing is sited on Rhydlafer Drive it is difficult to imagine where this can be safely located.

5. The proposed development does not fit with current planning policy. We contend that the development potentially does NOT meet planning policy and potentially breaches statutory provision. We invite you to postpone this decision to enable the planning officer to re-consider the issues we raise. To summarise some of the potential breaches:

- The primary purpose of the Welsh Government document “Planning Policy Wales” (Feb 2021) is to ensure that the planning system contributes towards the delivery of sustainable development, a principle embodied in the Future Generations Act 2015. Sustainable development means that a body MUST act in a manner which ensures that the needs of the present are met, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs
- This site will NOT be accessible by foot, bike or public transport for the community it is said to serve. Whilst the planning officer asserts that residents of Plasdwr will be able to access the surgery by foot or bike she makes no reference to the nature of the road they will need to use, the distances involved, its 10% gradient, or the lack of cycle paths. It is wholly unrealistic to say that the sick, infirm, the elderly or those with children will be able to access this surgery other than by private car. It now appears to be conceded that Pentyrch residents will be unable to access their own surgery other than by driving to it.
- Section 2 PPW sets out clearly that sustainable places are the goal of the land use planning system. Placemaking maximises well-being and creates sustainable places. Placemaking Wales has been wholly disregarded.
- Para 2.22 sets out that in a post-Covid world, the well-being of people is key. Para 2.23 specifically confirms that Building Better Places must prioritise placemaking, decarbonisation and well-being. This development achieves none of these 3 goals. It is not in keeping with PPW strategic placemaking para 3.42 and accessibility para 3.49
- The development fails to meet the requirements set by PPW at para 3.5- 3.7 for access and inclusivity and

disregards the provision of movement set out at para 3.12; good design is about avoiding the creation of car-based developments. This development with its inherent transport problems pays no heed to the statutory provisions of the Environmental Wales Act 2016. It will increase traffic and emissions and negatively affect the health and well-being of residents.

- It is wholly inconsistent with Wales Transport Strategy 2021 and the requirement for planning applications to meet Welsh Government requirements to use the sustainable transport hierarchy (para 4.1.2).
- No consideration has been given as to how this proposed development meets the requirements of the Active Travel Wales Act 2013 despite the crucial role of planning in delivering this act (para 4.1.29 and 4.1.32).

Given these concerning potential breaches of planning policy and the potential breaches of statutory provision, we ask you to defer the decision to enable the planning officer to reconsider the issues we raise, which we will happily set out in a comprehensive document.

6. Further Conditions

Should the committee accept the recommendations of the planning officer and approve this proposed site, despite the strongly held objections of the public, residents feel very strongly that the planning officer's conditions of planning are wholly insufficient and should be amended to include the following provisions:

1. **Restricted Parking or Restricted Access to Residential roads.** To ameliorate residential parking problems, there should be "residents only parking" or "residents only access" to both sides of the Rhydlafar estate, with further consideration being given to having a "gated" access area for the areas of Ffordd Gwern /Clos St Catwg as these roads will be some of the most affected by overspill parking, as they are located closest to the site. Ffordd Gwern/Clos St Catwg consists of only 17 houses and so overspill parking will be overwhelming for such two such small cul -de- sacs.
2. **Pull-In Lay-bys for Buses.** Public and school buses currently park on Rhydlafar Drive (alongside numbers 12 and 9 Ffordd Gwern), on a narrow stretch of road and close to a bend. This is also the closest point to the proposed access road for the surgery. As the safety of children is of the highest concern, we insist that the bus stop is moved to the bottom end of Rhydlafar Drive nearer Llantrisant Road on the opposite side of the road to the

	<p>surgery. This will mean that buses will stop near the post box, close to the steps to the park. There is sufficient room in that area for the provision of two bus “pull-in lay-bys”. This will mean that children will not have to cross Rhydlafar Drive to access the buses and it will alleviate potential hazards for surgery patients. There are issues with visibility from the site and the planning officer has had to request assistance for the splay. The bus being moved to the opposite side of the road near the post box will improve this further.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Surgery parking should be increased to 40 to allow for optimum parking on site. 4. Opening hours of the surgery. As this is in a wholly residential area the operating hours of the facility should be limited to Monday to Friday, not 7 days per week, as is currently suggested. The operating hours should not be greater than standard GP surgery hours namely 8 am – 6.00 pm. 5. Planted screening of high fences. It is proposed that the building should be surrounded by a 2.4-metre-high fence. We would ask that this should be tree lined on the outside to lessen the intrusion of the building for residents at such a prominent site, and to fit in with its residential, rural surroundings. We would also seek confirmation that secure fencing will run alongside the current tree line next to Ffordd Gwern so that the site is secure on that boundary. 6. Construction management plan. During site development, building operations including deliveries should only take place between Monday and Friday and between the hours of 8 am and 4 pm. No lorries, construction vehicles or private vehicles used by site workers should be allowed to park on any Rhydlafar residential roads. There should be daily cleaning of Rhydlafar Drive and all steps should be taken to minimise noise and disruption to residents. <p>Yours faithfully Catherine Heyworth On behalf of the Rhydlafar Residents Group</p>
REMARKS:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The issue of the location of the proposed health centre is discussed in the officer’s report. The health centre is not a simple replacement for the Pentyrch surgery; it will serve the whole of the northern section of the Practice area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The issue of walking and cycling to/from Pentyrch is addressed in the report. It is considered that for some people access by cycle or on foot would be acceptable, but not for the majority of patients. For this reason the Council’s Transport officers have negotiated a contribution towards a community transport service. - The £15,000 contribution from the developer is not intended to finance the whole transport service – it is a

	<p>contribution towards it. It will be for the Council to provide further funding and organisation. The Public and Passenger Transport Team are satisfied with this contribution. The issue of staggered appointment times and the possibility of having to wait for a bus would be the same for any patient having to access any surgery by public transport.</p> <p>2. The health centre will be accessible from other areas via the bus routes and, in the future, the new cycle and pedestrian facilities along Llantrisant Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The objector assumes that all residents of these areas are happy with their GPs . - The objector assumes that Rhydlafar residents would not want to change to the new surgery despite it's being within easy walking distance, meaning that they would not have to drive to Radyr or wait for a bus. - The proposed facility is not an 'overspill' for Plasdwr. New residents will be able to use it and may choose to do so, pending the provision of the new and much larger facilities in Plasdwr. A healthcare facility is to be provided in Phase 2B of the Plasdwr development, and must be completed before the occupation of more than 4,750 dwellings on that site. The UHB has identified a need for a replacement surgery for the northern section of the Practice area. - Housing is also being built closer to Rhydlafar (phase 1 of the Plasdwr development) as well as further west along Llantrisant Road. The proposed health centre, if approved, will not be completed until January 2023 (assumed completion date). - Pedestrian and cycle facilities, as well as bus services, along Llantrisant Road are being improved as part of the new housing developments. The Crofft-y Genau Road junction is to be improved (this will be delivered prior to the occupation of the 3000th dwelling within the Plasdwr development) and will include a pedestrian crossing, and as part of the Plasdwr planning consent, regular monitoring of traffic at this junction has to be undertaken, until 5 years after final occupation. <p>3. Parking and road safety issues are discussed in the committee report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highways and Transportation officers have raised no objections on highway safety or parking grounds. - The development provides more off-street parking spaces than would normally be permitted, exceeding the maximum set out in the Council's adopted parking standards by 55%. - The houses in Rhydlafar have their own off-street
--	--

	<p>parking facilities in the form of drives and garages. Despite this, cars are frequently parked on the highway in front of the houses. This has not so far led to the roads becoming 'inaccessible'. Similarly, the cars of visitors to the health centre parked on the public highway would not cause the roads to become inaccessible. If any vehicle, being that of a resident or a visitor, is parked in such a way as to block access or cause a hazard, this is an offence under Highways legislation and can be dealt with appropriately.</p> <p>4. Highways and Transportation officers have raised no concerns regarding pedestrian safety. There will not be such a large increase in traffic that it would become any more hazardous to cross the road than at present. Also, waiting restrictions will be introduced to Rhydlafer Drive to ensure that vehicles do not interfere with visibility.</p> <p>5. The proposal is considered to accord with current planning policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The facility is intended to serve the northern part of the UHB Practice area and to provide services in that area that are at present only available at other surgeries outside the immediate area or at a hospital, to which patients have to travel some distance. Clearly it would not be possible for a facility with such a wide catchment area to be fully accessible by foot, bike or public transport to every resident of that area. It will be accessible to many by walking, cycling and public transport. It will not only be used by those travelling along the lane from Pentyrch. For some – for example the residents of Rhydlafer – it will be more accessible than current health facilities and will provide a wider range of services. - Placemaking has not been 'wholly disregarded'. The proposed development has been considered in relation to the aspects of Placemaking set out in PPW, e.g. the proposed development will provide enhanced healthcare services within the surrounding community, represents an efficient use of land etc. It will reduce the need to travel for some in the community whilst increasing it for others, therefore a balanced view has to be taken. In this case, the benefits of the development are considered to outweigh the fact that some people will have further to travel to access their GP surgery. - The proposed development is intended to improve people's well-being. Accessibility and placemaking are addressed elsewhere in the report. - The development is not 'car-based', although it does provide an excess of car parking provision (this is
--	---

	<p>discussed elsewhere). The development is not considered to have 'inherent transport problems' and it will not result in an unacceptable increase in traffic and emissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The development will be accessible to many by walking, cycling and public transport. It should be noted that the current surgery in Pentyrch is not accessible by these means to many residents in the Practice area. A balanced view has to be taken on this issue. - Active travel has been considered and this issue is discussed in the report, although it does not specifically refer to the Active Travel Act itself. <p>6. The proposed conditions are considered to be adequate. It must be noted that planning conditions are required to be (i) necessary; (ii) relevant to planning; (iii) relevant to the development to be permitted; (iv) enforceable; (v) precise; and (vi) reasonable in all other respects.</p> <p>With regard to the conditions suggested by the objectors -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Restricted Parking or Restricted Access to Residential roads. A condition restricting parking or access to other roads is not considered necessary or reasonable. There is no evidence that such a condition is required. Highways and Transportation officers have not raised any concerns in this regard. 2. Pull-In Lay-bys for Buses. Again, such a condition is not considered necessary or reasonable. There is no evidence that such a condition is required. Highways and Transportation officers have not raised any concerns in this regard. The visibility splays are acceptable and the provision of waiting restrictions will ensure that they remain so. 3. Surgery parking should be increased to 40 to allow for optimum parking on site. The development is already proposing parking above the Council's adopted standards and such a condition is not considered reasonable or necessary. 4. Opening hours of the surgery. The surgery will not be so close to existing houses or generate so much noise and disturbance that such a condition could be regarded as reasonable or necessary. 5. Planted screening of high fences. No high fences are shown on the submitted plans. A 2.4m
--	--

high fence is specified in the landscaping schedule but this relates to a protective fence erected temporarily around trees to protect them from construction works. A permanent fence of this height would require separate planning permission. Part of the site will be enclosed by a new hedge. If Members wish to add a condition to the planning permission requiring the approval of details of boundary structures, this would be acceptable. The following is suggested:

Prior to the commencement of development, details of the means of site enclosure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The means of site enclosure shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to the development being put into beneficial use.

Reason: To ensure that the amenities of the area are protected, in accordance with policy KP5 of the Cardiff Local Development Plan.

6. Construction management plan.

A condition requiring a Construction Management Plan has not been requested by highways or pollution control officers. A condition as suggested by the objectors would be unreasonable, unnecessary and unenforceable: noise from construction sites is already controlled under Pollution Control legislation, the depositing of materials on the highway is controlled under highways legislation, it would not be lawful to prevent vehicles being parked on any part of the public highway (unless they were parked dangerously or caused an obstruction) and if a condition restricting deliveries to the site to certain times were imposed, any vehicle arriving before that time could simply park up (on the public highway) and wait until the designated delivery time. Also, restricting the hours of construction as suggested would simply prolong the construction period. This would not achieve the objectors' aims.

Construction Management Schemes can be required where considered necessary but would not cover the issues of noise or parking on a public highway for the reasons given above. If Members are minded to approve the application and consider a construction management condition appropriate, the following is suggested:

No development shall commence until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction

	<p><i>period. The statement shall provide for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;</i> <i>ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;</i> <i>iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;</i> <i>iv) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding, including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;</i> <i>v) wheel washing facilities;</i> <i>vi) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during demolition and construction; and</i> <i>vii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.</i> <p><i>Reason: In the interests of public amenity, in accordance with policy EN13 of the Cardiff Local Development Plan.</i></p> <p>A sixth recommendation could also be added to the decision notice, i.e. the standard recommendation often added to remind developers of their obligations, as follows:</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION 6: To protect the amenities of occupiers of other premises in the vicinity attention is drawn to the provisions of Section 60 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 in relation to the control of noise from demolition and construction activities. Further to this the applicant is advised that no noise audible outside the site boundary adjacent to the curtilage of residential property shall be created by construction activities in respect of the implementation of this consent outside the hours of 0800-1800 hours Mondays to Fridays and 0800 - 1300 hours on Saturdays or at any time on Sunday or public holidays. The applicant is also advised to seek approval for any proposed piling operations.</i></p>
--	--

PAGE NO. 52	APPLICATION NO. 21/00497/MNR
ADDRESS:	LLANDAFF PRIMARY CARETAKERS HOUSE, 28 HENDRE CLOSE, LLANDAFF, CARDIFF
FROM:	Applicant.
SUMMARY:	<p>Information on access to the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school gates are opened on both the Cardiff Road and Hendre Close sides at 5.30am by the caretaker and closed at 6.00pm. Staff for the school and Busy Bees are able to access the school grounds from either side. • The school has two breakfast clubs, one which is run

by the Council and starts at 8.30am, and the other is provided on school site by Busy Bees. The latter is for parents needing childcare and starts at 7.50am. This time ties in with parents dropping siblings off to Busy Bees nursery, presently in place at the Scout Hall.

- Busy Bees has provided an After School Care service on the school site for 10 years, and a breakfast club provision on the school site for three years.

Movement of people:


- Nursery and School staff and parents can arrive, leave and drop off from either entrance between 5.30am to 9.15am, and 3.00pm to 6.00pm.
- Between 9.15am and 3.00pm, the gates to the school are locked for the safeguarding of the children.
- The nursery manager has a security access fob for accessing the school and emergency use during these times, and does so when required via intercom access.
- Parents needing access during school times (to collect a poorly child for example) would presently access on foot from Cardiff Road side. Should this proposal be approved and Busy Bees were to be located in the caretaker's house, parents would similarly access on foot via Hendre Close.
- Furthermore, beyond the driveway outside the caretaker's house is the large staff parking area for school staff, which is accessible all day long to allow teachers and visitors, deliveries etc. at any point, so could be utilised but is not intended to be – the point being that in any event, there would not be a need to park in Hendre Close for any reason.
- Presently, Busy Bees has fewer than five children arriving or leaving at lunchtime, and this is anticipated to be even fewer with the proposed move, as the appeal for parents will be that the premises is open later, so they will be able to make use of the full day childcare. This would mean that Busy Bees' service as a pre-school nursery will be catering primarily for children requiring full day's care.

Format of Busy Bees nursery:

- Busy Bees is a pre-school day nursery, different to other traditional day nurseries who operate for younger children. It acts as a quasi-preschool to Llandaff City Primary, in the absence of the service being available at the main school. Busy Bees prepares children for school, and mirrors lots of things the school does, to make a smooth transition for

	<p>children and their parents when moving to the next stage of their education. Parents therefore do not use Busy Bees as a creche facility, where one would expect children to be dropped off/picked up at different points throughout the day. Instead, Busy Bees has a start and finish time like school – children either arrive for breakfast, or at 9.00am for registration. They all depart together at home time, as per the school, and have done so for the past five years without causing any traffic issue, with parents arriving on foot to collect from both sides of the school. Many parents then go through the gate to collect brothers and sisters from Llandaff City Primary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children staying after 3.00pm will be collected alongside siblings at school, where the Busy Bees after school service has been available for 10 years, running until 5.30pm, and at one point with up to 70 children on site. • Busy Bees has a licence to operate from the school to provide out of school care on site for children attending Llandaff City Primary, they work together for the safety of the children. <p>Evidence of agreement with School:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of Busy Bees’ lease agreement are provided as evidence of longstanding and present legal arrangements to access the school and use its premises. • The documents include plans which show that parents at present are walking past the caretaker’s house to collect from the school buildings outside of normal school opening hours. This should clearly show how stopping to collect younger children from the caretaker’s house is not going to result in an obvious increase in traffic (vehicular or pedestrian).
<p>REMARKS:</p>	<p>The documents demonstrate the applicant’s legal agreement with the school to occupy parts of the school premises at certain times of day during school term times, to use the school playing fields and playground when not in use by the school and to use the school grounds for access and egress.</p> <p>The submitted evidence is considered to support the contention that the proposed use of the former caretaker’s house as a nursery will not result in an unacceptable increase in traffic in the streets around Hendre Close.</p>

PAGE NO. 52	APPLICATION NO. 21/00497/MNR
ADDRESS:	LLANDAFF PRIMARY CARETAKERS HOUSE, 28 HENDRE CLOSE, LLANDAFF, CARDIFF
FROM:	Councillor Philippa Hill-John
SUMMARY:	<p>Councillor Hill-John has asked for the following statement to be considered as she is unable to attend the Committee meeting.</p> <p>Statement:</p> <p>We recognise some residents want to see the Nursery application go ahead and we accept the reasons put forward for the Nursery to relocate to the Caretakers House within the school.</p> <p>We are not against the nursery relocating to the Caretakers House, however residents have asked us to highlight the ongoing issues they have to endure of nuisance parking in the area at drop off and pick up times.</p> <p>At our request Highways have put in measures to mitigate against this and I enclose a photograph of the mitigation measures with 40 bollards installed to stop illegal parking on top of the roundabout.</p> <p>But the 33 residents of Vaughan Avenue who have signed the petition against the application, who feel they will be the most affected by the granting of the application. They have asked us to highlight that despite the bollards being installed, there are still ongoing parking issues that exist.</p> <p>Parents collecting and dropping off their children still park on the inner perimeter of the roundabout which highways have said is dangerous. The police have had to be contacted on a number of occasions to warn drivers.</p> <p>Previous applications have been refused on impacts on the highway by the planning committee in the past, which was upheld by the planning inspectorate.</p> <p>We would be grateful if these parking issues could be considered when determining the application.</p> <p>Photograph:</p>

	
REMARKS:	Noted. Parking issues are considered in the officer's report.

PAGE NO. 88	APPLICATION NO. 21/00321/MNR
ADDRESS:	FORMER MORRISONS, 113 BRYNHEULOG, PENTWYN, CARDIFF
FROM:	Head of Planning
SUMMARY:	<p>In condition 2 edp6705-d0001e page 1 of 2 and page 2 of 2 should read:</p> <p>Detailed Soft Landscape Plan 'edp6705-d001' revision F',</p>
REMARKS:	That condition 2 be amended accordingly.

This page is intentionally left blank