

## **APPENDIX B CONSULTATION RESULTS**

### Friends of Forest Farm

With regard to the proposed new Public Right of Way (going between points K, X & I as shown on the Public Rights of Way – Section 257 Application drawing within the 'Velindre Statement of Reason' document sent by you, and as shown as between points D, H & I on the 'S257 Whitchurch Footpaths Map low res' document sent by you:

**It must be ensured that the Public Right of Way is kept at a distance away from the green buffer zone which is supposed to be kept and maintained between the top of Longwood SSSI and the Velindre Cancer Centre site.**

We would be grateful if you will take whatever formal steps are necessary to ensure this.

### Additional Friends of Forest Farm Comments relating to the wider site

Whilst, we understand this is only initially for a limited amount of time we are concerned of the impact on the SSSI and the PROW through this area as the projects developes.

These pathways are narrow, on a steep bank and conditions are dry at the moment due to the present drought conditions.

Since lock down more people have discovered Forest Farm and use of these footpaths.

However, they will soon become muddy and dangerous with increased footfall as autumn and winter rains arrive.

Added to this diversion urgent engineering work to the bottom of the canal is due to in the near future closing the towpath. This will also add to the footfall through the SSSI.

We have already requested that Velindre provide a temporary footpath alongside the SSSI on their land for the duration of the build.

In the short term a diversion of the PROW will have minimal impact on the SSSI due to the present underfoot conditions

We however, we do not feel that this a medium to long term solution as the project develops.

The SSSI is a fragile environment and increased footfall especially in winter months will damage the area. Also, the footpath would become dangerous due to the risk of falling which would result in it having to be closed.

Therefore, we request that the relevant council department instruct Velindre to provide a temporary footpath alongside the SSSI on their land until the building of the new hospital is complete.

## PACT Comments

Below is my reply to the statutory Consultee letters and supporting documents relating to the Section 257 Town & Country Planning Act Application for Whitchurch Footpaths 106, 107 & 108.

*The application for the diversion of the public right of ways is premature because , currently only outline planning has been granted for the area effected and surely legally the planning authority **must** be satisfied that the diversions are necessary to enable the development before granting them.*

*Until further planning permission has been applied for and granted , it will not be possible for the planning authority to know whether they are actually necessary because;*

*1.The buildings shown on the outline application are liable to change.*

## Mr Rock S53 Applicant Comments (requested to be informed)

The application is premature because, currently only **outline** planning permission has been granted for the area affected. (Full planning permission has been granted for bridges and a site access road but those do not affect the network of PRoWs which are the subject of this application.)

Legally the planning authority must be satisfied that the diversions are **necessary** to enable development before granting them. Until full planning permission has been applied for and granted, it will not be possible for the planning authority to know whether they are indeed necessary because:

1. The buildings shown on the outline application are liable to change. (Indeed one of this buildings shown on the outline application stands on top of the proposed PRoW diversion!)
2. The full planning application has not yet been submitted and may undergo significant change prior to approval. It would be wasteful of public resources to consider diversions now and then do that all over again once full planning permission has been granted.
3. I understand that a design partner has now been chosen and some artist's impressions of the proposed buildings and rough layouts have been made public. The few details they show are inconsistent with the proposal. In particular, they do not show the proposed PRoW diversions K-I-J-G at all.

I note that RoW Circular 1/09 – Section 7 states "Most outline planning applications do not contain sufficient information to enable the effect on any right of way to be assessed" and this is patently true in this case.

To reiterate, there is currently **no way** that the general public, council's the PRoW team or the Planning Committee can tell from the outline planning permission whether the proposed diversions would be necessary so the proposals should not be considered at this time because the applicant cannot demonstrate that they meet the legal test of necessity.