

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE  
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICES, ANGEL STREET, BRIDGEND  
ON FRIDAY, 24 JUNE 2011 AT 2.00PM

Present:

Councillor M Gregory - Chairperson

Councillors

R D L Burns  
M W Butcher  
N Clarke  
E Dodd  
C E Hughes

Councillors

C J James  
A Jones  
M Lewis  
R Shepherd

Councillors

J C Spanswick  
G Thomas  
M Thomas  
K J Watts

Councillors

C Westwood  
H M Williams  
M Winter  
R E Young

Officers:

D Llewellyn - Group Manager Development  
D C Davies - Development Control Manager  
J Jenkins - Team Leader (East)  
C Flower - Team Leader Technical Support  
N Moore - Team Leader Policy and Development  
J Duddridge - Group Manager Transportation  
P Stanton - Public Protection Officer  
P Gavigan - Principal Solicitor  
T Bodys - Solicitor  
G P Jones - Democratic Services Manager (Electronic Back-up)  
M A Galvin - Senior Democratic Services Officer - Committees

546 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

547 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor R D L Burns - P/08/1114/OUT - Councillor Burns declared a personal interest as a member of Bridgend Town Council but who takes no part in the consideration of planning applications. Councillor Burns added, that he could possibly indirectly be affected by transportation issues as a result of the development due to living in close proximity to it.

Councillor M Lewis - P/08/1114/OUT - Councillor Lewis declared a personal interest as a member of Bridgend Town Council but who takes no part in the consideration of planning applications.

Councillors R E Young confirmed that whilst observations had been given on the application in the form of a letter submitted to the Local Planning Authority by the Bridgend Branch Labour Party, he as a member of this party had taken no part in the meeting that had discussed the proposal.

Councillor J C Spanswick added that this letter was not from the Bridgend Labour Party Constituency Group, only from the Bridgend Branch of the Constituency of

which only Councillor Young was a member and not other Labour members of the Development Control Committee.

548 PUBLIC SPEAKERS

The Chairperson announced that the following public speakers would address the Committee, and speak upon the undermentioned application:-

<u>Planning Application</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Name</u>
P/08/1114/OUT	Island Farm Site, Bridgend	Cllr. E Hughes, Ward Member
P/08/1114/OUT	Island Farm Site, Bridgend	Cllr. C A Green, Ward Member
P/08/1114/OUT	Island Farm Site, Bridgend	Cllr. C Lewis, Mayor, Bridgend Town Council
P/08/1114/OUT	Island Farm Site, Bridgend	Mr G Bryan, Clerk to Merthyr Mawr, Community Council
P/08/1114/OUT	Island Farm Site, Bridgend	Mr K Warren, Asbri Planning on behalf of the objectors
P/08/1114/OUT	Island Farm Site, Bridgend	Mr N Hegarty (applicant)
P/08/1114/OUT	Island Farm Site, Bridgend	Mr C Potts (applicant's agent)

549 AMENDMENT SHEET

The Chairperson announced that he had accepted the Development Control Committee Amendment Sheet as a late item, in accordance with Part 4 (Paragraph 4) of the Council Procedure Rules, in order to allow for the Committee to consider necessary modifications to the Committee report, to take account of any late representations and revisions that required to be accommodated.

550 PLANNING APPLICATION P/08/1114/OUT - ISLAND FARM, BRIDGEND NEW DEVELOPMENT (MIXED USE-PORT/LEISURE/COMMERCIAL/OFFICES)

After the public speakers had addressed Committee, the Group Manager Development presented the report.

He commenced by giving a description of the development which was an outline planning application for a scheme that would provide the following:-

- a 15,000 seat rugby league stadium
- a 2,000 seat football stadium plus 2 additional football pitches
- a 5,000 seat rugby union stadium plus 3 ancillary outdoor training pitches
- an indoor tennis centre plus 10 outdoor courts
- an indoor 4G training pitch and sports hall offering a range of sports eg badminton, squash etc - 4th Generation turf is a FIFA 2\* certified long piled synthetic turf which does not require infill to give the surface its performance. The memory in the turf's pile ensures that the synthetic turf is lifted back to an upright position, even in the absence of sand and rubber crumb infill.
- an indoor swimming pool (25m) within the Sports Centre
- ancillary offices and uses
- access road and signalised junction onto the A48 and secondary link onto Technology Drive
- a 16.7ha (41 acre) SINC area safeguarded for nature conservation
- cycle paths and footway improvements on the A48
- internal site footways and cycle paths

- internal site access roads and parking for 2262 vehicles
- a Green Bridge over the proposed access road linking the A48 to the development
- a Park & Ride facility
- associated hard and soft landscaping
- diversion of the overhead power lines and towers between the west and east boundaries
- a 21,000sq m extension to the Science Park including internal access roads, parking and associated landscaping

The Group Manager Development advised that the proposal would provide a dedicated service road, off the new access road from the A48, in order to maintain and manage Hut 9 (Grade II Listed building). No car parking or any other facilities were proposed relating to Hut 9.

He confirmed that the development area would extend to a total approximate area of 52 hectares comprising:-

- 13.3 hectares of predominantly tree and scrub covered to the north,
- 35.8 hectares of predominantly arable farmland to the south and east;
- 2.8 hectares of grazing land to the north east.

The report commenced by outlining responses in relation to consultations undertaken in respect of the application.

Pages 49 - 74 then gave details of the individual representations and objections received to the application from various statutory bodies, organisations and members of the public, etc.

The report then included comments on the above mentioned representations so received, from Officers.

The Group Manager Development then explained the location of the development and its proximity in relation to surrounding areas and landmarks.

The Committee were then shown a computerised fly through model of the development and the surrounding area as part of The Group Manager Development's presentation.

The Group Manager Development advised Members that if they were minded not to refuse the application before them today, then it would be referred to Council for determination.

If Council were minded to approve the application, he explained that it would then be referred to the Welsh Government, due to BCBC being one of the landowners where the development would be situate. Should Council resolve to refuse the application he added, reasons for such refusal would need to be put forward, prior to the necessary decision notice being issued.

The Group Manager Development reminded Members that the application had been referred to Committee as a major application that did not accord with the Council's Unitary Development Plan, in view of the objections received from local residents and Merthyr Mawr Community Council, and at the request of one of the ward Members.

The application was also accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

The principal planning policy context for the scheme was then explained upon page 77 of the report, and the applicant had in the report expanded upon these by stating that the proposed development would contribute to, and assist the County Borough, in achieving a number of the plans overall aims and objectives, with the overarching aims of particular relevance to the Island Farm development being explained on page 78 of the report.

The Group Manager Development explained that in respect of the adopted Bridgend Unitary Development Plan (UDP), the northern portion of the application site was currently allocated as a site for Special Employment purposes under Policy E6(i). The southern portion of the site, which would include the sporting uses was located in the countryside (Policy EV1 refers), as it was situated outside the designated settlement boundary of Bridgend defined by Policy EV12 of the UDP. Part of the site he confirmed was also identified by Policy M14 (3), as a safeguarding area for potential land won sand and gravel resources.

The Group Manager Development explained that given the above, whilst the application was out of accord with the UDP, it was considered that there were relevant material considerations that outweighed these policies.

The five main policy areas which officers considered pertinent in the determination of the planning application were as follows, under which are outlined the material considerations that were relevant to each.

1. Site for Special Employment Allocation Policy E6(1) Island Farm

The Group Manager Development explained, that the UDP allocated 26 hectares of land at Island Farm for high quality special employment under Policy E6(1). This allocation represented an extension of Bridgend Science Park, which had been successfully developed as a prestige science business park, and was currently occupied by a number of high technology businesses. The UDP anticipated that Island Farm would be developed in a similar manner.

The Island Farm site was identified, protected and distinguished from other employment sites on the basis of its physical and locational characteristics, particularly its peripheral yet prominent location adjacent to an area of countryside, and its proximity to the strategic road network he added. Given the sensitive location of this site, the requirement for consistently high design and environmental standards within an overall concept framework would be a pre-requisite for development.

The current planning application proposed to develop 6.56 hectares of land (Table 2.1: Development Schedule - Environmental Statement) for employment purposes which accorded with Policy E6(1) of the adopted UDP. The applicants proposed to use the majority of the remaining part of the allocation for nature and conservation purposes, which represented, on the face of it, a significant loss of special employment land.

The Group Manager Development explained that whilst this proposal appeared to involve a significant loss of allocated employment land, the

evidence from the supporting information, in particular the Environmental Statement, demonstrated that its loss on conservation and ecological grounds may be inevitable. In this respect deliverability of the entire 26 hectares for its intended Special Employment purpose was called into question. In principle, therefore, this aspect of the proposal and its limited nature was considered acceptable, as the conservation and ecological constraints would equally apply to a proposal just for special employment purposes across the land allocated by Policy E6(1). He continued by advising that CCW had advised that given the presence of European Protected Species on the Island Farm site (dormice and several species of bats), there would be a requirement within any proposals for development on the UDP allocation site to protect very significant areas of habitat in order to ensure that the Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) of these species can be maintained, as is necessary to ensure compliance with the requirements of the European habitats regulations. (see the detailed response in Countryside Council for Wales' observations in the Consultation Responses section). The proposed development could, however, in part, be regarded as enabling development, bringing forward the early implementation of at least part of the site for employment purposes.

The Group Manager Development reminded Members that the deposit Local Development Plan that had recently been approved for consultation recognised the ecological constraint on this site and had only identified a maximum of 11 hectares out of the total allocation of 26 hectares as developable employment land. He advised that the small shortfall between the 6.5 hectares proposed by the present application and the longer term potential of only 11 hectares would be made good by the employment generated by other sporting and recreational elements of the scheme.

2. Development in the Countryside Policy EV1

The Group Manager Development explained that in respect of Policy EV1, given the size and nature of the development, which in effect was an integrated 'Sports Village', it was accepted that a greenfield/countryside location was necessary for the recreational and leisure element of the development. This site, on the edge of the main settlement of Bridgend, was sequentially preferable to a remote location away from infrastructure and transportation links. Furthermore, he explained one of the main aspects of the scheme was the outdoor sporting facilities which represented appropriate recreation uses in the countryside in their own right. In respect of the loss of countryside due to the indoor sporting facilities and stadia being located outside the designated settlement boundary, these uses covered an area of approximately 13.4 hectares and, given that over 12.5 hectares of land, within the existing settlement boundary, and a further 3 hectares, outside the settlement boundary, were being retained and enhanced for ecological, biodiversity and conservation purposes, it was considered that this loss of countryside would be compensated. The Sports Village would offer a mixture of private and public facilities including the Public Open Space/Nature Conservation area and club facilities.

3. Sport, Recreation and Leisure Development Policy RC1(A and B)

The Group Manager Development then advised the Committee that in terms of the adopted Bridgend LDP, there was no specific Policy to assess the development of major indoor sporting facilities and stadia.

However, he then referred Members to page 81 of the report which explained the reasons why there was an identified need for additional quantified and qualitated Sports and Leisure facilities within the County Borough.

The provision of the proposed facilities had the ability to increase the profile of the area both on a regional and national basis and introduce an element of civic pride as well as contributing to the quality of life for people who choose to use the sports facilities. The facility would also reduce the significant deficiency in provision of outdoor sports facilities in the area, as illustrated in the Outdoor Sports Facilities Audit 2006, which indicated that in quantitative terms there was an additional requirement for more than 20 hectares of playing fields to satisfy the existing population. He advised that the recent 2010 Audit still identified a deficiency of over 15 hectares.

The development would also satisfy a qualitative test of need in that it would be unique to Wales as no other scheme of its kind was available elsewhere, and The Group Manager Development contended that it would add vitality and attractiveness, which was a relevant issue to take into account when setting aside certain established policies.

The Group Manager Development also confirmed that out of all suitable town centre, edge of centre, district centre and out of centre sites assessed, given the size and category of developments proposed, it had been accepted that a greenfield/countryside location was necessary for the recreational and leisure element of the development. The site in question on the edge of the main settlement of Bridgend, was considered sequentially acceptable when considered against other potential sites previously considered and highlighted in the Environmental Statement. On the issue of whether elements of the scheme could be located on differing sites elsewhere, the Group Manager advised that it was relevant to consider in this instance whether the whole was greater than the sum of the parts.

4. Conserving Land - Won Sand and Gravel Policy M14 (3) Island Farm

In terms of the above, The Group Manager Development explained that whilst allocated in the adopted UDP both the quality and quantity of the affected safeguarded sand and gravel resource had now been more extensively tested on site and appeared to be limited to a level which both negated the need for long term safeguarding and made prior extraction not economically feasible in this instance. Some of the resource could however be used on site in construction works. The finite resource would not therefore he explained, be sterilised to such a degree that would warrant an objection to the proposal and would not be contrary to the objectives in MTAN1 or the SWRAWP Regional Technical Statement 2008. Indeed, based on this up to date information the safeguarding allocation would not now be taken forward in the LDP.

5. Development Affecting the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land

The Group Manager Development advised that TAN 6 provided practical advice and guidance on the role of the planning system in supporting the delivery of sustainable rural communities, and how the planning system could contribute to sustainable agriculture.

Though policy indicated that high quality agricultural land should not be set aside for development, however the Group Manager Development advised that this could be relaxed if it was considered that there was an overriding need to provide on such land, a particular type of development.

Though the Agriculture Department of the Welsh Government had opposed the loss of this land to the proposed scheme, the Local Planning Authority considered that the provision of the facilities subject of the application would be of wider benefit to the County Borough and beyond than retaining the land for agricultural purposes in accordance with normal policy. Furthermore, a significant area of the higher quality land would not necessarily be permanently lost as it would be used for playing fields and other open uses and measures could be taken to retain and reuse the important top soil in these areas.

It was also pointed out that the loss of quality agricultural land had not been regarded as so significant as to sustain a reason for refusal on a previous application to develop over this area as recently as 2007.

This balance had been struck he added, when considering the loss of employment land and high quality agricultural land against the benefits of providing the scheme and its facilities which could have national, regional and local benefits, as well as making employment land readily available for development.

6. Highway, Transportation and Infrastructure Implications

At this point in the meeting, The Group Manager Development asked the Group Manager Transportation and Engineering to explain the highway implications regarding the scheme to Members.

The Group Manager Transportation and Engineering acknowledged that the proposed scheme was associated with very difficult and complex transportation issues. He fully realised that the proposal would have an affect on the highway network and infrastructure of the immediate surrounding area.

He explained that highway schemes had been examined that would seek to mitigate and overcome the existing problems that occurred within this location, as well as any further problematic issues that would arise should the scheme be progressed.

He confirmed that the Highways and Transportation Section would have almost certainly objected to the application, if they had concluded that the existing problems being experienced at nearby highway locations could not be resolved.

He advised that the Traffic Management Assessment conducted had taken three years to complete. Though Halcrow had made a statement in 2009, objecting to the scheme on highway grounds, since then the Highways

Department and the site developer had examined the various highway problems that would be brought about by the scheme on a stage by stage basis, and devised a scheme that would mitigate these.

He referred Committee to the Management Assessment Executive Summary attached at Appendix 'C' to the report.

This explained a considerable number of highway improvements and other associated requirements that if implemented would adequately support the highway implications brought about by the scheme, largely through Section 106 Agreement obligations and Conditions being attached to the application.

He explained that a limit had been established in terms of visitors to the facility of 8,000 at which time it would be considered a major event and regulation would then be imposed for off-site park and ride, marshalling and other mitigating actions. In addition when the estimated number of visitors to a major event exceeded this number no other events would be allowed to take place on the complex until time had been given for these visitors to disperse .

A considerable number of shared parking spaces (1,735) would be provided in the leisure facility as well as an off site park and ride scheme that would directly be linked to road and rail services. Added to this he explained would be improved walking and cycling links.

Major events at the facility are estimated to occur six times per year and these and other associated events would be co-ordinated by a Transportation Forum that would be set-up as part of the S106 obligations.

The developer had agreed, under the provision of a Section 106 Agreement(s) to provide funding to the Forum, to be used to overcome any adverse issues arising from holding events which may affect nearby residential areas.

Enforcement of matters such as increased traffic and parking would be policed by both the South Wales Police and the County Borough Council, who are seeking responsible for civil parking enforcement from the Welsh Government.

The development if approved, would be constructed in phases, and the M4 would provide the strategic access route to the application site, with the A48 and A473 providing links between the motorway and the site. The principal access to the proposed development would be via a new signal control junction on the A48. A secondary access through the existing Science Park (via Ewenny Road and Technology Drive) would also be provided.

The Transport Assessment had also taken into account works that would in all likelihood be required to both improve the current highway infrastructure condition and traffic flow, together with any increase that would arise from the introduction of the new sports facilities, affecting the following nearby highway areas:-

- Broadlands roundabout



- Ewenny roundabout
- Ewenny Road/Technology Drive T Junction
- Picton Court roundabout
- Waterton Cross roundabout
- Coychurch roundabout and
- Bocam Park roundabout.

In order to fully explain the current problems that existed in these locations and how these would be mitigated in the future if the new scheme progressed, the Group Manager Transportation and Engineering then referred Members to a paramics simulation model on the Council Chamber monitor, that outlined the flow of traffic that currently existed at peak hour traffic times on the highway network near where the proposed development would be located, and anticipated traffic flows should the scheme be implemented, when signalised junctions and other associated traffic restriction schemes would be introduced.

He concluded his submission, by confirming to Members that should the layout of the proposed development alter in the future in any way to that which currently proposed, then this would be closely looked at further in the detailed stage of the application, to ascertain if any changes to the traffic restriction proposals would be required.

The Group Manager Development advised that one of the public speakers had alluded to the point of whether or not the developer would be able to fully deliver the financial implications of the scheme, which would be considerable.

He added however, that the developer had earlier assured the Council that he would be able to comply fully with the terms of the Section 106 Agreement proposals and that should he renege and not comply with this Agreement, then action could be pursued against him by the Council through the courts.

He further added that the issue of funding was not a material planning consideration should Members be minded to refuse the application. If a proposal fulfils all the usual land use, infrastructure, environmental and transportation tests, then the applicant has the right to a permission as that consent runs with the land not the applicant.

The Group Manager Development then concluded his submission, by advising Members that the application had been recommended for approval, as the substantial number of benefits attributed to the proposal, largely outweighed any land use policy conflicts and the mitigation and planning requirements identified in relation to each of the planning considerations could be secured through planning conditions and a Section 106 obligation, together with the fact that it satisfied all other relevant planning material considerations.

Members then raised in turn a number of points regarding the proposed scheme as follows:-

- Insufficient parking will be available at the new facility;

- How will the development reduce existing 'rat runs' on the highway infrastructure that surrounds the immediate area of the proposed development, e.g. New Inn Road;
- Will the developer bear the cost of all the traffic calming measures and restrictions required should the development proceed;
- How many vehicles will the Park and Ride facility cater for and will this be provided for both on and off site;
- Concern was expressed regarding pedestrians walking to the development from Merthyr Mawr Road and the Bridgend town centre area across the A48. An under/over pass was recommended for reasons of safety.
- The development will result in increased off/on street parking.

At this point in the meeting the Chairperson recommended that the meeting be adjourned for 15 minutes for a comfort break which the Committee agreed to.

Members upon returning to the meeting continued raising further queries regarding the applications, as follows:-

- How can officers be assured that the Management Assessment Executive Summary (Appendix 'C' to the report) will fully address issues regarding existing highway over-intensification and further demands of traffic should the development go ahead;
- By what methods would officers pursue to reduce the nitrogen dioxide emissions at locations such as Ewenny roundabout;
- Has consideration been given to extra traffic coming from/going to Porthcawl, particularly in the summer when large scale events may also be taking place at the new sports facility;
- Will the traffic calming proposals such as signalised junctions, etc, lead to an increase of queuing of traffic and delays at these locations;
- Who will enforce the traffic/pedestrian movements on days when large scale events occur at the development;
- Will there be a noticeable increase in vehicular noise and vibration as a result of the development upon businesses situate within the Science Park area;
- The amount of objections to the proposed application amounts to less than 1% of the population of the County Borough and this was a small proportion of the County Borough as a whole;
- The development will introduce low value employment rather than high value employment and a reduction in jobs to that currently envisaged at the location;
- The facility will bring a much needed boost to Sports and Recreation facilities in the area and will utilise and flourish local talent. It will bring prosperity to the area and is much needed.
- The facility appears to be of a high standard, but is in the wrong location due to increased demands it will place on the highway infrastructure

In terms of the Park and Ride facility, the Group Manager Transportation and Engineering explained that the developer would be providing this on-site. He would also make provision for an off site Park and Ride facility,

accommodating a minimum of 500 spaces, and it would be decided at a future date where to locate this.

In respect of pedestrians safely accessing the site, particularly from the Merthyr Mawr road area, the Group Manager Transportation advised that Conditions 11 and 12 of the consent would cater for this prior to the stadia being constructed. This would be supported by manual control operations being deployed in key areas such as Merthyr Mawr road and along the A48.

The problems regarding traffic movement at places in the immediate vicinity of the development such as the Ewenny junction were apparent and getting worse. This would be mitigated by the provision of signalised junctions which will allow "pulsing" of traffic and give rise to improved traffic flows to that which currently exist.

The large events held at the facility, i.e. 8,000 in terms of spectator capacity, would trigger an off-site Park and Ride facility operation. This would also initiate increased movement of vehicles and pedestrians entering or leaving the development site. This figure could be altered however the Group Manager Transportation and Engineering advised, should the need arise.

The Public Protection Officer confirmed that the issue regarding nitrogen dioxide emissions would be the subject of future monitoring with the developer.

In terms of traffic building up on match days and this being exacerbated in the summer months by people travelling to Porthcawl, the Group Manager Transportation and Engineering advised that these issues would be managed by the Forum. He added that surveys evidenced that the highest flows of traffic along the A48 occurred in week-days rather than at week-ends when events at the stadia were more likely to take place.

The Group Manager Development added that the first phase of the Porthcawl regeneration proposals would include the build of a major food store as food stores in Bridgend were over trading due to residents from Porthcawl shopping there. This would in all likelihood result in a reduction in traffic along the A48 between Bridgend and Porthcawl.

In relation to Members being made aware of the exact location of the park and ride facility prior to development works commencing, that would facilitate visitors to/from the main stadium which would not be constructed until a year or two's time, the Group Manager Transportation and Engineering explained that it would be open for the developer to propose a location for this facility and submit this to the Authority for approval, following necessary land acquisitions being processed. It would be included therefore in more detail in the terms of the Section 106 Agreement.

In terms of funding any staff such as Enforcement Officers on days where large scale events take place at the main stadium, the Group Manager Transportation and Engineering advised that this would again be supported by the Forum.

In terms of sound and vibration from vehicles affecting businesses that exist in the Technology Park, the Group Manager Transportation and Engineering confirmed that existing highways would be extended from the site onto the A48 to cater for extra traffic. The units referred to were away from the proposed main thoroughfare, which it was estimated would only receive a 4% increase of heavy vehicles to that which currently exists, and any extra vibrational issues would not be measurable he added. It was not anticipated that further high levels of vehicular traffic would proceed through Technology Drive and the existing employment sites as a result of the development.

The Group Manager Development advised that Members had raised some concerns earlier about a probable reduction in jobs, particularly high quality jobs should the proposed development go ahead. He reminded Members, that this site at Island Farm had been allocated for employment use for 28 years in successive Development Plans, during which period no jobs had been created at all. It was a material consideration that the present application would at least bring forward part of that allocation whilst other elements of the scheme would provide other forms of employment.

The Group Manager Development then concluded his submission. By stating that that professional officers from various disciplines within the Council had considered all the information that had been presented to them as contained in the report, and made their assessments, which in turn gave rise to the balanced recommendation before Members.

Members agreed by way of consensus of opinion, to conduct an electronic vote upon the application, following which, it was

- RESOLVED:
- (1) That the application be referred to Council as a proposal that is a departure from the Development Plan that the Development Control Committee is not disposed to refuse, for the reasons contained in the report of the Corporate Director – Communities.
  - (2) If Council were minded not to refuse the development, the application be referred to the Welsh Government as a proposal in which this Council has a financial interest and as an application which is out of accord with the adopted Unitary Development Plan but which this Council is minded to approve.
  - (3) If Council resolve to approve the proposal and the Welsh Government has granted authorisation then the applicant enter into a Section 106 Agreement in accord with the Heads of Terms outlined in the report.
  - (4) That the Corporate Director - Communities be given plenary powers to issue a decision notice granting consent in respect of the proposal, once the owner has entered into the aforementioned Section 106 Agreement, and subject to the standard outline conditions and the conditions detailed in the report, (together with the recommended Notes).

Subject to the inclusion of the following Conditions 40 and 41, and Note I:-

Conditions:-

- 40 There shall be no beneficial use of Phase 2 (c)(Rugby Union Stadium) or Phase 2(d)(Sports Centre) or Phase 2(e)(Main Sports Stadium) until such time as a signing scheme, to direct pedestrians between the town centre and the site, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented, as agreed.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and sustainable travel.

(Policy T2 - Bridgend Unitary Development Plan)

- 41 No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To identify and record any features of archaeological interest discovered during their works, in order to mitigate impact of the works on the archaeological resource.

(Policy EV44 - Bridgend Unitary Development Plan)

Note:-

- I. With respect to condition 40 above the scheme should consist of finger posts directing pedestrians along the most appropriate routes from the Bridgend Town Centre to the site.

The meeting closed at 5.30pm.