

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**5 FEBRUARY 2015**

**AMENDMENT SHEET**

**The Chairperson accepts the amendment sheet in order to allow for Committee to consider necessary modifications to the Committee report to be made so as to take account of late representations and corrections and for any necessary revisions to be accommodated.**

| <b>ITEM NO.</b> | <b>PAGE NO.</b> | <b>APP. NO.</b>     |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| <b>8A</b>       | <b>13</b>       | <b>P/14/840/OUT</b> |

A full site visit by the Development Control Committee took place on Wednesday 4 February 2015. The local Member and one objector were also present.

The Group Manager Transportation and Engineering (Highways) has no objections to the proposal subject to conditions and an advisory note.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the following conditions and noted be added:

8. Notwithstanding the submitted plans, no development shall commence until a scheme has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing the site frontage boundary with Manor Grove being set back and a 1.2m wide segregated footway which shall appropriately link into the existing footway on the South Eastern side of Manor Grove. Such a scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the agreed details before the development is brought into beneficial use.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to promote sustainable means of transport to/from the site.

9. The development hereby approved shall be served by a single means of access from Manor Grove.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

10. There shall be no means of pedestrian or vehicular access created at any time on the northern, eastern or south eastern site boundaries of the dwelling.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety

Note

o) The applicant/developer is advised that the south-eastern corner of the application site boundary appears to include part of the highway. Final plot layout and detailed designs of the development shall not include this land within the scheme.

**8B**

**23**

**P/14/772/OUT**

A full site visit took place on Wednesday 4 February 2015. Local ward members and two members of the community council were present.

**8C**

**31**

**P/14/700/FUL**

A full site visit took place on Wednesday 4 February 2015. The local members and a member of the community council were present. Queries were raised in relation to control of traffic movements associated with existing operations on the site and whether any material will be taken from the site to accommodate the tanks.

Complaints have been received in relation to lorries not using the route stipulated in a S106 in association with operations on the Cenin site. The complainant was requested to provide evidence, however, nothing further was submitted. Furthermore, a number of planning officers have since visited the area at various times to investigate this matter and have not seen any evidence of the breach of the S106 routing agreement.

The site will be periodically monitored to ensure the agreed route is being followed and if any suspected breaches are brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority these will be investigated by the Enforcement Officer.

The applicant has confirmed that the material removed from the ground to accommodate the digestate tanks will all be re-used on site in the 1.25m high containment bund.

Paragraph 6 of page 41 , the word 'see attached' should be removed,

## CONSULTATION RESPONSES

The Transportation Development Control Officer requested that an additional condition be attached to any permission granted.

Merthyr Mawr Community Council provided the following additional comments:-

### 'Vehicle Movement

HGV vehicles – up to 10 tons - and LGV vehicle movements are to be limited to: 102 PER DAY coming off the A48 and passing Houses.

We urge Councillors to reject the application on the basis of road safety. The A48 here has a short 50 mph Limit because of previous road safety problems, despite the applicant's assertion that accidents are few. Also the ancillary road leading to the site is so narrow it is unclassified.

### Archaeological Trust Condition

My Council urge the imposition of the condition for Archaeological supervision suggested by GGAT in order to preserve possible Prehistoric period down to Roman remains.

### Lighting

My Council urge the imposing of a condition restricting the hours of the lighting which will be on 8m and 6m poles. In order to reduce visual intrusion on the landscape and to reduce the interference with local bat flight paths.

### Visual Intrusion on the landscape

My Council urge a planning condition prohibiting the removal of trees or hedgerows. In order to reduce the visual impact on the rural landscape. '

## COMMENTS ON ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

The comments raised in relation to highway safety have been addressed in the Development Control Committee report.

The report proposes a condition requiring an archaeological watching brief, at the request of Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust, a condition requiring a lighting scheme, at the request of the Councils Ecologist, and a condition requiring a landscaping scheme in the interests of visual amenity.

Natural Resources Wales requested that an additional condition be attached.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The following conditions be added:-

24. No development shall commence until such time as a scheme to dispose of foul drainage has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as agreed.

Reason: To protect the water environment.

25. No development shall commence until a scheme for the provision of a widened access / egress (supported by vehicle swept path diagrams) has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The improved access shall be implemented in permanent materials for a distance of no less than 15m before the development is brought into beneficial use and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

**8E**

**65**

**P/14/714/FUL**

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Fay Nevens of 20 Clos Castell Newydd reiterated a point previously raised in relation to land ownership and advised that the proposed fences lies within her property and advised that a professional measured survey of the site had been carried out. The point regarding the conservatory at 20 Clos Castell Newydd being omitted from the site plan was also raised.

J Smith of 10 Carn Wen provided the following comments:-

'I refer to the properties on Broadlands the applicant has referred to of a similar type to the proposed new build. The major differences are that these were included as part of the original development (evidenced by the initial planning applications) and have not been constructed in a green corridor. The properties are not in elevated positions and do not affect visual amenity. The proposed build does not relate appropriately to the topography of the site and backs directly on to another development which results in over development and loss of visual amenity'.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Draft reasons 1 & 2 be replaced with:-

- 1) The proposal constitutes an over development of the site as there would be insufficient amenity space available for future use of occupiers of this development contrary to criterion 3 of Policy SP2 of the Local Development Plan and Note 8 of Supplementary Planning Guidance 02:Householder Development.
- 2) The proposal would result in the removal of a section of a 'Green Corridor' within the Broadlands Estate to the detriment of biodiversity and visual amenities, which is contrary to criteria 2 & 10 of Policy SP2 of the Local Development Plan.

**MARK SHEPHARD  
CORPORATE DIRECTOR – COMMUNITIES  
5 FEBRUARY 2015**