

**FINAL MINUTES OF A MEETING OF PLANNING COMMITTEE PENNARD COMMUNITY  
COUNCIL HELD ON Friday 18<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2019  
AT PENNARD COMMUNITY HALL (Small hall)  
at 7.30pm**

**Present:** Cllr Ralph Cook (chair), Cllr Susan Rodaway, Cllr Sally Rogers, Cllr Jeff Rogers, Cllr Darren Hickery, Cllr Arthur Rogers

**1. Apologies:** Cllr Lynda James, Cllr Angela Brunt, Mark Smith.

**2. Declarations of Interest:** None.

**3. To Agree submission from Pennard public meeting with regards to 2018/2580/FUL the **new development on land north of Pennard Rd and East of Pennard Dr.****

The Public meeting was discussed and the comments gathered read out, It was agreed that the comments should be transcribed straight to the Comments Submission of the County Planning Site along with the section 106 funding suggestions.

**Comments Gathered From Members Of The Public - these are listed in order of speaker not importance.**

- The LDP stated that there was around 200 new houses required over the whole Gower Peninsula, Why is there such a high number being built here? This is more a suburban development than a village one.
- Gower is being treated as 2 separate areas and this is wrong
- If affordable houses are included then these should be built first as there is no guarantee that they would be included otherwise.
- Why are 70 houses being built on one side of the road when planning was refused for one house on the opposite side of the road.
- We have a moral and statutory duty to look after our AONB don't treat this plan as a done deal IT IS NOT.
- The entrance to the site is extremely dangerous especially when the weather is icy and there are lots of children going to and from school.
- The electrical distribution box (opposite 118) is not shown on the plan where is it going?
- There are several entrances to garages etc. by the path that children use going to and from school
- Where are visitors going to park
- The width of the roadway seems very narrow and there does not seem to be any defined pathway
- How will emergency vehicles and refuse lorries get around there does not seem to be any room for turning or passing parked vehicles.
- There does not look as though there is room for cars to pass parked cars.
- There are going to be a significant number of cars now accessing the main Pennard Rd which will cause problems on the bends by the church as the road is very narrow at this point,
- Who is going to "police" the local vs not local requirement?
- Young people who currently live in the village can't afford to buy houses here, "Local" should apply to them first.
- The local need for affordable housing is not being helped by this development due to its definition of "local"
- Should access to the development not be from the main road
- What is to stop properties being sold to investors and for second homes
- How are they going to deal with the cows?
- If this field is developed what will happen to the next one and the next
- Will the buses and school coach timings be affected once construction starts
- How will the lane cope with haulage vehicles? The road surface is not strong enough and will be ripped up.
- We do not have a good public transport system, which will be important with more houses.
- A resident believed that the availability of adequate public transport was a legal pre-requisite for a development of this size. Public transport and the changes to it are the subjects of frequent local complaints
- There are not enough bungalows.
- The status of driveways or roadways should be marked as a member of the public felt this status might have an implication for the obligation of the developers in planning for emergency vehicle access.

- There does not look as though there is room for cars to pass parked cars.
- There are going to be a significant number of cars now accessing the main Pennard Rd which will cause problems on the bends by the church as the road is very narrow at this point,
- Planners seem to object to using Pennard Road as access for the new development because of the volume of traffic there, but this observation does not seem to count against the development taking place.
- There was a request that Coastal should share their statistics from which they have defined need.
- There was a concern raised that the hedge alongside Pennard Drive is a protected ancient hedgerow.
- The density of housing is much greater in comparison to the rest of the estate and therefore not in keeping with that.
- There do not seem to be street lights on the plan. One resident felt that if there were street lights then by law the road should be adopted. If there is no provision, how disruptive would a later addition of lighting be
- It had been observed that the relevant Swansea Council web pages listed “73 constraints” but there was no link to identify these.
- Has the suitability of Pennard Road, Linkside Drive and Pennard Drive been assessed for the volume of construction traffic? Will the developer be required to contribute to making good where needed? Is a survey to be taken before and after?
- “Local need” should take into consideration the ward’s ageing population. We should be planning ahead to ensure that people do not have to move out of the area as they grow older.
- I think there needs to be a greater proportion of rental options to put some of these properties within reach of local people.
- Additionally, as the school is worried about the shrinking number of lower aged pupils, more rental options would put properties within the reach of more people not yet on the housing ladder but with new families.
- Lower priced housing for sale, not just built as affordable housing but also a greater number of smaller houses for sale would also help this.

A question was put to the room, despite the overall objection to the development, if approved what they felt would be relevant section 106 requests to help mitigate the impact of the development. It is important to note the objection to the development should take precedence over these requests.

**Suggestions to be included in a section 106 funding application to mitigate impact - these are also listed in order of speaker not importance.**

- Speed Calming Measures on Pennard Rd
- Speed cameras
- Speed notification displays
- Wider road between the development and the church with a path
- Priority lines and change to road layout at on Pennard Rd and at the entrance to the new site.
- Suggestion to change traffic priority at the Pennard Road end of Linkside Drive to give priority to Linkside Drive, changed traffic priority at the Linkside Drive end of Pennard Drive to give priority to Pennard Drive.
- Road upgrade
- New Library
- Traffic lights to control the narrows
- Install a wide path behind the hedge for safe access along the road between the development and the church
- All weather shared use path joining up with the one proposed at Bishopston
- Tennis Courts
- Upgraded Pavilion (Community Hub)
- More play equipment in the Park
- Multi use all weather play area
- Increased Policing. There was a specific concern about the increase in drug use as well.
- There was a suggestion of a “village entrance” which may slow traffic.
- A contribution to the Hall extension was also raised
- Burial ground expansion, more land required.

#### **4. To Agree submission from Pennard Community Council with regards to 2018/2580/FUL the new development on land north of Pennard Rd and East of Pennard Dr.**

The Community Council fully supports the comments made at our recent public meeting and would also like to add to this with the following submission:

1. This application is clearly well within the AONB and as such requires the greatest of scrutiny in order to comply with the current UDP and draft LDP.

2. We are against the proposal to capture this land into the village envelope. The Community Council accepts the need for low cost housing in the area but the methodology of arriving at the required numbers requires clarification and justification. This query is legitimate in view of the recent applications in the AONB at Llanrhidian, Higher Lane, the Greyhound Oldwalls development and the completed development in Surlage.
3. We stress the need for conditions to *ensure* the properties are purchased/rented by *local* people. Whilst we have difficulty in devising effective conditions, it is for the applicant and the LPA to do so. Are 70 homes necessary to satisfy, in whole or part, that requirement in one development over a short period of time?
4. In view of the fact that the LDP has yet to be approved, we believe that this application is presumptuous. This application should not be even considered until the LDP has been finalized. However, within the emerging LDP we consider this to be an inappropriate development in the countryside as we do not have the jobs infrastructure and community facilities to justify a development of this size.
5. The Community Council feel that this development is an over development and shows little respect for the AONB. The housing types appear to follow the Design Guide but the density and lack of open spaces do not. This development does not provide an attractive legible healthy accessible or safe environment. Loss of visual amenity to surrounding dwellings, loss of ancient hedgerow and negative impact on biodiversity. The identified need is for 300 homes in the Gower fringe zone, we feel this development is disproportionate that almost 25% should be located in such a small site in one location, and far too much for the identifiable need in the immediate locality. This also contravenes ER 4 and ER 11 of the emerging LDP. Furthermore, breaks in the ancient hedgerow will affect biodiversity of the entire hedgerow in a disproportionate way.
6. One image on the drawings is explained by the caption "private". Private roads rarely get adopted unless the frontages subsequently make them up to standard and that never happens as some or most frontages fail to contribute to the cost. The roads deteriorate for all time, eg Browns Drive and become a constant problem.
7. This development does not comply with the requirements of SI 1 of the emerging LDP. The reasons for this include inaccessibility by non-car transport to primary and secondary healthcare provision. There is no good interconnectivity between places and active travel is impossible due to lack of green infrastructure network. Such travel would result to significant risk to life.
8. The developers should be asked to pay, in full, the additional cost consequent upon the development, in improving the infrastructure, including the sewage disposal, electricity supply and school. This payment must prior to commencement of development be assessed and secured by a bond, in the event of non-payment. Otherwise such cost falls upon the CCS and the statutory undertakings, ie the paying public. These are problems created by the developer and must be resolved by the developer or at its cost.
9. We query the entrance to this development. As shown, it increases the burden on the existing and sole entrance road to the estate? The highway immediately fronting the school, surgery and library would become more hazardous. The recent erection of a pelican crossing outside the school, surgery and library indicates the concern of the CCS for the safety of pedestrians. An entrance further along the highway would serve to divert the additional traffic from that location.
10. The emerging LDP requires open space provision including the creation of new onsite facilities or the improvement of existing local provision off site along with appropriate maintenance contributions, this is clearly missing for this plan. This development also contravenes SI 8. The development has no lighting and will provide many dark corners for opportunities of criminal activity.
11. Taking into consideration the nature scale and sighting of this proposed development it is not supported by appropriate transport measures or infrastructure. To make changes to existing roadways would further urbanize the area. Additionally, the rural nature of the location means that horse riders are frequent users of the access lane. The large increase in traffic caused by 70 additional dwellings will drive such horse traffic away, further urbanizing our environment. It makes no opportunity to provide walking or cycling access, in fact has a significant impact on the public footpath adjacent to the development linking Pennard Rd with Pennard Dr. The proximity of a shared driveway with access onto Pennard Dr to this footpath will endanger life.
12. This proposed development contravenes policy RP 9 as no appropriate adequate or effective provision has been made for the storage recycling and other sustainable management of waste. In addition, the shared driveway and narrow winding roadway with only a single access point is unsuitable for recycling and refuse vehicles and personnel. There are two turning spaces within the development which due to insufficient parking provision will inevitably have vehicles parked in them, refuse vehicles will be unable to turn around in the development. This will be aggravated by the increasing incidents of parcel and grocery delivery vehicles.

13. We believe local occupancy criteria should be applied to the local need market homes and formally tied to an appropriate planning mechanism and/or legal agreement and to ensure that the dwellings are not used as a second home/holiday home in addition these restraints should be continuous regardless of subsequent transfer of property. We believe the definition of "local" is deeply flawed and believe that provision should be primarily aimed at need from the immediate locality.

14. We believe this proposal will be of detriment to subterranean water courses in the immediate vicinity of the site in this area. Furthermore, sewage and drainage infrastructure is insufficient to accommodate additional flows.

Finally, we have considered our comments with the emerging LDP in mind. If any changes should occur in the LDP from its current format that could relate to our proper consideration of this application then the application should be returned to public consultation. If this is not possible then consideration of this development should be delayed awaiting validation of the LDP.

The meeting closed at 10.00pm

\*\*\*\*\*