

Clare Whiting

From: Matthew Phillips
Sent: 24 November 2016 09:20
To: planning_admin
Subject: FW: Appeal decision implications

Policy officer comments – P/2016/0611

From: Linda Sharp
Sent: 23 November 2016 16:38
To: Matthew Phillips
Cc: Nicola Corbishley
Subject: RE: Appeal decision implications

Matthew

Thanks for sending this over I would reply as follows from a policy perspective:

- The main issue I consider is whether the development represents inappropriate development outside of the settlement limit, and whether the benefits of development outweigh the harm etc .
- Firstly, I note that the proposed development is sited on an area of land that was historically two landfills, known as 'Old Refuse Tip 1' and the 'Cable Tip', and a car dismantlers and scrap yard.
- Both local (policy PS3) and national policies are broadly supportive of the re-use of previously developed land, however it does not follow that all previously developed sites should be re-developed. I appreciate that this proposal is only on part of the site .
- Paragraph 2.7.1 of Planning Policy Wales advises that development plan policies be given decreasing weight when they are outdated or superseded. However, whilst the UDP plan period has now expired, its use of settlement limits (as part of a settlement strategy) remain broadly consistent with Planning Policy Wales.
- The principle of this development must be determined in line with the requirements of Policy H5. I accept that development of the site would result in the removal of a non-conforming scrapyards use however the UDP policy PS1 directs new housing development to land within defined settlement limits and therefore the proposals conflict with policy PS1 . Whilst the UDP does not entirely prevent residential development outside of settlement limits, in accordance with policy H5 it is only likely to be permitted where proposals are for the conversion of a suitable building, the subdivision of an existing dwelling, small scale affordable housing on sites adjacent to a settlement limit and key rural worker housing. None of these exceptions to the otherwise strict control over housing developments on sites outside of settlements apply to the appeal proposals. The proposed development therefore does not accord with policy H5.
- TAN (paragraph 6.1) advises that the need to increase housing supply should be given considerable weight when dealing with planning applications, provided that development would comply with development plan and national policies. However due to the separation of the proposed site from the settlement limit, (approx. 400m) the proposed development would fail to properly integrate with existing built up area and would appear as an isolated housing development not representing a sustainable form of development.

Happy to discuss further,

Linda

From: Matthew Phillips
Sent: 14 November 2016 17:02
To: Nicola Corbishley; Linda Sharp
Subject: Appeal decision implications

Nic/Linda,

I currently have an application for the redevelopment of the Legacy scrapyard on Llwynenion (P/2016/0611). There are a number of issues with the application but both myself and the agent had agreed to defer a decision until the Hafod Tileries decision had been made.

There are some very clear differences between the two sites but there are also some comparable aspects, particularly that both are previously developed site.

In light of the Hafod decision I would be interested in your views on the Legacy scrapyard application. I have previously indicated to the agent that I would be minded to recommend refusal due to its location and UDP policy. It doesn't automatically follow that because the Hafod was allowed, the Legacy site should also be granted permission. However if we proceed with refusal we would need to have a very robust reason for doing so!

I'd be grateful for your views on this.

Thanks

Matthew