

The DCA Committee has written to our councillors regarding a number of questions concerning the building work northwest of Danescourt. The letter is reproduced below.

Dear Peter and Sean

On Monday 16th May, the Committee had the first in person DCA meeting since before lockdown. Firstly, congratulations to you both and the DCA looks forward to working with you over the coming years.

The Committee has tasked me to write to you both on the following points. As you know the building work northwest of Danescourt has progressed at a pace and this has raised a number of questions:

1. The Committee is dismayed with the houses built opposite the garage due to their inappropriate height above those properties in Danescourt which back onto Llantrisant Road. Also the over-powering development now being built in the former field in the apex between Llantrisant Road and Heol Isaf. The Committee would like to know what principles of planning were followed and why the Planning Committee approved these details.

2. We have heard various rumours that the percentage of affordable housing has been reduced. The Committee would like to know what the original percentage was, and what it is currently planned to be. If the rumours prove correct, we would like to know why the Planning Committee allowed this reduction and who benefitted from these changes.

3. The Committee would like to know why planning permission was granted for the development south of Llantrisant Road where inadequate drainage was evidently provided by the developer. Having realised this inadequacy, the Council has found the need to avoid flooding occurrences by construction of the large attenuation pond on its parkland which has caused so much angst. There is also the matter of having set a precedent, with the implication that future planning applicants may be able to rely on the Council to solve their inadequate drainage proposals.

4. There are rumours that the ponds already built have not been constructed properly and are going to have to be replaced. Does this indicate inadequate inspection/supervision, and if that is the case why has this occurred? To cover these issues it would be very helpful if Simon Dooley could attend one of our meetings to give us an update and answer questions. As Elected Members please could you arrange this, and also be in attendance at that meeting?

5. There is an area to the west of the railway line and north of the access tunnel that has been referred to as a “depression”. This area is associated with the current proposal to build 36 houses to be served by a new road extension to De Braose Close. It has frequently been saturated during rainy periods and it is now being proposed as a water holding area in bad

weather. This seems a ridiculous idea. Please can you find out more about this and update us at the next Committee? Also there is no evidence that Transport for Wales (previously Network Rail) has been consulted on this proposal. Please can you determine whether consultation has taken place and what their response is?

6. There is a petition of some 2000 signatures against the 'save our woods' application plus more than 500 objections. There is a suspicion that reducing the affordable housing on the main developments, and by specifying affordable housing in the 'save our woods' application is an underhand and devious way of getting this application approved. We would hope that the percentage of affordable housing in the main development can be restored to the original levels in the main development. Please can you discuss this with the Planning Committee to reassure this is not the case, and report the outcome to our next Committee meeting?

7. The Committee would like to know current progress re the housing targets proposed by developers during preparation of the LDP. It is a legal requirement to report on progress. In particular, the Plasdwr development is claimed to be a garden city development, but there is no sign to date of the provision of any parkland, education, or community facilities, despite the number of houses already built.

8. Large planning developments are usually the subject of S.106 Agreements, often requiring the payment of significant sums of money to the Council for associated improvements. In recent years the Press has reported that a number of developers have avoided payment of these sums by claiming their developments had turned out to be nonviable. The Council apparently accepted these claims, but it is not known to what extent they were examined or what evidence was provided to justify any of them. It is clearly important that all the S.106 Agreements in respect of Plasdwr should be paid in full, either on or off-site, and our Committee are keen to receive an assurance to this end, together with amount that these s106

agreements have generated.

9. Many of the problems with the developments along Llantrisant Road flow from the adoption of a flawed LDP - the responsibility of the Council's Cabinet, not its Planning Committee. The fact that the Strategic Site allocations in the LDP were too large and not underpinned by a sustainable transport strategy was pointed out by the North West Cardiff Group (including DCA) during the LDP's preparation and at its Examination in Public. However the developers were listened to while the well-informed "voice of the community" was not. DCA thus implores you to ensure that the new Cabinet learns lessons from the LDP debacle, and takes a different approach during preparation of the Replacement LDP - one that gives equal weight to the views of the local community para 9 ...

Finally the Committee look forward to a considerable improvement in performance of the Council and its Planning Committee, who we hope will put Cardiff first as opposed to developers profits. We are confident that you will represent both the interests of Danescourt residents and Cardiff as a whole as your top priority.

Kind regards

Edgar Gibbs

Chair DCA