Bridgend County Borough Council
Bridgend Local Development Plan Examination

Action Points and Schedule of Matters Arising Changes (MACs)

Hearing Session 19 – Alternative Sites

Action Point 19.1: Agenda Item No.Qn 4a

BCBC would supply statutory consultation responses on Ty Draw planning application to the Inspector and to the Community Council's witness Robert Hathaway. The Council would review whether it could forward the responses from other interested persons with suitable redaction of details.

Appendix A details all the statutory consultation responses received to date in respect of planning application P/12/796/FUL: Land at Ty Draw Farm.

Action Point 19.2: Agenda Item No.Qn5

BCBC would supply details of public transport services for the Cefn Glas site.

There are bus stops on Barnes Avenue which is about 150m east of the site boundary. This is served by a half hourly service to Bridgend Town Centre (Service Number 1).

Additionally, Service Number 2 serves bus stops on Llangewydd Road which is about 250m south of the boundary (accessed via the proposed pedestrian access on the sites southern boundary). This again is a half hourly service to Bridgend.

The times of these two services are co-ordinated so that, together there is a bus every 15 minutes serving this general area.

Action Point 19.3: Agenda Item No.Qn5d

BCBC will send an updated appendix to the Inspector to include that the ratio is now changed from 60% brownfield 40% green field to 58% and 42%.

The following table details the proportion of housing land allocated under Policies COM1 & COM2 of the LDP that is proposed on greenfield sites as opposed to previously developed land taking into account the new and amended housing allocations.

	Greenfield	Previously Developed Land	Total
COM1: Bridgend SRGA	**1940 (58.36%)**	**1384 (41.64)**	**3324 (100%)**
COM1: Maesteg & Llynfi Valley SRGA	**84 (15.79%)**	**448 (84.21%)**	**532 (100%)**
COM1: Porthcawl SRGA	**40 (3.32%)**	**1166 (96.68%)**	**1206 (100%)**
COM1: Valleys Gateway SRGA	**373 (28.78%)**	**923 (71.22%)**	**1296 (100%)**
COM2	**889 (57.88%)**	**647 (42.12)**	**1,536 (100%)**
TOTAL	**3326 (42.13%)**	**4568 (57.87%)**	**7,894 (100%)**

Full details of the of the greenfield and previously developed land split is detailed in Appendix B of this document. This information updates Appendix C of the Bridgend CBC Examination Statement Session 1: Strategy (Doc Ref: HS01.05).

Appendix A

BCBC
RECE [redacted]
13 NOV 2012
CORPORATE DIRECTOR - COMMUNITIES DEVELOPMENT

Planning

From: landdrainage
Sent: 12 November 2012 15:28
To: Planning
Cc: David Lynn
Subject: Observation of Planning Application Ref: P/12/796/FUL - 94 Dwellings & employment uses - land at Ty Draw Farm, Pyle

FAO: Tony Gore / APCONREES

I have recently received your memo, dated 8th November 2012, for the proposed development of 94 dwellings, with associated access & public open space, and employment use at land at Ty Draw Farm, Pyle and respond below.

The application form states that the proposed area of development is not within a flood risk zone, within 20m of a watercourse and does not propose to increase flood risk elsewhere.

The application form states that the foul drainage will be disposed of via a connection to the public mains sewer. The developer is advised to contact Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water to ensure acceptability of the additional flows, to reduce the risk of hydraulic overload to the system. DCWW will also require a Section 104 Agreement to be entered into to permit the connection.

The application form states that the surface water will be disposed of via a connection to the main surface water sewer, with an attenuation system, but no calculations have been included within the application. Written confirmation is required that DCWW would adopt the proposed system, including the StormCell crate system which is not normally adopted by DCWW. It is considered that a S104 agreement will be required from DCWW for the future adoption of the proposed drainage, especially with regard to any POS land agreement.

It is noted within the drainage strategy that the volumes will be contained below ground for 1 in 30 year storm events and that for 1in 100 year storm, plus a 20% allowance for climate change, would be contained above ground, within the site, on the POS, but no details have been included. (It does not appear that any allowance has been made for increased storage, to allow for climate change, in the below ground attenuation system, also I would expect the allowance to be 30% rather than 20% given the expected life of the development.) It was also noted that the adoption and maintenance of the above ground storage proposals would lie with the Local Authority, but again no details have been included. This would require discussion and agreement with the BCBC Parks department who may have concerns over the restrictions posed by the underground attenuation system and potential management of flooding to the area in excess events.

No surface water is allowed to discharge to the public highway.

No land drainage run-off will be permitted to discharge (either directly or indirectly) into the public sewerage system.

In view of the limited information available at this time I would recommend that the Conditions below be attached to any consent you are minded to grant:

No development shall commence on site until a scheme for the comprehensive and integrated drainage of the site, showing how foul drainage, road and roof/yard water and land drainage will be dealt with, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the approved scheme must be implemented prior to beneficial use.

Reason: to ensure that effective drainage facilities are provided for the proposed development and that flood risk is not increased

And

Development shall not commence until a surface water drainage system has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The applicant shall ensure that an assessment is carried out into the potential for disposing of the surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system, in accordance with the principles set out in accordance with TAN 15 (or any subsequent version) and the results of the

assessment provided to the Local Planning Authority. Where a sustainable drainage scheme is to be provided, the submitted details shall:

i) Provide information about the design calculations, storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent the pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface water.

ii) Provide confirmation from DCWW with regard to adoption of the surface water sewer and below ground attenuation under a Section 104 Agreement.

iii) Provide information with regard to the additional above ground storage proposals. (Including levels/sections and flood outline)

Reason: to ensure that effective satisfactory management and disposal of surface water is provided for the proposed development and flood risk is not increased

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Regards

Sara

Sara Taylor | Land Drainage Engineer
Flood & Coastal Management | Bridgend County Borough Council
Communities Directorate | Waterton Lane | Waterton | CF31 3YP

[redacted]
Website: www.bridgend.gov.uk

E-mail may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.
Please do not print this email unless absolutely necessary.
E-bost yn cael ei logio, ei monitro a/neu ei chofnodi yn awtomatig am resymau cyfreithiol
Peidiwch ag argraffu'r neges e-bost hon oni bai fod hynny'n gwbl angenrheidiol.

AG

Planning

From: David Lynn
Sent: 13 November 2012 13:23
To: Planning
Subject: RE: Request for comments - Planning Application Ref: P/12/796/FUL

With reference to the above application, I write concerning your emailed request sent on 8th November 2012 concerning the application for 94 Dwellings and Outline-B1 Employment Use Of Remainder Of Site at Ty Draw Farm, Pyle.

The number of proposed dwellings generates provision of an equipped children's play area. The 94 number dwellings generate a LEAP standard equipped children's play area which could be either provided on the development site or off site via payment of an in lieu sum.

If provided on site, consideration should be given to the proximity to nearby dwellings and ground levels. Details for on site provision would need to be discussed and subsequently agreed.

In the event that the LEAP children's play area is not provided on site then payment of an in lieu of on site provision sum would be required. The sum would consist of £40,000 for the provision of the equipped play area and additional payment for the construction of a 1.5 metre wide tarmacadam access footpath linking the Fairfield road footway with the public open space situated off Ffordd Yr Eglwys. The existing footway network at Fairfield Road and Ffordd Yr Eglwys does not provide direct access to the public open space from the proposed development site. The footpath would be constructed to Highway standards and be on a gradient of no greater than 1:16. The cost of this footpath would need to be agreed. I understand that highway improvement works are required and that a pedestrian crossing point on Fairfield Road at the entrance to the proposed development site is part of these works.

It should be noted that the proposed underground SUDS attenuation system will not be adopted as open space land and that the applicant will need to make enquiries with Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water regarding future adoption.

For and on behalf of
Gareth Evans
PARKS AND PLAYING FIELDS MANAGER

David Lynn
Development Assistant

Parks And Playing Fields Section
Communities Directorate
Bridgend County Borough Council
Civic Centre
Bridgend
CF31 4WB.

[redacted]
Website: www.bridgend.gov.uk

BCBC
RECEIVED
13 NOV [redacted]
CORPORATE DIRECTOR - COMMUNITIES
DEVELOPMENT

From: planning@bridgend.gov.uk [mailto:planning@bridgend.gov.uk]
Sent: 08 November 2012 09:04
To: David Lynn
Subject: Request for comments - Planning Application Ref: P/12/796/FUL

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

Reference	:	**P/12/796/FUL**
Development	:	FULL APPLICATION- 94 DWELLINGS ASSOC. ACCESS,OPEN SPACE ETC; OUTLINE- B1 EMPLOYMENT USE OF THE REMAINDER OF SITE (2.23HA)
Location	:	LAND AT TY DRAW FARM PYLE BRIDGEND
Grid Ref	:	E2826 N1815

I have received the above application. Please click on the link below to view the documents submitted with the application -

Click here to view details on the application

Please provide me with your observations on the proposal within 14 days. If I do not receive your reply within the specified period I will consider you have no objections to this proposal.

13/11/2012

creu lle gwell
creating a better place

Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd Cymru
Environment Agency Wales

Bridgend County Borough Council
Development Control Section, Planning Dept
Civic Offices Angel Street
Bridgend
Mid Glamorgan
CF31 4WB

Ein cyf/Our ref: SH/2012/113949/01-L01
Eich cyf/Your ref: P/12/796/FUL

Dyddiad/Date: 22 November 2012

BCBC
[redacted] RECEIVED
22 NOV 2012
CORPORATE DIRECTOR - COMMUNITIES
DEVELOPMENT

Annwyl / Dear Mr. Tony Gore

94 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, *LANDSCAPING AND ENGINEERING WORKS. OUTLINE - PLANNING* APPLICATION FOR B1 EMPLOYMENT USE OF THE REMAINDER OF THE SITE COMPRISING 2.23 HA WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED APART FROM ACCESS. LAND AT TY DRAW FARM, PYLE, BRIDGEND.

Thank you for referring the above application which we received on 8 November 2012.

We have no objection to the proposed development but wish to make the following comments and conditions.

Pollution Prevention

Due to the nature of the proposed development the following condition should be included in any planning permission granted.

Condition 1
No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Method Statement detailing all necessary pollution prevention measures for the construction phase of the development is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Method Statement shall identify as a minimum;

- storage facilities for all fuels, oils and chemicals
- construction compounds, car parks, offices etc
- details of surface water drainage arrangements to be installed to intercept and treat contaminated surface water run-off
- details of measures to ensure no polluting discharge from haul roads/disturbed areas
- details of the nature, type and quantity of materials to be imported on to the site

BUDDSODDWR MEWN POBL
INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

- measures for dealing with any contaminated material (demolition waste or excavated waste)
- identification of any buried services, such as foul sewers, so that they are protected
- details of emergency contacts, for example the Environment Agency Pollution hotline 0800 807 060

The Method Statement should then be efficiently communicated to all contractors and sub-contractors (for example, via toolbox talks) and any deficiencies rectified immediately

Reason 1

To reduce the risk of pollution to controlled waters

Foul and Surface Water Drainage

It is acknowledged that the development intends to connect to the foul drainage to the main sewer. Your Authority are advised to consult Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water to confirm that there is adequate capacity in the system to accommodate the increased flows without causing pollution.

We note from the application form that the proposed method of surface water drainage is to be via surface water sewer. As stated within the Drainage Statement produced by Shear Design dated November 2009 soakaways are not a viable solution for the viable solution for surface water disposal.

The applicant should also be encouraged to investigate and implement additional forms of sustainable drainage techniques (SuDS) within the development, for example grey-water recycling, rain-water harvesting, permeable paving etc.

If it can be shown that SuDS can be used at the site, then we would ask that their use is secured by means of a **condition** on any permission granted.

Condition 2

The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a scheme to manage and dispose of surface water has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason 2

To reduce the risk of pollution to controlled waters and to prevent the increased risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of surface water disposal.

Further information on SuDS can be found in:

- TAN15, paragraphs 8.1-8.6 and Appendix 4
- the CIRIA C522 document 'Sustainable Drainage Systems-design manual for England and Wales'
- the CIRIA C697 document 'The SUDS Manual'
- the Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems (this provides advice on design, adoption and maintenance issues and a full overview of other technical guidance on SUDS).

The Interim Code of Practice is available on both our web site at: www.environment-

Cont/d..

agency.gov.uk and CIRIA's web site at www.ciria.org.uk

Any surface water management system should be designed to ensure there is no increase in surface water run-off from the site in all events up to and including the 1% (1:100 year) storm with an appropriate allowance for climate change. The details of the surface water system should be submitted and approved to the satisfaction of the Local Authority to ensure there is no increased flood risk elsewhere

Note to LPA and Applicant

We note that the proposed specific discharge rate of 31 l/s from this site of 6.2 ha to be suitable. This is equivalent to a general discharge rate of 5 l/s/ha. However, your authority should note that the storage volume calculations should be confirmed by your drainage engineers.

We do however note that the calculations include a 20% increase for climate change, for the 100 year storage capacity. Our external guidance document *Guidance on Surface Water Run Off*, indicates that the most appropriate figure for this would be 30%. A copy of this document has been enclosed for ease.

Should you wish to discuss this application further please contact me at the Llandarcy office.

Yn ddiffuant / Yours sincerely

Miss Lisa Hopkinson
Planning Liaison Officer

Deialu uniongyrchol/Direct dial [redacted]
Ffacs uniongyrchol/Direct fax 0
E-bost uniongyrchol/Direct e-m

End

Guidance on Surface Water Run-off (Wales only)

Effective from : 25/11/2011
Review Date: 25/11/2014

This Guidance should be treated as an interim document which may be superceded and/or amended by the enactment of legislation contained within the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (FWMA) and/or the requirements of the SuDs Approval Boards (SABs)

Limitations of use

This document will help and inform external organisations when they deal with development proposals involving flood risk in Wales. It is intended to provide some basic overview in respect of our advice regarding surface water matters in relation to flood risk and planning consultations in Wales. The document does not apply in England.

It is based on the best available information available to us at the date of the guidance but is not intended as a statement of law.

We reserve the right to amend, vary or revoke this guidance without notice.

Environment Agency and its Officers accept no liability whatsoever for any loss or damage arising from the interpretation or use of this guidance by persons other than Environment Agency and its Officers.

Who does this apply to?

Development and Flood Risk/Planning Liaison Teams that operate in Environment Agency Wales, including external organisations.

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION 2
2. HARMFUL EFFECTS OF TRADITIONAL DRAINAGE 2
3. PLANNING POLICY 3
4. GREENFIELD SITES 3
5. PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITES 4
6. DESIGN CRITERIA 5
7. CONSIDERING CLIMATE CHANGE 6

FURTHER INFORMATION

EXTERNAL USE ONLY

BCBC
RECEIVED
22 NOV 2012
CORPORATE DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES DEVELOPMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

Purpose of document

We have recently undertaken a review of the various methodologies for the calculation of surface water run-off for greenfield and previously developed Sites. This has established the following approach be used as best practice by Local Authorites, Developers, Consulting Engineers, Hydrologists etc. The following information contained within this advice note will provide a useful reference to ensure a more consistent approach is achieved with the determination of surface water runoff for such sites.

Our position on non-flood related issues

This document describes our approach in respect of Surface Water and Flood Risk and does not affect our position in respect to objections on other grounds, for example inadequacies in arrangements for sewerage, natural environment or other matters.

2. HARMFUL EFFECTS OF TRADITIONAL DRAINAGE

Overview

Traditional drainage systems are designed to move rainwater as rapidly as possible from the point at which it has fallen to a final discharge point, which is normally either a watercourse or soakaway. This approach has a number of harmful effects:

Run-off from hard paving and roofing can increase the risk of flooding downstream, as well as causing sudden rises in water levels and flow rates in watercourses.

Surface water run-off can contain contaminants such as oil, organic matter and toxic metals. Although often at low levels, cumulatively these can result in poor water quality in rivers and groundwater, affecting biodiversity, amenity value and potential water abstraction. After heavy rain, the first flush is often highly polluting.

By diverting rainfall to piped systems, water is stopped from soaking into the ground, depleting ground water and reducing flows in watercourses in dry weather.

As a result, many urban watercourses are lifeless and unattractive, and are often hidden in culverts under the ground.

EXTERNAL USE ONLY

3. PLANNING POLICY

TAN 15

In line with Section 8.5 of the Welsh Government's Technical Advice Note 15: Development & Flood Risk (TAN15), surface water run-off should be managed through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).

Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)

SuDS are an approach to managing surface water run-off which seeks to mimic natural drainage systems and retain water on or near the site, as opposed to traditional drainage approaches which involve piping water off site as quickly as possible. SuDS involve a range of techniques including soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable pavements, grassed swales, ponds and wetlands. SuDS offer significant advantages over conventional piped drainage systems. They can reduce flood risk by attenuating the rate and quantity of surface water run-off from a site, promote groundwater recharge, and improve water quality and local amenity. The variety of SuDS techniques available means that virtually any development should be able to include a scheme based around these principles.

Other Policies

Policies in emerging or adopted Local Development Plans are likely to support the delivery of appropriately designed, phased and managed SuDS schemes to ensure that flood risk from surface water run-off is properly managed.

4. GREENFIELD SITES

Our Advice

In this situation, surface water drainage proposals will be measured against the existing greenfield or undeveloped conditions of the site. We will therefore advise that for the range of annual flow probabilities from 1 in 1 year *up to and including the 1% (1 in 100 year) event plus an allowance for climate* change, that the developed rate of run-off into a watercourse should be reduced, in comparison to the undeveloped rate for the same event.

Flooding Problems Associated with Downstream Structures

Due to the limiting capacity of downstream structures associated with known flooding problems, the calculated Greenfield Rate should be measured against these structures. It may be necessary to further reduce the maximum Greenfield Rate as a result of any restrictions identified downstream of the site in question. Notwithstanding this, Local Planning/Drainage Operating Authorities and Sewerage Undertakers may already have or specify a lower maximum discharge rate into other non main river watercourses and/or drainage systems because of this situation..

EXTERNAL USE ONLY

5. PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITES

Our Advice

In line with with paragraph 8.3 of TAN 15 we will be seeking reductions in the peak rates of run-off for surface water drainage proposals. These will be measured against the existing characteristics of the previously developed site and will be treated favourably if they tend to meet greenfield standards.

Existing Drainage System

If the existing drainage system for the site is known, best practice modelling software should be used to model a range of probabilities up to and including the 1% (1 in 100 year) event plus an allowance for climate change. This will establish the pre-development rate and will ensure that the post–development rate into the receiving watercourses is reduced compared to the existing site peak run-off rates for the same events.

Dwr Cymru/ Welsh Water (DCWW) and Public Sewers

If the existing site previously discharged surface water into a combined public sewer, it is now likely that the Sewerage Undertaker i.e. DCWW, will require this to be removed from their system. In this instance, the surface water will either need to be infiltrated on site, discharged into a nearby watercourse or, where this is justified as unfeasible, at a rate agreed with them into their public system . If sustainable drainage is justified as unfeasible, then the maximum rate into their public system must be agreed with them.

With the former, the developer must apply the above requirements in consultation with the Local Authority (Ordinary Watercourses) and/or the Environment Agency Wales (Main Rivers).

EXTERNAL USE ONLY

6. DESIGN CRITERIA

General Requirements

Drainage systems should provide rates of discharge that are controlled to equivalent Greenfield run-off rates for the site in question.

Urbanisation can also increase the volume of storm water run-off as well as the peak in rate of run-off. Therefore, a developed site should be limited to the Greenfield run-off volume and reduced wherever possible. Infiltration or other techniques (interception storage) are to be used to ensure minimal discharge to receiving watercourses for rainfall depths up to 5mm. The additional volume of run-off generated i.e. the difference in runoff volume pre and post-development for the 100 year 6 hour event, should be disposed of by way of infiltration, or if this is not feasible due to soil type, discharged from the site at flow rates below 2l/s/ha.

Where the increased volume of run-off due to the development (up to the 1% (100 year) event plus an allowance for climate change) cannot be adequately managed within the site, the drainage system should be designed to ensure that the peak discharge for the 3.3% (30 year) and 1% (100 year) event plus an allowance for climate change does not exceed the 1 in 1 year Greenfield run-off rate. This typically ranges from 2 to 20 l/s/ha (**Note: this does not mean that we will accept all values at the higher end of this range**).

The maximum discharge rate and provision of attenuation will normally apply to all parts of the site where the existing run-off characteristics are altered by the proposed development. This is to ensure that the run-off from the whole site is not increased when compared to the pre-development situation. Sufficient storage must be provided so that the controlled rate of discharge is not exceeded over the lifetime of the development i.e. up to and including the 1% (1 in 100 year) storm rainfall event which must incorporate the latest adopted climate change guidance.

Storm Rainfall

Design rainfall totals should be derived for the appropriate probability or return period from Flood Studies Report or Flood Estimation Handbook (FSR/FEH) rainfall statistics (we also recognise there are other suitable methods). A drainage system design will need to be tested for a range of storm durations for each return period. Peak rainfall intensities should be increased as follows.

10% up to 2055
20% 2055 to 2085
30% 2085 to 2115

This will account for predicted changes in rainfall due to climate change over the specified design life of the drainage system.

Minimum Discharge Rate

A practicable minimum limit on the discharge rate from a flow control structure is often a compromise between attenuating to a satisfactory flow rate and minimising the risk of blockage. We recommend that the lower limit for the maximum discharge rate is 5 litres/sec (l/s). The minimum size of pipe discharging from a flow attenuation device should be 150mm laid at a gradient no less than 1 in 150 to meet the requirements of Sewers for Adoption 6th Edition.

EXTERNAL USE ONLY

Storage Types/Attenuation Measures

The preferred way of retaining run-off volumes on site is through open storage i.e. storage situated above ground such as ponds, dry basins, swales etc. These must be designed to contain run-off volumes generated by a 1% (100 year) storm rainfall event plus an allowance for climate change. When considering the initial layout for a development, it is essential that sufficient land is made available to accommodate these types of features.

Underground storage structures are the least preferred methods of storage. These generally comprise of engineered tank structures and are designed in accordance with Sewers for Adoption criteria. The underground drainage system, including storage structures, are usually designed to contain the 3.33% (30 year) critical storm event without surcharge. This will require a suitably designed site layout to manage exceedance flows so that when the design capacity of the underground system is exceeded, the excess surface water is safely stored above ground (dealt with at source within the site) without increasing flood risk elsewhere. This is in line with the standards for open storage described above.

The provision of attenuation measures and their long term maintenance need to be secured. It is for the LPA to decide how best this is achieved but we would expect to see arrangements in place to secure their provision and to ensure long-term maintenance.

Please note that the standards described above are based on current information and may change as new technical guidance becomes available.

7. CONSIDERING CLIMATE CHANGE

Climate Change

We will expect the allowances for climate change, set out in the latest WG approved project appraisal guidance, to be included when designing Surface Water Systems.

EXTERNAL USE ONLY

FURTHER INFORMATION

Preliminary Rainfall Runoff Management for Developments:
R & D Technical Report W5-074/A/TR/1 Revision D. Re-published November 2007

The Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems.
This Code of Practice provides advice on design, adoption and maintenance issues and a full overview of other technical guidance on SuDS.

The Interim Code of Practice is on the CIRIA website: www.ciria.org.uk

or our website at:
http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Business/icop_final_0704_872183.pdf

You should be aware that Section 8 of TAN15 (paragraph 8.4) states that if SuDS cannot be implemented, a conventional drainage system will need to improve on the status quo.

- CIRIA can provide the following resources relevant to SUDS:
- Sustainable Drainage Systems - The SuDS manual (C697)
- Sustainable Drainage Systems – Design Manual for England and Wales C522
- Sustainable Drainage Systems – Best practice C523
- Source control using constructed pervious surfaces - C582
- Infiltration drainage – Manual of good practice - C156
- Rainwater and greywater use in buildings – Best practice guide C539
- Review of the design and management of constructed wetlands - C180
- SUDS - Hydraulic, structural and water quality advice C609
- Designing for Exceedance in Urban Drainage – Good Practice C635

EXTERNAL USE ONLY

MEMORANDUM
COFNOD

Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol
Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr
BRIDGEND
County Borough Council

From: **GROUP MANAGER, PUBLIC PROTECTION**

To: **COMMUNITIES DIRECTORATE**
HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
For the attention of Tony Gore

Our Ref	Ext No.	Your Ref	Date
LJ/KW	[redacted]		22 November 2012

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
REFERENCE NO: P/12/796/FUL
DEVELOPMENT: FULL APPLICATION – 94 DWELLINGS ASSOC. ACCESS, OPEN SPACE ETC; OUTLINE – B1 EMPLOYMENT USE OF THE REMAINDER OF SITE
LOCATION: LAND AT TY DRAW FARM, PYLE, BRIDGEND

Further to your request for observations dated 08 November 2012, the plans with regard to the above application have been examined and I wish to make the following observations:

Having reviewed the Design and Access Statement, it is noted that the planned new development will consist of a mixture of residential properties and commercial class B1 usage. However, no details have been provided of the possible noise impact the proposed commercial development will have on the proposed residential properties. Therefore, in order to ensure adequate protection for residents against noise, I would request that prior to the commercial unit becoming operational, the applicant carries out a noise impact assessment using BS4142. The assessment should be carried out by someone suitably qualified to do so. Once the assessment has been completed, the findings must be forwarded to this department for assessment and approval prior to development, so that suitable noise limits and conditions can be imposed.

High levels of noise may be experienced by the noise sensitive development due to its close proximity to the M4 and A4229. Therefore, I request the applicant carry out a noise survey in accordance with "Planning Guidance (Wales) *Technical Advice Note (Wales)* 11 Noise" to establish which noise exposure category the proposed dwelling will fall within and submit a report, as to the appropriate remedial measures that will be taken to mitigate the impact of noise.

Records indicate that the proposed development is situated near a historical railway line. Whilst there is no evidence to suggest contamination of the soil, the presence of any significant unsuspected contamination which becomes evident during the development of the site shall be brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority.

Kind regards,

[redacted]

[redacted]

BCBC
RECEIVED
8 NOV 2012
CORPORATE DIRECTOR DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITIES

Mr L Jones, Group Manager Public Protection
On behalf of **ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE LEGAL AND REGULATORY SERVICES**

Dŵr Cymru
Welsh Water

Developer Services
PO Box 3146
Cardiff
CF30 0EH

Tel: +44 (0)800 917 2652
Fax: +44 (0)2920 740472
E.mail: developer.services@dwrcymru.com

Gwasanaethau Datblygu
Blwch Post 3146
Caerdydd
CF30 0EH

Ffôn: +44 (0)800 917 2652
Ffacs: +44 (0)2920 740472
E.bost: developer.services@dwrcymru.com

Assistant Director (Planning Services)
Bridgend County Borough Council
Civic Centre
Angel Street
Bridgend
CF31 4WB

Date: 21/11/2012
Enquiries Tel.: 08009172652
Our Ref.: 2012/DCWW/84091
Your Ref.: P/12/796/FUL -AC(
Grid Ref.: SS8260381501

Dear Sir

Re: Full application for 94 dwellings and Outline for B1 employment use 2.23 hectares, Land at Ty Draw farm, Pyle, Bridgend

Further to the above consultation we would provide the following comments:-

SEWERAGE

The proposed development would overload the existing public sewerage system. No improvements are planned within Dwr Cymru Welsh Water's Capital Investment Programme. We consider any development prior to improvements being undertaken to be **premature** and therefore **OBJECT** to the development. It may be possible for the developer to fund the accelerated provision of replacement infrastructure or to requisition a new sewer under Sections 98 - 101 of the Water Industry Act 1991.

Reason: To prevent hydraulic overloading of the public sewerage system, to protect the health and safety of existing residents and ensure no detriment to the environment.

The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer with the approximate position being marked on the attached Statutory Public Sewer Record. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights of access to its apparatus at all times. No part of the building will be permitted within 3 metres either side of the centreline of the public sewer.

Reason: To protect the integrity of the public sewer and avoid damage thereto.

We hope the above is satisfactory. However, should you require further assistance please contact us on the above telephone number, quoting our reference.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]
Rhidian Clement
Principal Planner

Our response is based on the information provided by your application/enquiry. Should the information change then we reserve the right to make new representation.

[redacted]
BCBC
RECEIVED
28 NOV 2012
DEVELOPMENT
COMMUNITIES

glas
Glas Cymru Cyfyngedig

Welsh Water is owned by Glas Cymru – a 'not-for-profit' company.
Mae Dŵr Cymru yn eiddo i Glas Cymru - cwmni 'nid-er-elw'.

We welcome correspondence in Welsh and English.

Dŵr Cymru Cyf, a limited company registered in Wales no. 2366777. Registered office: Pentwyn Road, Nelson, Treharris, Mid Glamorgan CF46 6LY.

Rydym yn croesawu gohebiaeth yn y Gymraeg neu yn Saesneg.

Dŵr Cymru Cyf, cwmni cyfyngedig wedi'i gofrestru yng Nghymru rhif 2366777. Swyddfa gofrestredig: Heol Pentwyn, Nelson, Treharris, Morgannwg Canol CF46 6LY.

RECEIVED
28 NOV 2012
CORPORATE DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES
DEVELOPMENT

Cemetery
Track
MORGAN COURT
Path
Post
8
Posts
2 Posts
8 to
Lay-by
Lay-by
46.3m
42.6m
A 4229
Pyle
Chapel
The Manse
Lay-by
Lay-by
Issues
Sinks
A 4229
Path
FB

LEGEND

Waste network:

	Foul chamber		Outfall
	Surface water chamber	LH	Lamphole
	Combined chamber		Storm Overflow
C-O	Combined sewer overflow		Rising main
S PC	Special purpose chamber		Gravity sewer
	Treatment works	P	Private sewer
	Pumping station	NB: Sewer symbol colour indicates the type.	

RED - Combined
GREEN - Surface Water
BROWN - Foul
Purple - Former S24 sewers (for indicative purposes only)

Notes:

--- Type notes here ---
--- Remembering to manually add line breaks ---

Dwr Cymru gives this information as to the position of its underground apparatus by way of general guidance only on the strict understanding that it is based on the best information available and no warranty as to its correctness is relied upon in the event of excavations or other works made in the vicinity of the Company's apparatus and any onus of locating the apparatus before carrying out any excavations rests entirely on you. It must be understood that the furnishing of the information is entirely without prejudice to the provision of the New Roads and Streetworks Act 1991 and of the Company's right to be compensated for any damage to its apparatus.

Service pipes are not generally shown but their presence should be anticipated.

EXACT LOCATIONS OF ALL APPARATUS TO BE DETERMINED ON SITE.

Reproduced by permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of HMSO. © Crown copyright and database right 2008. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey License number 100019534.

N
W E
S

Dŵr Cymru
Welsh Water

2012/DCWW/84091

Map Ref: ss8260381501
Map scale: 1:2,000
Printed by:
Printed on:

MEMORANDUM
COFNOD

[redacted] BCBC RECEIVED 4 DEC 2012 CORPORATE DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR - COMMUNITIES

Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr BRIDGEND County Borough Council

Countryside and Tourism

To: **Group Manager Development**

From: **Group Manager Regeneration**

Please ask for : Geoff Hobbs Ecologist **Ext Nº** [redacted]

Our ref:	**your ref:**	**date:**
TC9.GH.P/12/796/FUL	P/12/796/FUL / AK	07/12/2012

RE FULL APPLICATION- 94 DWELLINGS ASSOC. ACCESS,OPEN SPACE ETC; OUTLINE- B1 EMPLOYMENT USE OF THE REMAINDER OF SITE(2.23HA) LAND AT TY DRAW FARM PYLE

Thank you for your request for comments for the above application.

The proposed site has a special employment allocation under the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Policy E6 (5) Ty Draw Farm, North Cornelly. However, I note that the application is for a mixed use development, which may be considered out of accord with the UDP. Therefore, the following comments are provided should the proposed mixed use development be considered to be acceptable under the provisions of the adopted and emerging development plans.

An Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey conducted by Soltys Brewster ecology (2012) accompanies the application. The most significant ecological features identified were the hedgerows and trees and the site is likely, along with the woodland edge, to function to some extent as foraging, shelter and commuting habitat for birds and bats, and could potentially support common reptiles.

Recommended measures to avoid/minimise ecological impacts include retention of hedgerows, trees and woodland edge habitats and to comply with the law, a condition be included in any consent that states that any works should be done outside the nesting season, which is generally recognised to be from March to August. Alternatively, the applicant should demonstrate through a bird nesting survey by a suitably qualified ecologist that there are no nesting birds at the site immediately prior to works commencing. This survey should be submitted and agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

If at any time nesting birds are observed, works, which may disturb them, must cease immediately and advice sought. Any active nests identified should be protected until the young have fledged. Where a Schedule 1 species is involved, mitigation for impacts, e.g. loss of nesting site, should be devised and implemented.

MEMORANDUM
COFNOD

Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol
Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr
BRIDGEND
County Borough Council

Section 3.18 indicates that an area of semi-improved grassland on the bank verge to the north of the site (target note 9) was considered to offer suitable reptile habitat and presence/absence surveys would be required if this area was to be cleared (Plate 2). Unfortunately the Phase I habitat map with target notes do not accompany the online report. Therefore , I recommend that if this area is to be cleared, that a presence/ absence survey is conducted as per the recommendations in the ecological report.

A number of guidance documents are available on how to protect ecological features during construction including the BCBC Trees and development SPG 07, which provides guidance on developments that may impact on trees. The British Standard BS 5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction* provides detailed guidance on measures for the protection of trees during the construction process. This standard recommends types of protection and minimum distance for protective fencing around trees and prevention of damage to roots.

Retained woodland and hedgerows should be managed appropriately to aid adoption of green space in the future by the council and hedgerow management should include infill planting with native species to mitigate the loss of any hedgerows as part of the development.

The impact of lighting needs to be taken into account when assessing the potential landscape, visual and biodiversity impacts. There are no details proposed for a lighting scheme for the development. As mentioned in the ecological report the design of the site lighting should ensure that retained and proposed woodlands and hedgerows including boundary features are maintained as 'dark corridors'.

Artificial lighting can adversely impact on a number of species and all developments should consider and minimise the impacts of lighting schemes. Schemes near to woodlands, hedgerows and waterways such as this can be particularly harmful to biodiversity. Bats have been identified in the vicinity of the site and are known to be particularly effected as lighting schemes can impact on their behaviour and ability to survive.

British bats and their breeding sites and resting places are protected by law through UK legislation under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 which implements the EC Directive 92/43/EEC in the United Kingdom and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000).

This legislation makes it an absolute offence to damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place (sometimes referred to as a roost, whether the animal is present at the time or not), intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a place used for shelter and protection, or deliberately capture, injure, kill, or disturb a bat/bats. Lighting in the vicinity of a bat roost causing disturbance could constitute an offence so it is important that if a lighting scheme is proposed the Countryside Council for Wales is consulted and allowed time to provide advice on lighting proposals in the vicinity of bats and roosts.

MEMORANDUM
COFNOD

Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol
Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr
BRIDGEND
County Borough Council

Any lighting scheme for the proposed development should include wildlife sensitive lighting. Therefore, I recommend that the lighting scheme follow recommendations as found in the 'bats and lighting' document available on the Bat Conservation Trust) website (www.bats.org.uk). Care should be taken to avoid casting light over linear features such as hedgerows / line of trees which may be used by commuting bats. Low level, and directional lighting should be included, the use of baffles and cowls (as appropriate) could be used to achieve this. The applicant can seek advice from an ecological consultant on applying an appropriate lighting scheme.

I recommend that a condition of the development be that any external lighting scheme should first be submitted for approval by the local authority if it is in an area of suitable bat habitat (eg. woodland, old pasture, linking hedgerows and water habitats). If a lighting scheme is proposed a survey may be needed to determine the species of bat affected, their population levels, the likely impact of the lighting on the bats and possible mitigation.

Protecting, enhancing and recreating habitats and natural features in development will ensure that Bridgend continues to put sustainable development and national planning policy at the forefront of decision making

In my previous comments for this site (P/12/606/SOR dated 20/09/2012) I recommend that opportunities exist for the site to contribute to providing accessible natural green space for the public. I notice from the landscaping plan that accompanies the application that there are areas of woodland planting and retention of existing hedgerows. I welcome the creation of public open space into the design of the development which also acts as a visual buffer between the commercial/employment areas and residential.

These open spaces surrounding the employment areas are located a significant distance from many of the residential properties in the south. I repeat my previous comments that the creation of open space alongside the woodland would not only buffer the woodland from the development but it would be enhanced by the presence of the woodland and in the interests of Green infrastructure (Emerging Bridgend LDP Policy ENV5). The woodland itself also offers opportunities to act as an area of accessible green space. I understand that the woodland is within the ownership of the applicant and the management of the woodland to create safe walking trails will significantly improve the provision of accessible green space to the residents of the site.

The landscape plans provided with this application do not include details such as the species of trees, wildflower mixes, management regimes etc. **I recommend that the landscape scheme is resubmitted with these details including a scheme of management up to and beyond a time when the local authority may be requested to adopt public areas.** The document Landscapes Working for Bridgend County Borough (1997) and the design guidelines for landscape schemes within should be used to inform the landscaping scheme.

MEMORANDUM
COFNOD

Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol
Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr
BRIDGEND
County Borough Council

If you require further information please contact Geoff Hobbs on the following contact number

[redacted]

[redacted]

Dr G Hobbs
For Group Manager Regeneration

APCONRES - Cornelly CC

[redacted]

plan
independent
planning
consultancy

Development Control

Bridgend County Borough Council

Bridgend

March 4 2013

By e mail only

Dear Mr Davies,

LDP Session 19 - Ty Draw Site, Cornelly – Strategic Employment Site and Planning Application P/12/796/FUL -AC

Following the hearing into this site this morning, I write to advise that I have been instructed by Cornelly Community Council to write to Bridgend County Borough Council as Local Planning Authority, requesting either that application P/12/796/FUL is refused on the grounds of prematurity or that no positive decision is taken in relation to Planning Application on the grounds that such action would be premature and prejudicial to the LDP process. This is on the basis that any reading of the LDP and its evidence base would lead a reasonable person to conclude that the allocation of the whole site as a Strategic Employment Site is seminal to the strategy and objectives of the Plan.

One only has to look at the following sections to demonstrate this namely;

- The Plan Strategy and Focussed Regeneration Chpt 2 Pg 9 and Chpt 2 Pg 11;
- The Plan Strategy and Benefits of Growth Chpt 2 Pg 10;
- Spatial Distribution of Growth Chpt 3 Pg 20 and especially 3.1.10;
- Strategic Policy SP9 (4) Chpt 5 Page 45;
- Delivery and Implementation Chpt 9 Pg 86; and
- Appendix 3 Pg 106.

Should the LPA attempt to take a positive decision on the application in advance of the Inspector's Report – the Community Council will consider taking legal action.

Yours Sincerely

Robert Hathaway BSc Hons, Dip TP, MRTPI

[redacted]

[redacted]

B C
EIVED
AR 2013
CORPORATE DIRECTORATE DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITIES

Planning

From: Tony Gore
Sent: 01 March 2013 15:19
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Request for comments - Planning Application Ref: P/12/796/FUL

Please scan onto Anite

Tony Gore
Planning Department
Development Group
Communities Directorate
Bridgend County Borough Council

te
e[redacted]

From: Elaine Williams
Sent: 01 March 2013 11:17
To: Tony Gore
Subject: FW: Request for comments - Planning Application Ref: P/12/796/FUL

From: Elaine Williams ~ housing.
Sent: 01 March 2013 11:16
To: Gareth Denning
Cc: Tony Gore; Martin Ridgeway
Subject: RE: Request for comments - Planning Application Ref: P/12/796/FUL

Gareth, I've spoken to Tony regarding this site and had a brief conversation with Martin on Tuesday this week. We feel that there is a high concentration of 4 beds on the site as opposed to other units. The following information is the requirement for Pyle in accordance with the housing register and affordable housing.

bed	Total	1bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5
B3E	Pyle	461	187	93	33	0

As you can see in relation to affordable housing our need is still for one and two bedroom properties and for 4 bed and a lesser requirement for 3 bed.

In view of this if the mix cannot be changed we would require the following:

2 - 4 bed properties
4 – 2 bed of which we require 2 – 2bed units to be accessible/adapted
6 – 1 bed properties (perhaps they could consider converting some of the other units to meet the additional 4 – 1bed properties)

Total 12 units

Elaine

BCBC
[redacted]VED
- 1 MAR 2013
[redacted]PMENT

From: Gareth Denning
Sent: 20 February 2013 15:58
To: Elaine Williams; Martin Ridgeway
Cc: Tony Gore
Subject: RE: Request for comments - Planning Application Ref: P/12/796/FUL

Dear both,

Further to my email below, I took a call from Mark Roberts of Barton Willmore yesterday afternoon seeking advice on the likely tenure and size of affordable housing we would be looking for in this location.

The proposed scheme includes the following mix:

5 x 2-bed
34 x 3-bed
53 x 4+ beds
2 x 1-bed (flats)

If you have any thoughts on the above can you let me know?

Many thanks, Gareth

Gareth Denning
Principal Section 106 Officer
Bridgend County Borough Council
Civic Centre, Bridgend, CF31 4WB
[redacted]

From: Gareth Denning
Sent: 05 February 2013 10:14
To: Elaine Williams
Cc: Martin Ridgeway
Subject: FW: Request for comments - Planning Application Ref: P/12/796/FUL

Hi Elaine,

If you have any observations on the planning application below, can you provide them to Tony as soon as possible? Particularly regarding the suitability of the mix and the tenure we would look for in this location.

We are recommending to the LDP Planning Inspector that the site be included as an additional housing allocation to help meet the shortfall in numbers he has identified.

I've attached my initial comments regarding likely S106 requirements, which I will be forwarding to Tony in turn.

Many thanks, Gareth

Gareth Denning
Principal Section 106 Officer
Bridgend County Borough Council
Civic Centre, Bridgend, CF31 4WB
[redacted]

APCONRES - Education

Planning

From: Tony Gore
Sent: 04 February 2013 10:04
To: Planning
Cc: Gareth Denning
Subject: FW: Proposed residential development, Ty Draw farm, North Cornelly P/12/796/FUL

Please scan onto Anite

[redacted]

B C B C
RECEIVED
FEB 2013
CORPORATE DIRECTOR - COMMUNITIES

Tony Gore
Planning Department
Development Group
Communities Directorate
Bridgend County Borough Council

tel [redacted]
em

From: John Herd
Sent: 04 February 2013 10:01
To: Tony Gore
Cc: Gareth Denning; Julie Griffiths
Subject: RE: Proposed residential development, Ty Draw farm, North Cornelly P/12/796/FUL

Hi Tony,

Sorry for the delay in replying. Whilst the primary and secondary schools (Corneli and Cynffig) have spare capacity the Welsh medium school Ysgol Y Ferch O'r Sger is full. Analysis of the area shows that traditionally 16% of the Corneli catchment choose Welsh medium education. It is likely that this development will contribute an extra 3 children (94 x 0.22 x 16%) which may require installing temporary accommodation at the school. We would therefore require a contribution for 3 places (£48933).

Thanks,

John

--

John Herd
Project Manager
Strategic Planning and Resources
Children's Directorate
Bridgend County Borough Council
Sunnyside
Bridgend
CF31 4AR
[redacted]

From: Tony Gore
Sent: 04 February 2013 09:50
To: John Herd
Subject: Proposed residential development, Ty Draw farm, North Cornelly P/12/796/FUL

John,

APCONRES → AG.

Planning

From: Tony Gore
Sent: 01 February 2013 10:05
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Proposed residential/industrial development, Land at Ty Draw farm, North Cornelly. Application P/12/796/FUL (MAIL ID 13.042)

Please scan onto Anite

Tony Gore
Planning Department
Development Group
Communities Directorate
Bridgend County Borough Council

tel: [redacted]
ema[redacted]

B C B [redacted]
RECE[redacted]
- 1 FE[redacted]

CORPORATE DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES DEVELOPMENT

From: Nick Corrigan
Sent: 01 February 2013 10:04
To: Tony Gore
Cc: property
Subject: RE: Proposed residential/industrial development, Land at Ty Draw farm, North Cornelly. Application P/12/796/FUL (MAIL ID 13.042)

Hi Tony,

Property have no comments.

As you know we have a residential site to the North which we're progressing with Hendre, but it's not adjoining the subject site.

Regards,

Nick Corrigan Bsc (Hons) MRICS | **Disposals Surveyor**
Bridgend County Borough Council | ICT & Property | Property Services | Ravens Court | Brewery Lane | Bridgend | CF31 4AP
Gwerediadau Syrfëwr
Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr | TGCh ac Eiddo | Gwasanaethau Eiddo | Cwrt y Cigfrain | Lon y Bragdy | Pen-Y-Bont Ar Ogwr | CF31 4AP

[redacted]
Website/Gwefan: www.bridgend.gov.uk

From: property
Sent: 01 February 2013 09:45
To: Nick Corrigan
Subject: FW: Proposed residential/industrial development, Land at Ty Draw farm, North Cornelly. Application P/12/796/FUL (MAIL ID 13.042)

[redacted]
Cynorthwyydd Gweinyddol
Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr | TGCh ac Eiddo | Gwasanaethau Eiddo | Cwrt y Cigfrain | Lon y Bragdy | Pen-Y-Bont Ar Ogwr | CF31 4AP

[redacted]
Email/E-bost: [redacted]

A3

Planning

From: Tony Gore
Sent: 19 December 2012 15:56
To: Planning
Subject: FW: planning aplication p/12/796/ful

Please scan onto Anite

B C B
RECEI[redacted]
20 DEC 2012
CORPORATE DIRECTOR - COMMUNITIES
DEVELOPMENT

Tony Gore
Planning Department
Development Group
Communities Directorate
Bridgend County Borough Council

[redacted]

From: Emma Aston
Sent: 19 December 2012 15:30
To: Tony Gore
Cc: Karen Williams (Public Protection)
Subject: planning aplication p/12/796/ful

Hi Tony

Discussed please see below amendments for this application:

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
EMPLOYMENT AND RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, TY DRAW FARM, NORTH CORNELLY
APPLICATION: P/12/796/FUL

The noise report in respect of the above planning application has been examined by this Department and I have the following observations:

The report by Hunter Acoustics has been carried out using the correct methodology to determine the ambient and background noise levels and has identified that the proposed development will fall within Noise Exposure Category B. Suggested planning conditions have been provided in the report by the Acoustic Consultants. However, the internal noise levels suggested are not commensurate with the World Health Organisation Guidelines for preventing sleep disturbance at night and with preventing annoyance during the day. These levels should therefore subsequently be amended to ensure that ' all such rooms achieve an internal noise level of 35 dBA Leq 16 hour during the day and 30 dBA Leq 8 hour at night' instead of 40dBA and 35dBA respectively. The garden area should also be designed so that at least 50% of the garden area does not exceed 50dBA LAeq16hour as opposed to 55dBA to protect the occupants from exposure to noise of moderate annoyance as opposed to serious annoyance.

The background levels at position B and C are substantially higher than that for position A, (in excess of 10dB higher at certain corresponding times of the day). However, the suggested noise condition to limit noise from the industrial units is based on the average background level at location C, despite the proposed residential units being located at position A. In addition, the proposed condition must be reworded to ensure that the cumulative noise from the industrial units does not exceed an overall noise level. As a result, noisy activities and plant from each individual unit must be approved by the department prior to occupation to ensure that the overall noise limit is not exceeded. The additional proposed noise mitigation measures relating to screening and the positioning of fixed plant should also be included. Consequently, I would recommend that the following conditions be imposed if consent is granted.

1. Prior to commencement of development a scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to provide that all habitable rooms exposed to external noise in excess of 63 dBA Leq 16 hour (free field) during the day (07.00 to 23.00 hours) or 57 dBA Leq 8 hour (free field) at night (23.00 to 07.00 hours) shall be subject to sound insulation measures to ensure that all such rooms achieve internal noise level of 35 dBA Leq 16 hour during the day and 30 dBA Leq 8 hour at night. No habitable room shall be occupied until the approved sound insulation and ventilation measures have been installed in that room.

2. Gardens shall be designed to provide an area which is at least 50% of the garden area for sitting out where the maximum day time noise level does not exceed 50 dBA Leq 16 hour (free field).

3. A detailed assessment shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the internal and external noise levels specified in 1and 2 above have been achieved.

4. The commercial/industrial units shall be designed and operated to ensure that the rating level (when assessing the noise using BS4142) of the cumulative noise generated from operations on site measured (or where this is not possible, calculated) at any residential premises as an A-weighted equivalent continuous sound pressure level (LAeq1hour), shall not exceed 53dB in any one hour period between 07.00 and 19.00

5. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, operations at the commercial/industrial development shall be restricted to the following hours: 07.00- 19.00 hours Monday-Friday, 08-00-13.00 hours on Saturdays, with no operations on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

6. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, deliveries to the commercial/industrial development shall be restricted to between the following hours: 07.00-19.00 hours Monday- Friday, 08.00-13.00 hours on Saturdays, with no deliveries on Sundays or Bank Holidays

7. Prior to the commercial units becoming occupied, details of fixed plant and activities that may give rise to noise problems to the existing and proposed residential properties shall be submitted to this department for consultation and shall be agreed with the Public Protection Department to ensure that the cumulative noise limits specified in condition 4 are not exceeded.

8. External plant shall be located away from the western facades of the employment units.

9. An acoustic barrier shall be located along the western boundary of the "employment zone" prior to the development being brought into beneficial use to remove the line-of-sight from residential premises to low level plant. The design details of the barrier shall be submitted to the department for consideration, together with the appropriate barrier calculations to demonstrate that the barrier will be effective.

Thanks Emma

Miss Emma Aston - Environmental Protection Officer
Bridgend County Borough Council
Public Protection department
[redacted]

E-mail may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.
Please do not print this email unless absolutely necessary.
E-bost yn cael ei logio, ei monitro a/neu ei chofnodi yn awtomatig am resymau cyfreithiol
Peidiwch ag argraffu'r neges e-bost hon oni bai fod hynny'n gwbl angenrheidiol.

MEMORANDUM
COFNOD

Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol
Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr
BRIDGEND C B C
County Borough Council

RECE [redacted]

5 DE

CORPORATE DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES

COMMUNITIES DIRECTORATE
(Street Scene)

Distribution:

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
F.A.O. TONY GORE – FOR DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MANAGER

Our Ref:	Your Ref:	Ext No:	Date:
CMM/SS/NAH/WB/1(9)		[redacted]	30th November 2012

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

REFERENCE: P/12/796/FUL
DEVELOPMENT: FULL APPLICATION – 94 DWELLINGS ASSOC. ACCESS OPEN SPACE ETC.
OUTLINE – B1 EMPLOYMENT USE OF REMAINDER OF SITE (2.23HA)
LOCATION: LAND AT TY DRAW FARM PYLE BRIDGEND
GRID REF: E2826 N1815

I refer to your e-mail dated 29th Novembser 2012, regarding the above planning application.

Before commenting in detail on the application, I outline below some general points relating to new housing developments and their potential impact on domestic recycling performance.

You will be aware that over the last 25 years house design and construction has changed significantly due to pressures brought about by concerns over climate change. Similar environmental pressures relating to the depletion of natural resources have resulted in a strong emphasis being placed on increasing recycling levels.

In the same way that house designs, etc have change there is also a need to consider how new housing layouts impact on the ability of householders to recycle. In our experience, the great majority of householders will recycle provided it is convenient for them to do so. One of the "convenience" issues for householders is the distance that recycling containers have to be carried from their homes to the vehicle collection points.

Modern housing layouts sometimes include areas which have relatively long distances between properties and collection points. As a consequence, householders who have to carry their containers a long distance often choose not to make use of recycling services.

MEMORANDUM
COFNOD

Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol
Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr
BRIDGEND
County Borough Council

The Council has embraced the challenges associated with improving recycling levels and is well placed to achieve the statutory 52% recycling target for 2012/13. However, by 2025 the statutory target increases to 70%. This level of performance will only be achieved if a higher percentage of householders make use of the recycling service provided by the Council.

Referring to the above application, I comment as follows:-

Property nos. 91, 92, 93, 94, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 39, 40, 35, 36, and 37 are situated on what appears to be private drives which are not made up to highway adoptable standards and will therefore be not accessible to waste/recycling vehicles.

Residents will have to carry their waste out to the point at which the private drive meets the adopted highway. The waste and recyclables currently involves two large black plastic boxes for paper, cardboard and glass bottles / jars, a large blue bag for plastic containers and other recyclables, a large brown container for kitchen waste and black refuse sacks for general waste. Considering the extent of the waste and recyclables involved and the distance to be carried you can understand why recycling is being discouraged. Also further problems will be created with refuse sacks and recycling containers left outside other residents properties for collection.

In summary, therefore, the above planning application is not acceptable from a waste management perspective. In its current format the development will discourage effective use of the Council's recycling services.

If I can be of further assistance please do not hesitate to contact my department.

[redacted]

Andrew Hobbs
GROUP MANAGER STREETWORKS

B C B C
RECE[redacted]
2 9 NOV
DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATE DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES

Planning

From: John Dover
Sent: 29 November 2012 12:26
To: Planning
Cc: Alex Carey; Tony Gore; Gail Lewis; Anthony Godsall; Kevin Mulcahy; Nigel Moore
Subject: PLANNING APPLICATION P/12/796/FUL - 94 DWELLINGS (FULL) B1 EMPLOYMENT (OUT) LAND AT TY DRAW FARM PYLE BRIDGEND.

Planning,

Reference: P/12/796/RES. APCONRES - Highways
Development: FULL APPLICATION – 94 DWELLINGS ASSOC. ACCESS OPEN SPACE ETC. OUTLINE – B1 EMPLOYMENT USE OF REMAINDER OF SITE (2.23 HA).
Location: LAND AT TY DRAW FARM PYLE BRIDGEND.
Grid Ref: E2826 N1815.

Referring to the planning layout drawing number drawing number PL-03 Rev. G, the Design and Access Statement and other related information submitted as part of the above planning application, I would inform you that I have examined the details to confirm that the internal layout conforms with Manual for Streets 1, BCBC's Parking Standards (SPG 17) and other national and local guidance to identify any non-compliance and matters that would be of concern and potentially a threat to highway and public safety.

I would advise that the preliminary comments of the Highway Authority are:-

Improvements to the Existing Highway Network Necessitated by this Development Proposal.

It should be noted that you should await the observations of Alex Carey in respect of the outline B1 employment use of the site and improvements to the existing highway network before determining this hybrid planning application. In this regard it is noted from the Design and Access Statement submitted that a new upgraded public footway is proposed to the north of the site that will run east / west to School Terrace, North Cornelly. Consideration should be given to this facility being a footway / cycleway in the interests of sustainability by reducing reliance on the car for certain journeys. Alex Carey will elaborate on this requirement when formulating his highway Conditions to be imposed on any planning permission granted.

Creation of Adopted Country Lane Fronting Plots 17 – 22.

In order to provide a continuous adopted pedestrian link between the footway associated with the housing square in front of Plot 17 and the footway that terminates outside Plot 22, the Highway Authority proposes to adopt the private drive arrangement fronting Plots 17 – 22 as a country lane. The country lane concerned only serves 8 dwellings and therefore will be lightly trafficked and will be ideal for pedestrian use.

As a private drive sufficient public utility value exists (more than 5 dwellings) to warrant its make up under a Private Street Works scheme as per the provisions of the Highways Act 1980. Consequently, to prevent highway rights becoming established a 'Private Road' sign would have to be erected at each end of the private access. Adoption as a country lane will obviate the need for such signs.

Furthermore, adoption will assist with the collection of waste and recyclables as the refuse freighter will enter the adopted country lane to collect such items whereas they would not enter onto a private drive. However, swept path analysis details shall be submitted for a large 3 axle refuse vehicle (11.6m long with a turning circle of 20.3m) negotiating the tight bend in the vicinity of Plot 17 to prove the operational requirements of the country lane from the perspective of waste collection.

The provision of a narrow service strip to accommodate the statutory undertakers services should be considered to negate mains services and private services being located under the adopted carriageway resulting in excavations in the carriageway and potential closure of the lane when carrying out repairs. This could be achieved by narrowing the carriageway to 3.5m (country lane width) to provide a 1m strip.

Creation of Additional Shared Surface Access Road with 'Safe Space' Footway (1.2m Minimum Width) and Country Lane Fronting Plots 75, 77 – 81 and 70.

The access road fronting Plots 75, 77 – 81 and 70 does not propose a segregated 'Safe Space' footway for pedestrians and yet a footway a minimum width of 1.2m could easily be provided fronting all of the above dwellings with slight adjustments to the layout. A continuous looped footway would be formed by doing so.

As a footway on one side only in respect of a two-sided development would then emerge, the access road shall be constructed as a shared surface access road with the carriageway surfaced in StreetPrint and the footway in paviour blocks both to a herringbone pattern. Ramped rumble strips shall be provided to the entrances to the shared surface streets.

The section of road fronted by one-sided development (Plots 77 – 80) can be deemed to be a country lane because of the width of the carriageway but a footway must still be provided fronting Plots the classed that one

Swept path analysis details shall be submitted for a large 3 axle refuse vehicle (11.6m long with a turning circle of 20.3m) negotiating the tight bends fronting Plots 77 and 80.

A safe means of leading pedestrians onto the shared surface access road shall be provided.

Private Drive Fronting Plots 90 – 94.

The private drive serving Plots 90 – 94 should be 4.5m wide for the first 10m reducing to 3.65m for the remaining length with passing places 4.5m wide considering the length of the driveway (75m approx.). This will remove the 3.0m pinch point in the vicinity of Plot 90. Furthermore, the driveway shall have an independently operated turning facility that allows large delivery and emergency vehicles to carry out a three point turn to emerge from the drive in forward gear. Without such a turning facility such vehicles will have to reverse out of the drive which would be a threat to public safety. Paragraph 6.8.8 of Manual for Streets 1 (MfS 1) states that 'reversing causes a disproportionately large number of moving vehicle accidents in the waste/recycling industry' that are 'invariably severe or fatal'. BS 5906:2005 recommends a maximum reversing distance of 12m. The same threat of accidents occurring will apply to delivery vehicles.

The private drive must be amended to remove the above concerns and swept path analysis details shall be submitted to illustrate how a large delivery vehicle would manage to carry out a three-point turn to emerge from the drive in forward gear utilising the turning facility to be provided. A swept path analysis shall also be provided for Plot 94 to illustrate how a car parked on the drive can similarly egress in forward gear

Furthermore, the length of the driveway is concerning particularly from the perspective of residents having to carry waste and recyclables long distances out to the primary adopted access road. It should be borne in mind that three large containers and a bag for recyclables has to be placed out weekly and on a fortnightly basis refuse sacks containing household waste as well as recyclables have to be carried out to the adopted highway. Paragraph 6.8.9 of MfS 1 states (i) that residents should not be required to carry waste more than 30m to the storage point, (ii) waste collection vehicles should be able to get to within 25 m of the storage point (note, BS 5906: 2005 recommends shorter distances) and (iii) the collection point should be reasonably accessible for vehicles typically used by the waste collection authority.

The length of this driveway disallows the above criteria to be achieved. However, creating a 4.8m wide junction with a bellmouth created using radius kerbs with the initial section of adopted road being a length of 12m (maximum reversing distance) would facilitate the refuse freighter reversing into the junction proposed thereby going some way to addressing the above. However, this may not be sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the waste collection service. Consequently, you will need to approach the Waste / Recycling section (Gail Lewis) of the Street Works Department to ascertain if the above would be acceptable. BS 5906: 2005 provides guidance and recommendations on good practice.

Adoption Layout (Drawing number PL-05)

The areas of adoption shown shall be amended to take account of the above comments.

Parking.

It has long been the experience of local planning and highway authorities that parking is the biggest single issue of concern in recently-constructed residential developments. Parking problems manifest themselves in pavement parking, obstruction of driveways and accesses, hindrance to larger delivery vehicles and refuse freighters, damage to soft landscaping and footways, and cluttered, unsightly streets. They cause tension between neighbours that has been known to escalate into violence.

In view of the above, the parking facilities have been given a detailed assessment in terms of ensuring

compliance with BCBC's Parking Standards (SPG 17) in relation to resident (occupier) parking taking account of the fact that some 3 and 4 bedroom properties are relatively small with box rooms that are only suitable for a child. Accordingly, the resident parking element has been applied as follows:

> One resident parking space per bedroom (maximum of 3 spaces) unless the following applies:-
> (i) Two bedroom dwelling where gross floor area is 75m2 or less – 1.5 spaces per unit.
> (ii) Three / four bedroom dwelling where gross floor area is less than 120m2 – 2 spaces per unit.
> *Note: (i) and (ii) takes account of one or two of the bedrooms being a box room that will be for child.*

Referring to the Car Parking Schedule submitted I would comment that it contains a few errors that have been corrected in assessing the parking. As a result, the conclusions are as follows:

Plots 10 – 14, 21, 23 – 26, 33, 56 – 59, 82, 89 & 94.

3 resident parking spaces per dwelling should be provided in respect of these 4-bedroom dwellings as opposed to the 2 proposed. As a result 12 resident's vehicles will be displaced to an on-street location. The parking to Plot 89 is extremely remote with no direct path access from the dwelling to the parking hence it is expected that the property owners will park their 2 cars on street outside the property where they can be overlooked.

Although a departure from the Parking Standards has been allowed in respect of 4-bed dwellings with two small bedrooms there is a concern that if just 50% of these properties did not conform to what is expected in terms of car ownership then an additional 12 resident vehicles will be displaced on street. This is not considered to be an unreasonable assumption.

Also, visitor parking has been evaluated to ensure a rate of 1 space per 5 units as an integral part of the design of the development. In this regard 8 unallocated on street visitor parking spaces are to be provided whereas 19 are required. The two visitor parking spaces located within the private drive arrangement serving Plots 51 -55 are remote from the remainder of the Plots and are therefore inconvenient for use by the majority of visitors. The shortfall in visitor parking is therefore 11.

The shortfall in the parking numbers is adequately illustrated by the poor parking ratio of 2.1 that is the conclusion of the Car Parking Schedule submitted. If the adopted Parking Standards were applied more rigidly this ratio would equate to 2.5.

This is an extremely important issue especially as it is evident if you were to visit the Parc Derwen site at Coity on a weekend that a large amount of pavement parking is occurring causing obstruction of the footways for pedestrian and obstruction of the free flow of traffic on the carriageways. This seems to be due to the fact that no matter how much off-street parking you provide for residents unless it is extremely convenient for them to park they will not park in their allocated spaces. Parking in parking compounds seems to be a problem area as are garages involving the inconvenience of manually opening a garage door. Where the parking involves a drive-through garage to a parking space behind the problem of on street parking is compounded as two cars are displaced on street. Perhaps remote controlled electrically operated garage doors would be the means of making the use of these parking spaces more convenient. Similarly, where a gated drive is involved the inconvenience of having to stop momentarily to open the gates is problematic for some residents. Creating a shortfall in the parking provision in respect of this site only serves to exacerbate the above issues.

Concluding, I would comment that the shortfall in resident and visitor parking provision totals 37 which is a substantial number. As regards Plots 1 – 14 it could be argued that sufficient space exists to cater for the displaced vehicles because of the one-sided development involved for this section of road but what if insufficient parking is provided for the adjoining B1 employment area. The introduction of traffic calming involving double-sided narrowings will limit the on street space available further and therefore the parking that can be accommodated safely on street to cater for the above shortfall is too limited to avoid pavement parking, obstruction of driveways and accesses, hindrance to larger delivery vehicles and refuse freighters, damage to soft landscaping and footways, and cluttered, unsightly streets that can cause tension between neighbours that has been known to escalate into violence. Consequently, these unacceptable parking problems result in objections to this development proposal on highway and public safety grounds and should also raise reasons for refusal from a planning perspective.

Cycle storage must be a factor of dwelling design. Guidance on this subject is available within Manual for Streets.

Visibility – Vehicle / Pedestrian Sight Splays to Individual and Shared Drives and Parking Spaces.

Visibility – Vehicle / Pedestrian Sight Splays (1m x 1m (minimum) splayed at 45%) to individual and shared

drives and parking spaces involving the splaying back of any abutting boundary element at 45° and the widening of the accesses affected in permanent materials shall be considered in the in the interests of highway and public safety by improving vehicular accessibility thereby encouraging drivers to reverse into parking spaces and drives to increase visibility when emerging back onto the street in forward gear and to assist drivers of vehicles to see pedestrians on the footway and vice versa. MfS promotes this approach of encouraging drivers to reverse into their parking spaces.

Traffic Calming.

The street design does not illustrate in respect of all lengths of street that traffic speeds will be physically reduced to facilitate a maximum design speed of 20 mph. As the streets are to be designated a 20 mph Zone as per the recommendations of Road Safety Strategy for Wales as produced by the National Assembly for Wales then the streets must be designed to physically restrict traffic speeds accordingly. Moreover, for shared surface access roads where pedestrians and vehicles will share the same surface and country lanes the target design speed shall be 15mph. To restrict the traffic speeds to 15mph traffic calming features at intervals of less than 40m. centres are necessary to achieve the target speed. Research for Manual for Streets has shown that block paving in shared surface streets reduces traffic speeds by between 2.5 and 4.5 mph, compared with speeds on conventional streets with asphalt surfaces (Fig. 7.7).

MfS 1 stipulates in paragraph 4.5.5 that 'long, straight streets can ....lead to higher speeds' and evidence from traffic-calming schemes suggests that speed-controlling features are required at intervals of no more than 70m.in order to achieve speeds of 20mph or less. The main spine access road serving this site is an excessively long straight street with limited deviation from the straight line.

An acceptable street layout in terms of traffic calming would illustrate a **variety of measures** at the above intervals to attain the necessary restriction of speeds. The types of measures concerned could be as follows:

- Junction plateaux.
- Housing squares will, in addition to their role as focal points, provide a traffic calming effect through a combination of alignment of routes and surface material.
- Variations in carriageway width where the edge of roads will follow the building frontages producing variations in road widths which will have a traffic calming effect.
- Narrowings that have build outs on both sides of the carriageway with a speed cushion located in the middle of a 3.7 metre wide constriction of the carriageway.
- Closely linked chicanes with speed cushions that restrict the width of the carriageway to 3.7 metres wide.

Any cul-de-sac less than 80m in length will not require traffic calming if 20mph is the target speed.

In addition to other measures, double-sided narrowings with a speed cushion located in the middle of the carriageway constriction are necessary as research shows that single sided and double sided narrowings are ineffective unless there is a sufficient amount of opposing traffic. A double-sided narrowing deflects both lanes of traffic making encountering opposing traffic more likely and the speed cushion makes the driver align the car to minimise the impact of the speed cushion on the vehicle therefore causing him/her to slow down.

Paragraph 7.2.7 of Manual for Streets 1 (MfS1) states that 'the use of computer-aided design (CAD) tracking models and similar techniques often proves to be beneficial in determining how the street will operate and how vehicles will move within it'. In consideration of the above, the designer should take account of the fact that the location of narrowings should be carefully considered in terms of not creating ingress or egress problems in relation to nearby driveways. In this regard swept path analysis / auto track details for a family sized car should be provided to illustrate that such problems will not occur. In relation to chicanes a swept path for a refuse freighter shall be submitted. Ramps to junction plateaux shall not be coincident with vehicular crossovers to driveways as the construction of such ramps at such locations is impractical.

As stated above, these traffic calming features will limit the amount of available space for parked vehicles on street and will therefore compound the issue of the parking problems identified above.

Tegula Block Paving.

It should be noted that the use of Tegula block paving is not acceptable to the Highway Authority.

Amended layout drawings are necessary to enable me to provide formal observations of no objection and to formulate planning conditions and advisory notes to be imposed on the planning consent granted.

I trust the above information is of assistance.

KEEPING SOUTH WALES SAFE • CADW DE CYMRU'N DDIOGEL

AP CONRES Crime Prevention

Port Talbot Police Station
Station Road
Port Talbot
SA13 1JB

[redacted]

28th November 2012

Planning Department
Bridgend

Dear Mr Gore

Re Planning Application Number P/12/796/FUL-Tydraw Farm.

Having reviewed the drawings in respect of the above proposed development I would make the following recommendations:-

(i).Site layout.

I am generally pleased with the site layout. However I would ask for the parking courtyard at the rear of plots 15-18 to be designed out.

(ii).Lighting.

Lighting on the estate must meet the British Standard 5489.

BCBC RECEIVED [redacted] 29 NOV 2 CORPORATE DIRECTOR - COMMUNITIES DEVELOPMENT

Chief Constable Peter Vaughan, BSc (Hons), DipAppCrim, Prif Gwnstabl

(iii).Boundary identification.

Defensible space using symbolic barriers e.g. change of surface colour or texture, must be built into the design to encourage a feeling of territoriality amongst users especially at the entrances to the development.

There must be a change of surface, i.e.colour or texture at the entrance to the estate and to identify public areas from private or semi private areas e.g. the footpaths from the driveways/front gardens.

Preferably front garden boundaries would be identified by a low wall and gates.

(iv).Landscaping and planting.

There must be clear lines of sight across the development.

Trees must be bare stemmed up to 2 metres from the ground and must not interfere with lighting. They must not be located to provide an assist for criminals to climb over walls. Plants or bushes should only grow to a maximum height of 1 metre.

There must be clear unobstructed views of the parking bays from the properties.

(v).Side and rear boundaries.

Robust fencing or walls at least 1.8 metres high must protect the rear and sides of the properties. Gates must be robustly constructed, be the same height as the fencing (minimum height 1.8m) and be lockable. Gates, fencing and walls must be designed to be difficult to climb over.

Gates must be as near to the front building line of the properties as possible.

There must be nothing adjacent to walls or fencing to assist criminals in climbing over them.

Unlawful access to the rear of all properties must be prevented if possible.

(vi).Vehicle parking bays.

Parking bays and the driveways must be overlooked by rooms in the properties that are usually occupied i.e. living rooms. This is especially important where there is side parking e.g. a side window in plot 70 would overlook the visitor parking bay. If there are two bays at the side of two houses only one of the properties need have a window overlooking the side parking.

Parking bays and the driveways to the garages must be well illuminated and there must be no obstruction and clear lines of sight from rooms overlooking the parking bays/driveways.

Rear parking that is not overlooked is vulnerable and must be designed out.

(vii).Garden sheds.

Garden sheds must be sited away from the rear and side fencing to prevent assisting people in climbing over the perimeter security.

Where cycle storage is provided in a shed, the shed should be securely fixed to a concrete foundation and the shed door fitted with a certificated 'Sold Secure' Silver Standard padlock, hasp and staple (coach bolted through the shed structure). Providing the shed door is at least 44mm thick the shed door can be locked into the doorframe using either a mortice deadlock or mortice sash lock certificated to BS 3621: 2007.

The bicycle security ground anchor should also be certificated to 'Sold Secure' Silver Standard.

(viii).Bin stores.

Bins must be kept in secure areas e.g. the rear gardens.

(ix).Security lighting.

Security lighting must be installed controlled by PIR detectors, photo electric cells or time switches. They must protect the rears and sides of the houses, the parking bays and the driveways to the garages.

Callers at the front doors of the properties must be lit during the hours of darkness by appropriate lighting.

(x).Drainpipes.

If the drainpipes are not within the fabric of the buildings or behind locked gates, they must be designed so that they do not offer an assist to climbing.

(xi).Public utilities.

Meter boxes must be fixed to, or as near to, the front building lines of the properties as possible.

(xii).Blank walls.

Windowless elevations or blank walls adjacent to space to which the public have access, should be avoided and provide at least one window to a habitable room wherever possible. Where blank flanking walls are unavoidable, a 1metre 'buffer zone' should be created.

(xiii).Door security.

All external doors, front and rear, to the individual properties should meet the SBD standard PAS 24 2007 or PAS 24 2012.

Wooden doors should have mortice locks fitted (up to the British Standard 3621) two thirds of the way down the individual doors. The front door in addition to the British Standard mortice lock must have a British Standard rim lock fitted a third

of the way down the door. Rear doors, in addition to the mortice locks, must have mortice bolts fitted 6 inches from the top and bottom of each door.

UPVC doors must be multi point locking.

Glass in door panels or adjacent to door panels should be laminated.

Doors in recesses of more than 600mm must be avoided.

The letter plate apertures must be no larger than 260mm x 40mm and be located at least 400mm away from any locks to stop access to the lock operating system through the aperture. An internal deflector must be fitted over the letter plate to restrict access to the locking mechanism and to prevent letter plate burglary.

(xiv).Window security.

All vulnerable windows fitted, i.e. ground floor windows, should meet the SBD Standard i.e. British Standard 7950, PAS 24 2012 or equivalent. They should have laminated glass fitted and also key operated window locks.

(xv).Intruder alarm system.

A 13 amp fused spur should be installed in each individual property. Ideally all properties would have an intruder alarm fitted up to the relevant British Standard.

(xvi).Identification of properties.

The individual houses must be clearly identifiable with house numbers clearly displayed.

(xvii).Garage.

The external garage doors should meet the standards specified by SBD i.e. LPS1175 SR1 or PAS 24 2007/2012.

There should be no windows installed in the garages.

The driveways to the garages must be protected by lighting.

Consideration should be given to alarming the garages the alarm being linked to the house alarms if fitted.

Further, more detailed information can be obtained from the Secured by Design website at www.securedbydesign.com .

If you wish discussing any of the points raised in this report please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely

Mike Harvey

Crime Prevention Design Advisor

Please note

For the Secured by Design Award to be made certification will have to be provided as proof that the Secured by Design standards have been met where specified.Preferably doors and windows will be installed by an approved Secured by Design installer.

Appendix B

Greenfield and Previously Developed Land
Policy COM1: Residential allocations in the Strategic Regeneration Growth Areas

Bridgend Strategic Regeneration Growth Area

Policy Reference	Location	Settlement	Greenfield	Previously Developed Land
COM 1 (1)	Parc Derwen	Bridgend	~~1500~~ 1515	
COM 1 (2)	North-East Brackla Regeneration Area	Bridgend	245*	~~105*~~ 305*
COM 1 (3)	Parc Afon Ewenny Regeneration Area,	Bridgend		~~550~~ 650
COM 1 (4)	Coity Road Sidings	Bridgend		140
COM 1 (5)	South Wales Police, Cowbridge Road	Bridgend		~~130~~ 138
COM 1 (6)	Land East of Masonic Hall, Coychurch Road	Bridgend	95	
COM 1 (?)	Land at Waterton Lane	Bridgend		42
COM 1 (7)	Jubilee Crescent	Bridgend	40	
COM 1 (8)	South of Joslin Road	Bridgend	34	
COM 1 (9)	Brocastle Estate	Bridgend		30
COM 1 (10)	Waterton Manor	Bridgend		36
COM 1 (11)	Brackla Street	Bridgend		19
COM 1 (12)	Parc Farm, North East of Parc Derwen	Bridgend		14
COM 1 (13)	Waterton Lane	Bridgend	11	
COM 1 (14)	6-10 Queen Street	Bridgend		10
		Total Units (3324)	~~1925 (65.05%)~~ 1940 (58.36%)	~~1034 (34.95%)~~ 1384 (41.64)

*Residential Allocation located on both Greenfield and Previously Developed Land elements of PLA3(2).

Maesteg & Llynfi Valley Strategic Regeneration Growth Area

Policy Reference	Site Name	Settlement	Greenfield	Previously Developed Land
COM 1 (15)	Maesteg Washery Regeneration Area	Maesteg		135
COM1 (16)	Ewenny Road	Maesteg		125
COM1 (17)	Coegnant Reclamation Site	Caerau / Nantyffyllon		100
COM1 (18)	Crown Road	Maesteg		40
COM1(19)	Former Blaencaerau Junior School	Caerau		35
COM1 (20)	Y Parc,	Maesteg	~~20~~ 51	
COM1 (21)	Land South of Cwmfelin Primary School	Cwmfelin	20	
COM1 (22)	Llynfi Lodge	Maesteg		13
COM1 (23)	Land Adj to 50 Heol Tywith	Nantyffyllon	13	
		Total Units (532)	~~53 (10.58%)~~ 84 (15.79%)	448 ~~(89.42%)~~ (84.21%)

Porthcawl Strategic Regeneration Growth Area

Policy Reference	Site Name	Settlement	Greenfield	Previously Developed Land
COM1 (24)	Porthcawl Waterfront Regeneration Area	Porthcawl		~~1350~~ 1050
COM1 (25)	Former Sea Bank Hotel Car Park,	Porthcawl		60
COM1 (26)	Pwll-Y-Waun	Porthcawl	40	
COM1 (27)	Albert Edward Prince of Wales Court	Porthcawl		35
COM1 (28)	MOT Centre Station Hill,	Porthcawl		11
COM1 (29)	The Nurseries, New Road,	Porthcawl		10
		Total Units (1206)	40 ~~(2.66%)~~ (3.32%)	~~1466~~ ~~(97.34%)~~ 1166 (96.68%)

Valleys Gateway Strategic Regeneration Growth Area

Policy Reference	Site Name	Settlement	Greenfield	Previously Developed Land
COM1 (30)	Land West of Maesteg Road	Tondu		~~436~~ 538
COM1 (31)	*Parc Tyn Y Coed*	Bryncethin	323	
COM1 (32)	*Ogmore Comprehens-ive School*	Bryncethin		130
COM1 (33)	Gateway to the Valleys	Tondu		100
COM1 (34)	*Former Christie Tyler Site*	Brynmenyn		75
COM1 (35)	Bryncethin Depot	Bryncethin		50
COM1 (36)	Land at Abergarw Farm	Brynmenyn	50	
COM 1 (37)	Glanyrafon	Tondu		30
		Total Units (1296)	373 ~~(31.24%)~~ (28.78%)	~~821~~ ~~(68.76%)~~ 923 (71.22%)

			Greenfield	Previously Developed Land
		Total Units (6358)	~~2391~~ ~~(38.81%)~~ 2437 (38.33%)	~~3769~~ ~~(61.19%)~~ 3921 (61.67%)

Policy COM2: Residential allocations outside the Strategic Regeneration Growth Areas

	Site Name	Settlement	Greenfield	Previously Developed Land
COM 2 (1)	Land SW of City Road	Bettws		80
COM 2 (2)	City Farm	Bettws	40	
COM 2 (3)	R/O Heol Dewi Sant	Bettws	11	
COM 2 (4)	Land adjoining Cwm Ogwr Fach	Blackmill		43
COM 2 (5)	Cae Gleision, Broadlands	Bridgend	284	
COM 2 (?)	Land at Llangewydd Road, Cefn Glas	Bridgend	228	
COM 2 (6)	Ysgol Bryn Castell,	Bridgend		150
COM 2 (7)	Chelsea Avenue	Bridgend		110
COM 2 (8)	Llys Fitzhamon, Bridgend	Bridgend	41	
COM 2 (9)	Cefn Glas Road	Bridgend		10
COM 2 (10)	Coed Parc	Bridgend		20
COM 2 (11)	Former Wildmill Boiler House	Bridgend		10
COM 2 (12)	Former Abercerdin School	Evanstown		11
COM 2 (?)	Coronation Works	Evanstown		11
COM 2 (13)	Former Goricon Site	Kenfig Hill		29
COM 2 (14)	Troed Y Ton	Kenfig Hill		39
COM 2 (15)	Pant Yr Awel Court	Pant Yr Awel		19
COM 2 (16)	Ty Nant, Heol Llangeinor	Llangeinor	10	
COM 2 (17)	Waunwen	Nantymoel		35
COM 2 (18)	Cwrt Colman Street	Nantymoel	21	

COM 2 (19)	Heol Y Fedwen / Haul Bryn	Nantymoel	11	
COM 2 (?)	Ty Draw Farm	Pyle	94	
COM 2 (20)	Marlas Farm	North Cornelly	48	
COM 2 (21)	Land at Gibbons Way	North Cornelly		45
COM 2 (22)	Ffordd yr Eglwys (land off),	North Cornelly	22	
COM 2 (23)	Thomas Crescent (land adjacent)	North Cornelly,	14	
COM 2 (24)	South of Hendre Road	Pencoed,	35	
COM 2 (25)	2 Penprysg Road	Pencoed		12
COM 2 (26)*	Former Surgery Site, Coychurch Road	Pencoed		13
COM 2 (27)	Pencoed Primary School	Pencoed		10
COM 2 (28)	Land Rear of Ty Draw Close	Pyle	30	
		Total	~~567 (47.13%)~~ 889 (57.88%)	~~636 (52.87%)~~ 647 (42.12)

			Greenfield	Previously Developed Land
		COM 1 (6358)	2437 (38.33%)	3921 (61.67%)
		COM 2 (1536)	889 (57.88%)	647 (42.12)
		TOTAL (7894)	3326 (42.13%)	4568 (57.87%)