



PLANNING COMMITTEE – 10TH JUNE 2015

SUBJECT: SITE VISIT - CODE NO. P/99/0768 – LAND AT PENALLTA COLLIERY, YSTRAD MYNACH, HENGOED – DISCHARGE OF CONDITION 5 – IN RESPECT OF THE PROPOSED LOCALLY EQUIPPED AREA OF PLAY (LEAP)

REPORT BY: ACTING DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES AND SECTION 151 OFFICER

PRESENT:

Councillor D.G. Carter – Chair
Councillor W.H. David - Vice Chair

Councillors A. Angel, M. James and A. Lewis

1. Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs E.M. Aldworth, J. Bevan, L. Gardiner, D. Rees and Mrs J. Summers.
2. The Planning Committee deferred consideration of this application on 6th May 2015 for a site visit. Members and Officers met on site on Wednesday, 20th May 2015.
3. Details of the application to discharge condition 5 attached to P/99/0768 in respect of the proposed locally equipped area of play (LEAP), Cwm Calon, Ystrad Mynach were noted.
4. Those present viewed the proposed site from Merlin Avenue and examined the plans, position and dimensions of the proposed equipment in order to fully appreciate the proposals.
5. Members were asked to note that the proposed park would incorporate 6 pieces of equipment, suitable for use by toddlers and would be the smallest of the play areas designated for the development as set out in its 'master plan'. The different levels of formal open spaces on the development were noted to include a Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) and a Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) and with the inclusion of the proposed LEAP, would provide high quality facilities for children living within the development.
6. The Local Ward Member on behalf of residents expressed concern that although the playground had been clearly identified on the developments 'master plan', it had not been included on the subsequent 'phase plans'. He asked Members to note that the position of the houses that would now be directly affected by the LEAP had not formed part of that original 'master plan' and as such their location in relation to the play area had not been properly considered in this context. He also raised concern in relation to loss of privacy, primarily due to the height of the proposed climbing frame, which would allow living room, bedroom and bathroom windows of adjacent properties to be viewed by its users. Reference was also made to the privacy distances between the houses and the park which was as little as 10m from certain habitable rooms. The level of noise generated by a play area would also have a detrimental impact on residential amenity. Concerns were also expressed that the proposed

position of the park had the potential to attract older children to the area later in the evening and that this would give rise to incidents of anti-social behavior. The Local Ward Member requested that consideration be given to reducing the footprint of the proposed park removing the climbing frame element and that the park be clearly identified as age restricted.

Officers confirmed that the imprint of the play area had been reduced from that originally submitted and the equipment following consultation meetings with residents had also been descaled and reconfigured whilst maintaining the appropriate provision.

7. Members were asked to note that the proposed playground had not changed its position since the 'master plan' and that the principle of providing formal open spaces remains the same and are in line with Council policies for an active and healthy lifestyle. The network of play, leisure and recreational facilities on the development had been carefully planned to ensure adequate and sufficient provision to accommodate the number of houses built. In terms of privacy distances, Officers confirmed that in high density developments, buffer zones may have to be reduced in order to provide play facilities for children, which is in line with guidance. The existing landscaping design would be continued to ensure that the finish of the proposed play area would blend in with the rest of the development.
8. Officers confirmed that following consultation with 118 neighbouring properties, 16 letters of objection had been received. Details of the objections are within the Officer's report.
9. The initial planning report concluded that having given due regard to relevant planning policy and the comments from consultees and objectors, the application is considered to be acceptable and Officers recommended that permission be granted.
10. A copy of the report submitted to the Planning Committee on 6th May 2015 is attached. Members are now invited to determine the application.

Author:	E.Sullivan	Democratic Services Officer, Ext. 4420
Consultees:	M. Davies	Principal Planner
	J. Rogers	Principal Solicitor
	M. Noakes	Senior Engineer (Highway Development Control)
	C. Davies	Senior Environmental Health Officer
	R. Lloyd	Special Projects Officer

Appendices:

Appendix 1 Report submitted to Planning Committee on 6th May 2015