

Raglan Community Council
Notes from the Public Consultation relating to Planning Application????
held on Wednesday 15 August 2018 at Raglan School
at 7.00 pm

Present

Cllr Hazel Davies
Cllr Martine Dorey
Cllr Charlotte Exton
Cllr Richard Moorby

Cllr Sylvia Price
Cllr Helen Tilley
Cllr Brian Willott (Chairman)

In attendance: Adrian Edwards Clerk
59 Members of the public.

Apologies for absence.

Cllr's Chris Butler-Donnelly, Dave Bevan and Penny Jones

The chairman opened the meeting and thanked those in attendance for attending. He explained that this is a consultation, to allow the community council to gain the feelings of residents relating to the proposed development of 111 dwellings on Monmouth Road in Raglan. He explained that the community council is a formal consultee in the planning process.

It was explained that this meeting has been arranged to make observations within the timeline set out in the planning process. He explained that the clerk to the community council will give a presentation indicating the main points of the application. It was explained following the presentation the floor will be open for those in attendance to ask or inform the meeting of any concerns or observations.

This meeting is not a Planning Committee meeting; it is a meeting looking for residents opinions so observations can be put forward by the community council. It was also explained that the consultation will reflect all the observations already made, including the large number of objections, and the correspondence received supporting the application.

A slide was shown with some of the candidate sites that were put forward for inclusion in the current Local Development Plan (LDP) The locations were identified to those present.

Q A question was asked about the number of patients registered at Castle Gate Medical Practice and is the figures the total number of patients registered in Raglan or also does this include Monmouth.

A The numbers were taken from the Castle Gate Medical Practice website, so it could be assumed that it would be Monmouth also.

It was explained that Planning Policy Wales (PPW) offers advise that PAs should consider the capacity of existing and potential infrastructure, including other utilities and social infrastructure (such as schools and hospitals), and that the community is able to absorb further development.

The chairman invited anyone with concerns to address the meeting. Mr Colwyn Knight made comment

with regard to the objections submitted by the Raglan Action Group. Mr Knight stated that this Planning Application will be one of the largest events that have and will affect the village for a number of decades. He explained that he read all the observations on the Planning Authorities planning portal. He explained that the observations supporting the application are people who are supporting the affordable housing in the village, and the action group sympathises with that proportion, as the village needs affordable housing. He explained that the action group are prepared to work with Monmouthshire County Council and social landlords in relation to providing affordable housing in the community.

He explained that the action group commissioned a Chartered Town Planner to look at the proposed Planning Application and make comment and submit the objection to the Planning Authority. Mr Knight read out a paragraph from the action groups objection:

"Paragraph 6.1.7 notes that 'in accordance with national planning policy, the LDP seeks to strictly control and reduce the environmental impact of new dwellings in the open countryside of Monmouthshire. The LDP defines open countryside as those parts of the plan area lying outside defined Town and Village settlement boundaries'..."

Mr Knight explained that this Planning Application is located outside of the development boundary for Raglan. He explained that there is a strong policy presumption against approving this Planning Application because it directly conflicts with the settlement strategy as outlined in the Development Plan.

He explained that Technical Advice Note (TAN) 1 states it is a requirement for Housing Authorities to maintain a 5-year supply of readily developable housing land in each local Planning Authority across Wales remains a key planning policy requirement of the Welsh Government. Mr Knight explained that the applicant is using the argument that the Planning Authority should be using sections from TAN 1, 6.2 the housing land supply figure should also be treated as a material consideration in determining Planning Applications for housing.

Mr Knight explained about the weight of the document to be afforded to the development plan and housing policies. He explained the principal of TAN 1 and the letter dated 18th July 2018 by the Cabinet Secretary for Energy, Planning and Rural Affairs. The letter issued included her decision to dis-apply the relevant section in paragraph 6.2 of TAN 1. Mr Knight read out the following section from the Ministers letter.

"As a result of the current housing land supply position across Wales some Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) are receiving 'speculative' applications for housing on sites not allocated for development in LDPs. This is generating uncertainty for communities and is to the detriment of the plan-led system. Therefore, in support of the review and to alleviate some of the immediate pressure on LPAs, I have decided to dis-apply paragraph 6.2 of Technical Advice Note (TAN) 1"

He explained that this statement undermines the applicant's statement and hands back the power to the Planning Authority to operate the planning led system and they can refuse this Planning Application.

A number of other points were raised in the following order.

- Landscaping and the lack of information.
- Heritage in the community and the effect on Raglan Castle and the Church and the Conservation area.
- Highways and the junction on the A40 and the impact on the High Street, along with the footways into the village, the increase in traffic on Station Road, following the expansion of the Highway dep't and the construction of the school.
- Limited Public Transport.
- Ecology.
- The removal of hedge rows to provide access into the proposed development.
- The loss of prime agricultural land.
- Infrastructure and school places.

Mr Knight asked on behalf of the action group that the community council supports or adopts the action group's objection. There was also some discussion relating to the consent just issued for the development of up to 45 dwellings on Chepstow Road along with any windfall sites. The current development with any other small sites would provide sufficient dwellings included in the LDP

Q It was asked about the affordable housing as there would appear to be some misunderstanding of the meaning affordable housing.

Q Will the housing Association buy the houses and then rent them out to tenants. There was some discussion over the affordability, and the different types of rent and occupation including part ownership and other methods.

A It was explained that the developer will construct the dwellings and the developer will appoint a social landlord under any section 106 agreement agreed with the Planning Authority at the Planning stage. It was also explained there are different tenancies that developers use. The main wording that is used is affordable housing, but that includes rented, part ownership and affordable.

Q It was asked how many of the affordable properties will be for local people, and will the housing be for older people as there is a need for housing for older people.

A It was explained that it will be a requirement to tie the section 106 process down so developers won't be able to discharge their responsibility for the provision of affordable housing.

Q Residents of Raglan should take ownership of the housing need for affordable housing in Raglan for the older and younger generations within the village when the county council don't have the funding to provide the housing need. It was explained that from the start the development on Chepstow Road should be given the chance to be embedded into the community before further development is considered.

A It was explained that it would be hoped that the county council will do some population analysis on the growth of the population in Raglan and surrounding communities.

Q The county council should consider what the listening to the residents on what is required and that way the provision may be considered.

Q It was explained that the development on Chepstow Road will be up to 45 dwellings not 45 dwellings. It was explained concern was expressed at the last public meeting over the potential of the flood plain and the impact it will have on the existing properties and the proposed dwellings.

It was explained that the argument should have been to stop the 156 proposed dwelling not stop the 111 dwellings, this is going to impact on the village as a whole.

Q It was explained that with the current proposals the traffic management and the increase in traffic is going to be a nightmare in the village.

Q It was asked if the community council will be challenging the Planning Department on the impact on the highways and infrastructure within the village.

A It was explained that the community council will be considering all of the points in a planning meeting next week where all of the points will be considered and the Education, Highway and Infrastructure will all be considered. All of the main points will be covered in the response the community council will make.

It was explained that the community council have expressed concern over Monmouth Road and the A40 junction and the community council have been working towards getting the A40 and the crossings upgraded or improved over the last twelve months. This will be an ongoing issue the community council will be following and it will still be ongoing at this stage.

Q It was felt that no further action should be taken until the Planning Authority has an agreement is in place to improve the infrastructure along with improvements to the A40, local footways before any further development can be considered, including an outer boundary of the proposed 111 dwellings

Q Concern over the contribution the developer could make could be anything from £10k upwards.

A It was explained that any section 106 funding through the contributions, follow a set of guidelines on the amount that will be considered. These figures will differ from education to adult recreation. This will be dealt with at the planning stage and the section 106 officers from the county council

Q There was some concern over the transport within the village if both the developments were to be approved and the number of extra vehicles in the village could increase to in excess of three hundred vehicles which could be doubled with two traffic movement per vehicle. This would have an impact on the High Street, and the threat of yellow lines being installed, which would have an impact due to the speed and resident crossing the road.

It was explained that the businesses within the village could find it difficult and Raglan is unique as a community.

Q Concern was expressed over the current speed and the amount of traffic that doesn't stop at the

junctions of Chepstow Road and Castle Street.

Q Concern was expressed about parking within the village.

Q It was felt that every access into the village is dangerous, an example was highlighted, the signage states that Raglan Village is a quarter of a mile from the A40 roundabout, but the first property is within 40 meters after leaving the A40 roundabout.

Q A question was asked about the construction of a roundabout at the Monmouth Road junction, and it was felt that this would not be viable and traffic would be forced to turn left towards the A40 roundabout. The reason given as soon who as the A465 is completed the traffic volume will increase and a further roundabout will not be granted due to road safety.

A It was stated that the current roundabout will be on the same trunk road so there wouldn't be any difference between the existing roundabout and constructing a new roundabout on the Monmouth Road Junction.

Q It was explained that residents of Raglan have been campaigning for over twenty years to improve the Monmouth Road junction and a number of MPs have been and inspected the junction and action has been taken.

Q A question was asked if no one is willing to listen what is left for the residents to do.

A It was said the community continues to lobby for action.

Q It was felt that the current footpath along Monmouth Road is insufficient and could be dangerous.

A It was highlighted that there is no proposal to reconstruct or upgrade the current footpaths, and pedestrians will need to cross the road more than once before they get to the village.

Q It was said if footpaths are not improved this has total disregard for residents and other footpath users

Q One person asked about the emergency access from the proposed development onto Station Road.

A No response made

Q It was said that there is a combination of vehicles on Station Road since the increase in traffic from the Station Road depot and the construction of the school, along with parents dropping children off at the day Puddle Ducks day nursery. If this development should go ahead there will be an increase in pedestrians using a road with a footway.

A It was asked if there are any questions relating to the school.

- Q** It was said the school was only built for 210 pupils, and the school will only be viable if the majority of people moving in to the village are older generation where their children have left home, and the school will have reduced numbers. There is nowhere for the school to expand and develop to cater for the increase in pupils.
- Q** There was concern over the school intake as MCC built the school as a 210 pupil's school based on the current LDP and the projections. Concern was expressed that children could be taught in demountable class rooms
- Q** It was said the people that may purchase the properties if consent was agreed could be people who will be commuting to Bristol or further afield.
- Q** It was said the school was built using the data from the current LDP, therefore if this proposed development was refused as being outside the current LDP there wouldn't be an issue with education.
- Q** There was some discussion over where can the village accept development and if the infrastructure could cope including the school, so therefore the village should be looked at as a whole.
- Q** A question was asked about the proposed candidate sites and the impact that could have on the community
- A** It was explained that MCC are under an obligation to provide housing county wide.
- Q** It was said MCC should be told that Raglan as a community has done its bit with the supply and allocation of houses.
- Q** It was felt, if consent is granted for the 111 houses, the surrounding fields will also be considered for development in years to come, and that will be a disaster for the community.
- Q** It was said that Langstone was similar to Raglan, and now Langstone is built all over.
- Q** A question was asked about the site on Usk Road as that would be a better location
- A** It was explained that the land on Usk Road was included as a candidate site in the last round of sites, and it would be for the current land owner to submit that site for consideration in the current call for candidate sites. This proposal is the one on the table for consideration; it's not possible to say we would be in favour to build in a different location. This application is on the table and it will need to be determined.
- Q** The current consultation is underway and will the community council be making any observations on the review of the LDP
- A** It was explained that the community council will be encouraged to make observations on the review process.
- Q** It was asked what the timescale is after the close of candidate sites in November.

A The timescale was explained, as the key stages are definitive from to delivery agreement between January 2018, and May 2018.

Key stages	Timescale	
Definitive	From	To
Delivery agreement	January 2018	May 2018
	Full Council – may 2018 Submission to welsh Government – May 2018 (Response to LPA to be received within 4 weeks)	
Pre-Deposit Participation	July 2018	November 2019
Preferred Strategy (pre-Deposit Consultation	December 2019	October 2019
	Report to council on draft preferred strategy – November 2019	
Statutory Deposit Plan Consultation	November 2010	May 2021
	Deposit Plan – 6 week consultation	
	Report to council on focused changes and submission of deposit plan to welsh Government – May 2012	
Stages	Timescale	
Indicative		
Submission of LDP to Welsh Government	Summer 2012	
Independent Examination	Autumn 2012	
Inspectors Report	Winter 2012	
Adoption	Early 2022(must be adopted within 8 weeks of receiving the inspectors binding report)	

Q Will a report be made and published in the press. It was explained that the press are in attendance this evening, and a notice was sent to a large number of news outlets informing them of the consultation this evening.

Q Is the proposed development site in the conservation area.

A It was explained the boundary of the conservation area runs the length of Monmouth Road, and this proposed site is outside the conservation area.

Q Will the community council be meeting to look and make observations for or against the Planning Application, and will the community councils decision be based on the feedback from this meeting or will it be on a personal decision.

A Consideration will be given to the comments from this evening and the observation on the Planning Portal. One member explained that she will not be available to attend the Planning Meeting but is against the proposal.

Q Will all the councillors be in attendance at the meeting. It was explained that some members will not be in attendance due to other diary commitments.

A It was explained that councillors should consider all the points made, but should enter the meeting with no predetermined outcomes in line with the Member's Code of Conduct. An example was given to other voting processes.

Q A question was asked if there are any members of the public who would like to support the proposed application.

Q Can a statement be made by a member that is unable to attend the meeting. Who will write the statement the community council will present to the Planning Committee.

Q Does the community council have a proxy system of voting if a member cannot attend.

Q A question was asked if the public will see the statement the community council will submit to the Planning Committee. Members asked why would anyone like to see the statement, why would one person like to see something, would it be to vet and amend the paper, and if that the case should the community council send it to everyone in the community and ask for 1500 comments. That is not practicable.

It was explained that in the last Planning Committee the chairman made a clear statement picking up all the points.

Can the Planning Committee or officers from MCC consider the application without it following the full process.

No, the process will need to be followed.

A The elected member must be in the meeting to vote.

A No, the Planning Committee must consider the application. The only person that can withdraw the application will be the applicant or their agent.

Q Is there any value in members of the public attending the Planning Committee meeting?

A Yes anyone can attend the Planning Committee meeting, the more people that attend will show the views of the local community.

Q A question was asked if the community council will consider the heritage impact on the Castle and Church along with the conservation area.

Q Was the conservation area agreed before or after the 2014 LDP. If the development area is extended

will the conservation area be extended?

Q If the community council would endorse the Action Groups submission that would help the process.

A It was explained that the population in Raglan has reduced and MCC will need to look at the impact that will have.

The chairman thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting at 20.54 hrs