

NEATH PORT TALBOT COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)
(Wales) Order 2015 (as amended)

HEAD OF ENGINEERING & TRANSPORT

HIGHWAYS OBSERVATIONS

PLANNING APPLICATION NO: 2/3/20/0709/00
APPLICANT: MR DAB HIGGINS
LOCATION: GWRHYD SPECIALIST QUARRY, GWRHYD
UCHAF FARM, GWRHYD ROAD,
PONTARDAWE, SWANSEA, SA9 2SB
PROPOSAL: VARIATION OF CONDITION 7 (TO EXTEND THE
TIME LIMIT FOR THE EXPORTATION OF
AGGREGATE AND WASTE MATERIALS) AND
CONDITION 8 (REMOVAL OF PARTS 8D AND 8E,
RELATING TO HGV TONNAGES) ATTACHED TO
PLANNING PERMISSION P2017/0036

The Highway Authority, in responding to the above application, provides the following substantive response:

No comment	☐
No objection (subject to any specified conditions below)	☐
Concerns have been identified (see below for how those concerns can be addressed by the applicant)	☐
Objection – on the grounds set out below	☒

MY HIGHWAYS OBSERVATIONS ON THIS PROPOSAL ARE AS FOLLOWS:-

I wish to recommend a **REFUSAL** and my reasons are as follows:-

To vary planning condition 7a & b

The proposal to amend the condition is recommend for refusal on the grounds of excessive removal of stone from site which would be detrimental to the existing highway network on which the Quarry currently uses as an approved haulage route.

Condition 7a and & 7b within the original planning application were specific in terms of what mineral tonnage was allowed to remove from site, however the wording on the proposed variations just refers to terms such as “**consisting of** “and “**an additional**”. Now that could allow for ‘pick n mix’ of mineral produce being removed from site instead of splitting it to “**750 tonnes per week for dimensional block stone and/or masonry products only**”, and then “**a maximum of 700 tonnes per**

week of aggregate produce” which is what the original conditions required. I wish recommend refusal for this proposal.

To vary planning conditions 8a, 8b, 8c

2. **8a)** This is proposed to be varied by not including the words **“Carrying dimensional Stone and Masonry Products”** again this is not specific and is left open to interpretation of what minerals is being taken from site and is contrary to the original approval.
3. **8b)** Again the proposed varied condition does not include or is specific to the original condition which state **“Carrying dimensional Stone and Masonry Products”** again this is not specific and is left open to interpretation of what minerals is being taken from site and is contrary to the original approval.
4. **8c)** Once again it refers to **“Additional Heavy Goods vehicles”** and remove’s the mineral specification(s) to this condition which requires the removal of **“mineral waste from production of dimensional stone and masonry products”**. again this is not specific and is left open to interpretation of what minerals is being taken from site and is contrary to the original approval.
5. **8d & 8e)** having reviewed the contents of the proposed application (P2020/0709) I have noted that the applicant wishes to sustain the amount of tonnage removed from site. However, it does not specify the tonnage in relation to the mineral(s), therefore this proposal leave it open to interpretation in respect of what minerals can be taken from the Quarry. This in addition to the proposed removal of conditions 8d and 8e which seek to remove the restrictions on ‘over the fence’ sales thus increasing and encouraging more vehicles trips to attend the site in order to buy waste aggregates, and possibly dimensional stone and/or masonry stone.

This has the potential to allow the applicant to deliver more dimensional stone and/or masonry stone via the conditions 7 (a), (b) and also conditions 8(a), (b) & (c) and seek to remove the waste aggregates via the removal of conditions 8d & 8e.

For reasons I have mentioned above, I feel that the applicant’s proposal under this application would seek to increase the deliveries/vehicles to and from the site and would therefore have a significant impact upon the highway network. Therefore I would like to recommend REFUSAL on highway safety grounds (which coincide with the reasoning given with the original planning approval P2017/0036).

NOTE: If extension on time only and not variation or removal of conditions is applied

In addition to the above, should we agree to sustain the wording of the exact conditions already agreed within P2017/0036, and just extend time only. I would recommend that there be an additional highway survey completed of the approved haulage route, which shall include the Gwrhyd Mountain, Coedffaldau Road and Bryn Road only. These sections of highways are currently facilitating the haulage route before HGV's then access onto Gwilym Road (A6390). The survey must include all surfacing, verges, drainage and any highway retaining structures. Any additional works/monitoring and defects shall be made good by the quarry under payment of an additional contribution through a section 106 agreement which shall be signed before granting approval of any application.

SIGNED:  DATE: 21/08/2020
HEAD OF ENGINEERING & TRANSPORT

HIGHWAYS REF: OBS200709-JWG