



Vale of Glamorgan Local Development Plan 2011 – 2026 Hearing Session 17: Transport

Statement by RPS on behalf of ABP (Representor ID - 2590)

This Statement sets out the position of ABP having regard to the Matters and Issues Agenda set by the Inspector for Hearing Session 17 – Transport where relevant.

Any numbering used below reflects that within the Matters and Issues Agenda for the Hearing.

4(a). Are allocated schemes consistent with national policy/ the Plan's strategy, free of significant constraints, supported by necessary funding and deliverable within the Plan period? and 4(b). Are the schemes with definitive route alignments appropriately allocated on the Proposals Map?

ABP made representations that Deposit Plan Policy - SP7 (6) - National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 88 (2590/4/1) and Deposit Plan Policy - MG16 (1) - NCN Route 88 (2590/4/2) cannot be shown as currently proposed because the proposed route of the cycle path as shown on the Proposals Map runs through ABP's private operational port land.

Whilst the Council responded that the NCN route reflects the route identified in a Sustrans feasibility report it also accepted that in progressing the NCN there will be instances where the preferred route as shown in the feasibility report cannot be implemented due to site specific constraints which were not possible to consider as a part of the feasibility work and that local changes can be considered as the scheme implementation progresses. As such the Council indicated that the LDP will only identify a preferred route that reflects the overall objective for the NCN rather than providing a definitive route.

ABP can confirm however that it has not been consulted over the routing of the cycle path through the Port by either Sustrans or the Council. It would like to reiterate that the route is shown to run along a private road that could be subject to closure at any time for operational reasons including railway crossings and chemical ship unloading. The routing of the cycle path along this route is therefore deemed inappropriate and potentially hazardous for cycle path users and it cannot be made publically accessible.

ABP confirmed to the Council that this route (as far as it runs through ABP's private operational land) cannot be delivered when its original representations were submitted in March 2013, these representations were then reiterated in December 2013 and similar representations were made in relation to Alternative Site 42 in April 2014. Accordingly, the Council has been aware for nearly three years that the route as currently proposed is not free of constraints and is not deliverable within the Plan period (or at all) and, as such, that it is not appropriately allocated on the Proposals Map.

In this regard the LDP is not sound and it is illogical for the Council to proceed with the LDP on this basis, and instead it should show an amended and potentially deliverable route that avoids ABP's operational land.