

# Land to the North of the Railway Line

Rhose, Vale of Glamorgan



Representations, Council Responses and Proposed Changes  
to the Draft Development Brief (July 2006)



The Vale of Glamorgan Council,  
Directorate of Environmental & Economic Regeneration

December 2006

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
1: Ms Barbara Price	Email	<p>I am a resident of Rhoose Point and wish to lodge my objection to further house building until some of the originally proposed infrastructure has been put in place. My personal view is that more houses with no facilities is just going to be a basis for growing vandalism.</p> <p>We have lived here for more than four years and nothing has been built other than houses. I have previously been in touch with the Council regarding the proposed pub, shops, medical centre etc, and have been advised that these are not going ahead. To build more houses without putting in place some of the original infrastructure promised is absolutely crazy.</p>	<p>The concerns regarding infrastructure problems and lack of community facilities on Rhoose Point are noted. Although, this is an entirely separate matter, the draft development brief recognises that the proposed development will place additional pressure on existing infrastructure and community facilities in the locality. Consequently, the developer(s) will be required to enter into a Section 106 agreement to ensure that either appropriate new facilities are provided or the necessary financial contributions are made towards the upgrading of existing facilities.</p>	None
2: Mr Andrew Bailey	<p>Q 1.1 – Very poor</p> <p>Q 1.2 – Very poor</p> <p>Q 1.3 – Very poor</p> <p>Q 2 – No</p>	<p>I used the form from the Vale of Glamorgan Council web site as a template for this response to the DDB.</p> <p><u>Overview and History</u></p> <p>The decision to make a large greenfield site available for further housing before 2011 was vigorously opposed by the residents and councillors of Rhoose and Rhoose Point. One of the major grievances was that the recently built Rhoose Point development was intended to provide not only houses, but also a country pub, employment, a shop, a nature reserve centre, a sport field changing rooms, a golf course and a golf club house. An impressive package, and</p>	Noted.	None

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>if the county pub, employment, shop, nature reserve centre, sports field, changing rooms, golf course and golf club house had actually been built the community might look more favourably on plans for further housing.</p> <p>In comparison, the master plan for the Land North of the Railway Line, Rhoose (LNRLR) includes no provision for anything other than housing and the minimum recommended recreational space. I know the community should be used to crushing disappointment from the planning system, but for the Council not even to attempt to dangle a planning gain carrot shows how little enthusiasm and imagination a scheme for Rhoose now merits, and how low the opinions of the community are valued. There is no pub, no indoor community facilities, no shop, no employment and no sheltered housing.</p> <p>The list of adopted UDP policies directly relevant to a housing development brief in Rhoose does not include Policy REC 5 (new playing field provision), Policy REC 11 (informal public open space) and Policy ENV 24 (conservation and enhancement of public open space). The failure to consider these policies directly in drafting the DDB means that the plans ignore the shortcomings of Rhoose Point and will be unable to fix them.</p> <p><u>Environmental and Sustainability</u></p> <p>Draft Development Brief 4.30  “Initial discussions have been held with Dwr Cymru / Welsh Water with regard to the discharge of both foul and surface water from the site and the Council understands verbal agreement has been reached by the developers on both these issues. However, further detailed investigation and modelling will be required. There appears to be significant drainage problems in the area and this issue will need to be carefully considered in the development of the site”.</p> <p>A ‘verbal agreement’? I feel more confident in the integrity of the design and planning process already. I am sure the residents of Rhoose Point waiting to have their drains adopted by Welsh Water and their roads adopted by the Council can sleep a little easier knowing that there is no longer a need for cumbersome paperwork or complex legally binding (and enforceable)</p>	<p>Although the draft development brief states that the land is allocated for approximately 600 dwellings, it also states that the Council will through discussions with the site developers seek to secure affordable housing, public open space, children’s play areas, appropriate landscaping and contribution / provision for educational, recreational, community and public transport provision.</p> <p>Policies REC 5 and REC 11 refer to the existing Rhoose Point development and are therefore not applicable. It is agreed that Policy ENV 24 is applicable.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Add Policy ENV 24 to list of relevant policies in paragraph 2.11 and update Appendix 2.</p> <p>None</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>agreements.</p> <p>“Appears to be significant drainage problems”? Either there are problems in run off from the LNRLR into Rhoose Point, or there are not. If there are problems, Planning Policy Wales in paragraph 13.2.4 states “development proposals should seek to reduce and certainly not increase, flood risk arising... from additional run-off from development”.</p> <p>After Welsh Water and the developers are made aware of these “significant drainage problems” in writing, the Council should secure an agreement, in writing, that following the “detailed modelling and investigation” the “significant drainage problems” will be resolved by the use of sustainable urban drainage systems such as rainwater harvesting and green roofs. The issue of run-off from the LNRLR into Rhoose Point is a specific key issue and should have been identified as such in section 5.3 of the Strategic Design and Landscape Guidance, because the need to minimise run off will have to be included in the design and layout of the houses.</p> <p>Planning Policy Wales 1.4.14 states “Warmer, drier summers will lead to increased pressure on water supplies, the planning of new development should be linked to the availability of water resources and environmentally-sound ways of managing demand”. There is no specific commitment to minimise water use. Rainwater harvesting and grey water utilisation is simple to provide and should be designed into every new building.</p> <p>This very large, high profile development on a greenfield site must have a commitment to community decentralised energy generation. Photovoltaics, solar water heating, solar powered street lamps, wind turbines and ground source heat pumps are all technologies that should be designed into this new housing estates. The actual commitment to combating climate change by minimising energy use is the stirring phrase from the Draft Development Brief 5.7 “Passive solar gain being achievable”. Stating if you happen to be facing south, your house might be warmer is not the same as a commitment to design all the houses on the site to demonstrably maximise passive solar heating benefits. Likewise designing the houses for passive air conditioning would be a practical way of reducing carbon emissions. This is a high profile / high value development, so there should be a firm commitment to achieve BREEAM ‘excellent’ ratings in at least 50% of the houses planned for the site, rather than the weak “we would expect” (Draft Development Brief paragraph 5.1).</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council has produced Supplementary Planning Guidance on Sustainable Development, which includes advice on sustainable urban drainage systems and energy efficiency in new developments. The SPG has been prepared in accordance with the Council's approved guidelines for the production of SPGs and would therefore be an important material consideration in the determination of any forthcoming planning application on this site.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Add reference to Sustainable Development SPG in paragraph 2.13.</p>
		<p><u>Security</u> The CCTV system should be designed into the framework of the new development. Every public entry to the site should be monitored 24 hours a day as well as the public open spaces as well as the youth shelters. The level crossing over the railway line needs a duplicate CCTV</p>	<p>Disagree. The Police have been consulted on the draft development brief and have not raised this as an</p>	<p>None.</p>


Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>system, since it has a rail safety and a security aspect. The Brief should also include a building/office for the community police, as the current is not adequate for current needs for Rhoose and Rhoose Point.</p> <p><u>Community Satellite Distribution</u> Install fibre optic cables to each new building as a measure of future proofing for communication technology upgrades. Install a community satellite dish and distribute the signal to all houses via a cable – this would allow the creation of a community television system.</p>	<p>issue. Furthermore, the Council does not have the resources to monitor such a facility. Accordingly, the Council will seek to ensure that any proposed site layout is designed to reduce the risk and fear of crime.</p>	
	Q.3 – No.	<p>There should be space allocated in both halves of the development for allotments.</p>	<p>Disagree. This would be up to the developer to decide and is not a land use planning matter.</p>	None.
	Q.4 Q.5 Q.6	<p>The location for the proposed youth shelter is not shown on the map. It sounds like a bus stop without even the prospect of travel, so I suspect it is targeted at the least financially mobile sections of the youth community. If it is somewhere in the park for young people to 'hang out' it must be assigned a dedicated CCTV input.</p> <p>The Council should use the money from this development to provide the community facilities required for Rhoose and Rhoose Point and already identified in the Unitary Development Plan.</p>	<p>Disagree. There is no evidence to suggest that there is a need for such a use at this location.</p> <p>The youth shelter will be sited within the area of public open space. Youth shelters are usually semi – open structures with seating and are popular with older children.</p> <p>The draft development brief recognises that the proposed development will place additional pressure on existing infrastructure and community facilities in the locality. Consequently, the developer(s) will be required to enter into a Section 106 agreement to ensure that either appropriate new facilities are provided or the necessary financial contributions are made towards the upgrading of existing facilities.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>The land assigned to the golf course in the Rhoose point development should be used for (1) Nature reserve, (2) sports field and (3) 'Community hub'</p> <p><u>1. The Nature Reserve</u> Attractive and ecologically rich environments are important, both for their own sake and for the health and the social and economic wellbeing of individuals and communities. This is recognised by the UDP, which states in Policy ENV 24 that 'open spaces which are important for amenity, recreation and/or nature conservation should be conserved and enhanced.' The former quarry and adjacent fields combine a recovered industrial and grassland coastal environment. The creation of a nature reserve here could be linked to the Aberthaw site managed by the South West and Wales Wildlife Trust using the caravan park, coastal path and railway line as 'wildlife corridors'. The trust has expressed an interest in managing the site. The section 106 agreement for Rhoose Point provides a contribution towards the cost of a nature reserve information centre but no money for the creation or management of the nature reserve. Participation in conservation tasks is a socially inclusive activity and develops stable and happy communities.</p> <p><u>2. The Sports Field</u> The UDP states in policy REC 5 (iv) 'a playing field is to be provided at the Rhoose Point Redevelopment, exact hectarage to be agreed'. It also states in policy REC 11 (v) 'land is allocated for informal public open space at Rhoose Point'. Part of the site (highlighted in red on the regulating plan included in the Rhoose Point Design Guidance May 2000) is contaminated with asbestos and is unsuitable for building. Blue Circle's illustrative Master Plan for Rhoose Point shows this site as a playing field, though there is no restriction within the Section 106 Agreement saying it has to go there. Rhoose has two well-used football pitches but no rugby pitch. A sports field with a rugby pitch and adventure playground would be an ideal solution for a patch of ground that now is used only by quad bikers. Nearly the entire site, between the west of Rhoose Point and the stream, should be given over to a sports field, it could also be brought into community uses such as markets, outdoor festivals, concerts and travelling fairs / shows.</p> <p>There is unclaimed funding from an existing Section106 Agreement for the construction of a changing room for a sports field. It would be logical to combine this money with the unclaimed nature reserve centre funding and use it as a contribution towards the community hub (see below) There is currently no safe pedestrian access to this area. There needs to be either a</p>	<p>Not relevant to the draft development brief. However, the adopted UDP allocates this part of the undeveloped coast for informal public open space (Policy REC 11 v refers).</p> <p>Noted but not relevant to the draft development brief.</p> <p>Noted but not relevant to the draft development brief. Nevertheless, the draft development brief master plan shows a central area of open space which will incorporate fully equipped sports pitches, a permanent changing facility, a multiuse games area, a skateboard facility, a neighbourhood equipped area for play and a local equipped area for play.</p> <p>Noted but not relevant to the draft development brief.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>new spur road down from the roundabout or a bridge over the stream at the base of the roundabout.</p> <p><u>3. The Community Hub</u> In 1997 the Facilities Planning Model used by the Sports Council for Wales identified 'the accumulation of unmet demand to the west of the town (St Athan / Aberthaw / Rhoose) suggests that a new 4-6 sports hall might be a viable option [UDP 8.4.57]'.  Rhoose does not just need a new sports hall. The rapid expansion of housing within Rhoose has not been met with an expansion of community facilities. Rhoose needs a building to unify the activities not just of the site, by linking the sports field with the nature reserve, but also providing a social and economic link between Rhoose and Rhoose Point. This would be an excellent site for a building providing a range of recreational and education activities. The Community Hub could have: the nature reserve information centre, changing rooms for the sports field, a nursery, a coffee bar, toilets and baby changing facilities.  A nature reserve information centre at Rhoose would provide a base for the wardens and conservation volunteers managing sites in Rhoose and along the coast. The welsh language nursery in Rhoose is prevented from expanding by its current location and would benefit from purpose built accommodation. This would allow the nursery to admit younger children and allow more children to attend. The hub will concentrate facilities at a public transport node, encouraging walking, cycling, train and bus use.</p> <p><u>The Indoor Beach</u> The decision for London to host the 2012 Olympics presents an opportunity to construct an Olympic training facility in Rhoose. This would make an important contribution to reducing carbon impact of the London Olympics in 2012 and provide a lasting legacy for the benefit of the community. Barry Island is already a centre for playing beach volleyball, which is a rapidly growing sport. Rhoose lacks a sandy beach with easy access. Instead of a conventional sports hall with a hard floor, Rhoose could build the community hub around an indoor beach. Sand is cheap to acquire, maintain and replace. An indoor beach would be a unique international competition and training venue, providing a tourist venue within Rhoose. The beach could be used for gymnastics and trampolining, beach football and beach rugby, team building courses, climbing, educational displays and demonstrations and finally play films and concerts.</p>	<p>Noted. However, the adopted UDP allocates this part of the undeveloped coast for informal public open space (Policy REC 11 v refers).</p> <p>Noted. The draft development brief clearly states that the preferred option would be to extend the existing school and confirms that 2 additional classrooms will be required for nursery aged pupils. This is reflected in the Section 106 requirements part of the draft development brief.</p> <p>Noted but not relevant to the draft development brief.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
	Q7.	I think there needs to a number of sites through out the development, otherwise people will	The community recycling site needs	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q8.	<p>simply drive to the site to do their recycling. The range of materials collected should be extended to garden waste, kitchen waste and cooking oil.</p> <p>No. Draft Development Brief 4.11            "The developers will also be required to investigate and, if appropriate, fund a footpath link from the site over or under the railway linking with the Rhoose Point development."            It is never appropriate to mix pedestrians and cyclists with trains. Funding for a footbridge or underpass at the end of the footpath through the estate is a simple matter of safety. Funding must also be provided for a similar safe pedestrian and cycle access at the station, because the current arrangement mixing pedestrians, cars and trains is unsuitable and unsafe.</p>	<p>to be close to the site's main entrance to allow the Council's refuse vehicles to access the facility effectively and efficiently. Green waste and cooking oil will need to be recycled at the Civic Amenity site in Hayes Road, Sully.</p> <p>Noted. Amendments made to the brief to require investigation of improvements to link the land to the north of the railway line to the employment site within Rhoose Point. The situation with the existing level crossing is an entirely separate matter and is not relevant to the draft development brief.</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.11 amended accordingly and insertion of new paragraph 6.19.</p>
	Q9.	<p>In conclusion, I would say that the site is the last best chance to make something more of Rhoose than a sterile commuter ghetto. This is an opportunity to create not just another identikit infill housing estate, but a working example of environmental design embracing the techniques and technologies that buildings and communities must start using to tackle climate change.</p> <p>The priority for planning gain must be to provide all the facilities promised for Rhoose Point. The stated aim of the development brief is for 'an effective and positive contribution to the social, economic and environmental well-being of the local community' and this will not be</p>	<p>Noted. As previously stated, developers will need to ensure that the proposed development embraces the sustainability and design policies contained within the adopted UDP and the Sustainable Development SPG.</p> <p>Disagree. However, the Council acknowledges that there have been shortcomings at Rhoose Point and</p>	<p>Add UDP Strategic Policy 2 to list of relevant policies in paragraph 2.11 and also add to Appendix 2. Add reference to Sustainable Development SPG in paragraph 2.13.</p> <p>None.</p>



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>achieved unless the scope of the brief includes the whole village and recognises the shortcomings of Rhoose Point.</p> <p>Additional email dated 21/08/06</p> <p>In reply to question 7 (community recycling facility) – Recycling should be integrated by house, by street and finally by the entire estate, rather than relying on a single site. Space should be allocated in the houses and outside to allow for a range of recycling options and to provide for new systems. At least one community compost facility should be included such as the rocket compost facility at CAT (centre for alternative technology) <a href="http://www.cat.org.uk">http://www.cat.org.uk</a></p> <p>Additional email dated 07/09/06</p> <p>1) There is no traffic calming indicated along Porthkerry Road. With the inevitable increase in traffic from the new estate, there should be.</p> <p>2) The Public Art scheme. I saw this in Swansea, and a Public Performance Art Space might be of more use than a specific work of art.</p>  <p>3) When the developers fail to meet their obligations, the Section 106 Agreement should have specific, and escalating, penalty clauses, with the money ring fenced for the community. Getting the children's play space for Rhoose Point was the drawing to the</p>	<p>does not wish to see this happen on this site. Accordingly, the draft development brief contains a substantial section on Section 106 requirements, which will ensure that the aim is met.</p> <p>Noted. However, the Council's preferred option is a single community recycling site close to the site's main entrance as described in paragraph 4.32 of the draft development brief.</p> <p>Noted. However, the impact of the development on the existing highway network will be dealt with as part of the traffic impact assessment to be submitted by the developer with any forthcoming planning application.</p> <p>Noted. The Council will give this suggestion consideration when discussing public art requirements with the developer in due course.</p> <p>Noted. The section 106 agreement will be appropriately worded to</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Add reference to public art SPG to paragraph 2.13 and 4.34.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		community. Getting the children's play areas for Rhoose Point was like drawing teeth, because the developers had no financial interest in providing them promptly.	ensure that the developer's contributions are reasonable and made at the appropriate stages of the development.	
3: D Ritchie	Written Note	<p>The planners who decided that a right of way should exist through Heol y Dryw should all be dismissed. Five minutes spent any evening from 8 to 11 should be enough to convince them that they are total idiots.</p> <p>The youngsters on this estate need a play area (13 to 16 year olds) not supervised by adults where they can smoke pot etc and play cricket, basketball and socialise with the opposite sex without fear of upsetting old fogies like my self, i.e.provide an area the size of a football pitch concrete with basketball at one end enclosed.</p>	<p>The main area of open space shown on the indicative master plan incorporates fully equipped sports pitches, a permanent changing facility, a multiuse games area, skateboard facility, a neighbourhood equipped area for play (NEAP), a local equipped area for play (LEAP) and a youth shelter. It should be noted that the NEAP is suitable for older children aged between 8 and 14 years.</p>	None.
4: Mr Andy Higson	E-mail	<p>I would like to express my objections to the above mentioned proposal. I do believe Rhoose / Fontygary has reached / exceeded the point for any more residential development. The school is in a very limited position to expand as are the amenities which go hand in hand with a larger community. The traffic on Fontygary road has increased dramatically over the last 5 – 10 years making increased pollution and traffic noise.</p> <p>In my opinion there should be no more new builds unless they are one house and in keeping with the way Rhoose used to be 15 years ago. There seem to be duplicate houses popping up but only those that appeal to a certain audience. We seem to be losing the variation of dwellings that used to make Welsh/British towns and villages unique. The new build houses look fine now but look at other areas and after 30 years they become pretty run down. I really hope Rhoose can realise this for my young family and their future.</p>	<p>Noted. The draft development brief sets out numerous section 106 requirements which the Council will be seeking from the developer to ensure that the development of this site makes an effective and positive contribution to the social, economic and environmental well being of the local community. The draft development brief also specifies that the developer will need to undertake and submit a traffic impact assessment to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and to identify appropriate transport solutions. The Council will seek to ensure that any proposed development is well designed using</p>	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
			appropriate building proportions, high quality materials that respect existing surrounding developments.	
5: Mr John Caddick	Q1.1 – Very good			
	Q1.2 – Very good			
	Q1.3 – Very good			
	Q2 – No	Is it the case that development of this site is a pre-requisite? Is there an option to reject further building here in favour of a council managed 'green wedge'? I understand that the land is owned by the developers, so this may not be the case. However if it were possible to preserve and enhance the green field area, this would be my first choice. If development of the kind outlined here is unavoidable in law then my answer to the question above would be yes. I believe the draft plan is comprehensive and stipulates the responsibilities of the developers clearly.	Noted. However, the site is now allocated for residential development in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (Policy HOUS 1 site 22 refers).	None.
	Q3 – Yes			
	Q4 - Yes	I will qualify this response by raising the concerns of those that live in Ceri Avenue and Ceri Road. Will adequate measures be employed to monitor and eliminate, if necessary, any annoyance issues due to the shelter? If the residents in this area are against the siting, is it possible to further develop the on-site facilities to compensate?	The draft development brief states that the developer will be required to provide 2 youth shelters. One will be provided within the area identified as public open space on the indicative master plan. It is anticipated that this facility will be overlooked by dwellings, which in turn should ensure that anti social behaviour is minimised. The other off Ceri Road is in a similar situation.	None.
Q5 – Yes.				
Q6 – Yes.				

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q7 -Yes			
	Q8 – No.	I would prefer more explicit discussion of the proposed bus route around the site. Have the bus companies made any agreements to serve the site?	No. However, the draft development brief specifies that the developer will have to provide new bus shelter infrastructure and subsidise a bus service for 5 years. These measures should be sufficient to ensure that the development is served by bus.	None.
	Q.9	Please would you address the following concerns? Thank you. There is at least one pair of Barn Owls that hunt on the site of the proposed development. This would suggest that the surveys discussed in section three have not identified all threatened species. Further assessment is required here.	Noted. The draft development brief states that the Ecological Assessment recommends that additional surveys are undertaken. If the surveys confirm that barn owls are present on site, further advice will be sought from the Countryside Council for Wales.	None.
		Is there a construction traffic management scheme? What route onto the site would construction traffic use? Will heavy vehicles be prevented from using Porthkerry Road (west of the site), Fontygary Road and driving through the village?	This is a matter for the developers and Highway Authority to discuss in due course.	None.
		Will due consideration be made to residents in Murlande Way?	As previous.	None.
		During which periods would construction work occur?	Not known at this stage.	None.
		Expansion of Rhoose Primary School must be sympathetic to the existing environment and paid for in full by the developers.	Noted. The draft development brief specifies the exact education requirements that the developer would be required to fund (paragraphs 4.24 to 4.27 refer).	None.
		Secure off-road and garage parking is important.	Noted. The draft development brief	

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>Assuming that the development proceeds as outlined, will this be the final stage of the building of Rhoose Point?</p> <p>Is the land to the east of Pentir Y De protected from other building?</p>	<p>states that careful consideration should be given to the security of car parking areas and that parking facilities should be provided in accordance with the Council's approved parking guidelines.</p> <p>No additional land is allocated for residential development in the adopted UDP in this vicinity.</p> <p>Yes. This land lies outside the Rhoose residential settlement boundary identified in the adopted Unitary Development Plan. It has a number of designations including countryside, undeveloped coastal zone and green wedge. It is unlikely therefore that any development would be permitted on this land during the plan period 1996 -2011.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
6: Mrs Gillian Berry	<p>Q1.1 – Very Good</p> <p>Q1.2 – Good</p> <p>Q1.3 – Good</p> <p>Q2 – No</p>	<p>I just don't think that Rhoose deserves any more development. The current Rhoose point development has not benefited the original village at all in fact; it has added a strain to already limited facilities. I understand that the developers were under obligation to provide decent facilities for Rhoose point including a doctors surgery, shops and a school but no of this happened. Therefore, before any planning permission is granted for this piece of land, the developers should be forced by the council to honour their original promises for Rhoose point.</p>	<p>Noted. However, the Council believes that the development of the site will assist in sustaining the existing public transport and village facilities provided in Rhoose as well as providing a range and choice of house types during the Plan period.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q3 – Yes		In addition, it is well located for nearby employment allocations. The Council is aware of the shortcomings of the existing development at Rhoose Point and is therefore seeking a number of appropriate Section 106 requirements from the developer in connection with the development of this site, which will benefit existing and new residents in Rhoose.	
	Q4 – Don't know	I am sure that Ceri Avenue would benefit from a youth shelter but it doesn't benefit residents living at the Fontygary end of the village. If you live towards Fonmon, it would take you almost 30minutes to walk to Ceri Avenue.	Noted. The 2 new youth shelters will be provided by the developer as part of a Section 106 agreement. Therefore it would be unreasonable to require them to provide such a facility in a location that it clearly unrelated to the site.	None.
	Q5 - No	Promises of financial contributions don't in themselves produce improved facilities for the village. How will the Council choose to spend this money, when will they choose to spend it (even if they receive a contribution from developers at a certain point in the development) and will villagers be consulted?	Section 6 of the draft development brief sets out the Section 106 requirements of the site including phasing. These have been prepared following detailed discussions with each of the Council's appropriate departments. The consultation of the draft development brief gave local people the opportunity to comment on this issue and the document may be amended if appropriate. Individuals will also have the opportunity to make comments if and when a planning application is submitted for the development of this site.	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q6 - Yes	If the play facilities outside Rhoose Community Hall will be upgraded, the play facilities outside the Celtic Way community hall should likewise be upgraded. Both playgrounds are massively inferior to the standards that the Council set out in the development brief. Whether the development goes ahead or not, the council should be addressing this issue.	Noted. However, as stated above, it would be unreasonable to require the developer to carry out works at a location that is unrelated to the site.	None.
	Q7 - Yes	Improvements to beach access at Rhoose Point and Fontygary would also be widely beneficial to the community.	Noted. The site does not adjoin the coast, but improved connections to the surrounding locality are proposed as part of the brief.	None
	Q8 – Don't know			
	Q.9	The “unmanned exhibition” at Rhoose library was a joke! It consisted of the poster in the window and a pile of comment forms! Staff seemed bewildered at the thought of an actual exhibition fitting into the library. Space may well have been an issue but a proper public exhibition for those without access to the internet would have made this a valid public consultation exercise.	Noted. However, several manned sessions were held during the consultation period in Rhoose Community Hall, Station Road.	None.
		I am disappointed that the preferred option for school provision currently is to extend the existing Rhoose Primary School. Surely the site is too small and the proposed new classrooms will cover the very beneficial recreational and educational green space currently on the site.	Noted. However, this is the preferred option of the Council's Education department.	None.
7: Mr Roger Griffiths and Mrs W le Masvriar	Q1.1 – Very Good Q1.2 – Good Q1.3 –			

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	<p>Good Q2 – Yes Q.3 – Yes Q. 4- Yes Q.5 – Don't know Q.6 – No Q.7 – Yes Q.8-Yes</p> <p>Q.9</p>	<p>Access to main rail crossing from new development to Rhoose Point should not be allowed due to safety and an inadequate road. We feel a bridge should be built for access across the railway line before someone is injured or killed.</p> <p>Also we feel where the golf course is a waste for land that could be used as a football pitch and other activities. Most important is that welsh water should be made aware of sewerage smells effecting everyone around the rail crossing.</p>	<p>Noted. Amendments made to the brief to require investigation of improvements to link the land to the north of the railway line to the employment site within Rhoose Point.</p> <p>The land to which you refer is allocated for informal recreation use in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (Policy REC 11 v refers). However, the draft development brief states that the public open space on the site will incorporate various recreational facilities including fully equipped sports pitches. The sewerage issue adjacent to the existing level crossing is noted. However this is not strictly relevant to the consultation on the draft development brief and you are advised to contact Dwr Cymru Welsh Water directly in order for it to be investigated.</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.11 amended accordingly and insertion of new paragraph 6.19.</p> <p>None.</p>



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
8: Dr Rosie Deady	Email	I'm not great with computers and don't know how to send you the correct form but my comments were basically do we definitely need housing and are there definitely no brownfield sites? If the answers are yes then this seems like a sensible proposal.	Noted. The reasons for accepting the Unitary Development Plan Inspector's recommendation to allocate this land for housing are contained within the Statement of Decisions document (2003). This is available for viewing at the Council's Dock Office, Barry or on the Council's web site.	None.
		The only other bit of infrastructure to be considered is the turning from 5 mile lane onto the A48 which is badly laid out and quite dangerous at present. I expect that a lot of the new homeowners will work in Cardiff so there will be increased traffic at that junction and it will need to be sorted out.	Noted. The draft development brief specifies that the developer will need to undertake and submit a traffic impact assessment to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and to identify appropriate transport solutions.	None.
9: Fiona Hughes	Q1.1 – Poor Q1.2 – Very Poor Q1.3 – Very Poor  Q2 – No	Absolutely not. This is not a plan for development but a plan for a blot on a particularly beautiful coastal landscape, as shown in your photographs. There are far more appropriate areas outside of Rhoose that would be far better suited to such schemes without having such a major impact – your own document states that the site has 'key views' and 'excellent views to the Bristol Channel'. It appears that the siting of this development is purely about making money by selling these views at a premium to the few rather than maximising them for the majority. Furthermore, what is the point of building more houses when estate agents are already struggling to sell the existing eyesores on Rhoose point? The area has a terrible reputation due to the disastrous planning of the recent development, with its inadequate waste and drainage making embarrassing headlines on national TV. This seems to be planning in progress for	Noted. The reasons for accepting the Unitary Development Plan Inspector's recommendation to allocate this land for housing are contained within the Statement of Decisions document (2003). This document is available for viewing at the Council's Dock Office, Barry or on the Council's web site. The Council will seek to ensure that any	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q3 - No	<p>another disaster.</p> <p>It would be more sensible to site the open space where the site A5 is placed in order to reduce the impact on existing housing. Furthermore, this would negate the requirement for two service roads for the new housing as well as entailing that the existing footpath is interrupted only once and not twice.</p> <p>Encouraging use of a footpath that is crossed by two roads and a railway track is simply inviting children to get hurt. This is all the more the case that the plans are encouraging children in the area to be using bikes and skateboards.</p> <p>The plans give no information as to what the 'youth shelter' actually is and what exactly it will be used for. As such how can anybody possibly agree or disagree with it? For example, will this house the proposed facility for skateboarding? If so, this should be kept as far away from housing and pedestrians as possible to avoid both nuisance and potential accidents. (And why on earth include a facility for skateboarding anyway- this is totally at odds with the nature of</p>	<p>proposed development takes account of the views both in and out of the site.</p> <p>Disagree. The draft development brief states seeks to ensure the privacy of existing dwellings that abut the site through careful consideration of the position of windows, levels, landscaping etc and in some cases may require more than 21 metres to be provided between houses. The main area of public open space shown on the indicative master plan has been located centrally to allow ease of access and benefits from screening due to existing mature vegetation. The road layout shown on the master plan has been designed by the Highway Authority and is the preferred arrangement.</p> <p>Disagree. The cycleway / footpath shown on the indicative master plan does not cross the railway track. It is inevitable that such routes will cross highways from time to time and in this case, the road in question is not a major one and the speed limit is expected to be 30mph or less.</p> <p>The youth shelter is likely to comprise of an open structure with seating on a tarmacadam base which will suit older children. It will not house the skateboarding facility.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		Rhoose? Like so many aspects of the plan it flies in the face of the existing conurbation which will do anything but provide a harmonious environment).		
	Q4 – Don't Know	As above.		
	Q5 – Don't know	How on earth can a judgement be made on this when no data as to the financial contribution is outlined and the requirements of such are so insubstantial and undefined? For example, no information whatsoever is given with regard to the size, type and location of new classrooms at the existing school etc etc.	The draft development brief contains a specific section on Section 106 requirements containing information on phasing and percentages. It would not be appropriate to include details of specific sums in such a document.	None
	Q6 – Yes	There are only two doctors' surgeries and one dentist in Rhoose as such; I would suggest that provision is made for a small medical centre. Further to this, please refer to my comments in the previous section.	Noted. However, these existing facilities are considered to be adequate to serve the existing and new residents of Rhoose.	None.
	Q7 – No	Given the level of noise and environmental pollution generated by such a site, as well as the impact of vehicles servicing the site- and notwithstanding the fact that such an amenity would be a complete eyesore- this should be well outside the vicinity of any conurbation as it is in Barry.	Disagree. Recycling facilities need to be easily accessible to Vale residents if the Council is to meet the Governments recycling targets.	None.
	Q8 – No	No with regard to the footpath as outlined previously.  As we are not given any information regarding the level of 'affordable housing' where people are presumable less likely to have cars – it is impossible to gauge whether the proposals for the bus service are adequate. With regard to public transport, no mention is made of the train service, which would be inadequate to serve commuters to Barry and Cardiff. If this is not addressed then further stress would be placed on the environment by the need for more cars.	The draft development brief states that the Council will require at least 20% of the total number of dwellings to be affordable. One of the main reasons for allocating this site for development was the proximity of the railway station. It is understood that the train operating company are seeking to improve	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q. 9	<p>In its existing form the proposal raises many more questions and does not give enough information on various aspects of the development, for example:</p> <p>What is the employment site– is this going to be office blocks, shops, a site operating manufacturing machinery or something else? Certainly with this number of new houses shops are required to serve them but no provisions appear to have been made.</p> <p>What is the finite number of houses? Point 6.19 states that if the development was to exceed 600 units, which implies that options are being left open for even more houses, making a complete mockery of all the servicing facilities outlined in the plan.</p> <p>What is the reasonable element of affordable housing as this again impacts upon the whole nature of the proposal.</p> <p>Various comments are made about the nature of the new housing but as ever no detail- can we</p>	<p>the frequency of trains on the Vale of Glamorgan line in the near future.</p> <p>The draft development brief does not identify land for employment within the site. However, the employment site on Rhoose Point is allocated for B1, B2 and B8 uses. Additional dwellings on the land to the north of the railway line will help to sustain existing and proposed retail facilities in the village.</p> <p>The adopted Unitary Development Plan anticipates that this site will yield 600 units but this clearly depends on the layout and density of the site. The draft development brief specifies that if this number is exceeded then the Section 106 contributions will need to be re-assessed accordingly.</p> <p>As stated in the draft development brief, at least 20% of the dwelling units must be affordable in accordance with Unitary Development Plan Policy HOUS 12 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing.</p> <p>Section 5 of the draft development</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>expect even more clones of the red brick eyesores that have already been shoe horned into Rhoose Point? Will the affordable housing consist of flats, are town houses part of the plans – both of which will have a substantial impact upon the nature of the development.</p>	<p>brief sets out the key issues that developers will need to consider when drawing up a scheme such as views, focal spaces, orientation of buildings, house types, materials etc. The type of affordable housing provided will need to be agreed with the Council's housing department and will reflect local need. The draft development brief states that there will be a mix of heights of dwellings on the site. However, due to the site's location and prominence, no building on the site will exceed 2.5 storeys unless it can be demonstrated that 3 storeys would have no unacceptable impact on surrounding uses and the landscape.</p>	
		<p>Clarification is required as to point 4.5 regarding 'new landscaping on the northern perimeter where it adjoins existing housing.'</p>	<p>This is required to safeguard the privacy of existing adjoining properties. The Council is likely to encourage developers to plant native species, which are appropriate for this exposed coastal location.</p>	None.
		<p>The emergency access route is not clear, as to where it meets existing roads.</p>	<p>Disagree. The emergency access is clearly shown on the indicative master plan in the draft development brief.</p>	None.
		<p>How will drainage issues be addressed such that the existing problems are dealt with and not exacerbated.</p>	<p>The Council has already had initial discussions with Dwr Cymru Welsh Water regarding the drainage on the site and has consulted with them on the draft development</p>	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>In the assumption that all houses will have one car and many will have two this implies an additional 1000 vehicles sitting in traffic jams on Pentir y De trying to get out at peak periods and by default adding to environmental pollution. Furthermore, Fontygary Road can barely cope with the existing traffic, let alone more. The proposal states that the village centre as a conservation area will not be impacted- this is entirely erroneous given the additional traffic generated. In addition new residents will exacerbate parking problems for local facilities such as shops and schools. This whole aspect requires addressing.</p> <p>In general, far too little information is given about the development to enable the public to make valid judgements against the outlines provided. Overall, details given in the development plans fly in the face of the existing nature of the village. Perhaps those involved in the Brief should review the ACORN classification of Rhoose and look at planning sympathetically to this rather than creating obvious discord. Here's an idea, instead of planning use of open spaces within the area, why not respect the wishes of local residents and leave 26 ha exactly as it is.</p>	<p>brief. The issue of drainage will ultimately be resolved at the planning application stage when detailed layout plans are available.</p> <p>Disagree. It is unrealistic to assume that everyone living on the new development will travel to and from work / school etc by car given the public transport facilities that exist locally. In addition, the draft development brief specifies that the developer will need to undertake and submit a traffic impact assessment to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and to identify appropriate transport solutions.</p> <p>The exact details of this development will become known if and when a planning application is submitted to the Council. The public will have a further opportunity to comment at this time.</p>	<p>Add relevant Conservation Area policies to paragraph 2.11 and update Appendix 2.</p> <p>None.</p>
10: Alan Wadey	Q1.1 – Good Q1.2 – Poor Q1.3 – Neutral Q2 – No Q3 - Yes Q4 – No	<p>Land off Ceri Road is a good area for the youth shelter, however this is a long way from many other parts of the village. It is well over a mile from areas of Rhoose Point and from the</p>	<p>This location was chosen as it is an existing local recreational facility</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q5 – No	<p>Fontygary end of the village, who is it to serve?</p> <p>The developers will make a fortune from this site. Lets see some proper facilities for Rhoose. The village will be as big as Cowbridge. Where are our shops, secondary school, leisure centre and other facilities? Where are the facilities promised when Rhoose Point was first built upon? The golf course, playing fields, interpretation centre, pub etc etc. Please finish one development before starting another. We don't yet even have adopted roads!!!!</p>	<p>used by existing children and likely to be used by new children on this site.</p> <p>Rhoose already has a significant number of shops and a retail site is identified on the existing Rhoose Point development adjacent to the transport interchange. Additional residential development in Rhoose will help to sustain such facilities. The Council's education department have examined the implications of the new development on secondary education and confirmed that the developer will be required to fund additional classrooms and associated facilities at Barry Comprehensive and Llantwit Major Comprehensive schools. In terms of leisure facilities, the existing Fontygary Leisure Park is in close proximity to the site and it would not be unreasonable to assume that residents may also choose to visit nearby Llantwit Major and Barry leisure centres which are easily accessible by public transport.</p> <p>The Council recognises the shortcomings of the existing Rhoose Point development and will seek to ensure that the developer for this site enters into an appropriate Section 106 agreement to ensure that all of the contributions are fulfilled.</p>	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q6 – Yes	Yes, see comments for Q.5 above. Estimates for the number of people living in the 600 units seem exceptionally low. Are you telling me that affordable housing will attract 2.35 occupants? What is this, a single mother and a child or two? Proper consideration towards the population headcount should be made when plans are submitted for the various types of houses. More accurate figures can then be calculated. I suspect higher figures will appear, which would impact such items as school places and recreation space allocated.	Noted.	None.
	Q7 – No		The Council is seeking to encourage people to use public transport as opposed to the private car in line with national planning guidance. Rhoose is also fortunate to have a direct rail link to Cardiff and Bridgend and the draft development brief seeks developer contributions for bus service improvements. Nevertheless, the draft development brief also specifies that the developer will need to undertake and submit a traffic impact assessment to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and to identify appropriate transport solutions. Amendments made to the brief to require investigation of improvements to link the land to the north of the railway line to the employment site within Rhoose Point. However, the safety of the existing level crossing is an entirely separate matter and is not relevant to this consultation.	Paragraph 4.11 amended accordingly and insertion of new paragraph 6.19.
	Q8 – No	Not a high percentage of people use public transport these days. The roads in and out of the village need to be upgraded instead. Also two footbridges are needed over the railway. One where the current public footpath goes through the new development and one by the railway station. It is unacceptable that there is no access when the barriers are down. Jeffrey James told me in person there was not enough room for a footbridge at the station. He obviously hasn't looked very hard at the location as there is plenty of space.		



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q.9	<p>Before this brief is approved, the existing Rhoose Point development should be finished. If the Council made mistakes by not having the developers legally bound to complete all aspects of work, they should foot the bill themselves rather than make the residents suffer. How do we know that this next development will not be exactly the same? The projected population increases should be reworked. Calculation errors here could have a very significant impact on the local community, especially the already over subscribed schools.</p> <p>The council should try to attract a major food chain to the village. Cowbridge now has a Tesco as well as a vast number of other shops. Rhoose has a spar and a couple of news agents. This is not enough to appropriately service the current population, let alone another 1500 people.</p> <p>If the Council were to provide the facilities promised with Rhoose Point, the village may be more willing for this development to take place.</p> <p>Having spent time providing these comments I am expecting an acknowledgement as a bare minimum. A response to some of the individual points would be greatly appreciated.</p>	<p>The adopted Unitary Development Plan stipulates that planning permission will not be granted for the development of this site until 80% beneficial occupation of the residential units on the Rhoose Point site has been achieved. As previously stated, the Council is aware of the shortcomings of the existing Rhoose Point development and will seek to ensure that this does not re-occur on this site through an appropriate Section 106 agreement.</p> <p>Noted. This is not something that the Council can have control over. However, it should be noted that there is land set aside for retail development adjacent to the transport interchange on the existing Rhoose Point development.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
11: Kenneth Harrison	Q1.1 – Good Q1.2 – Good Q1.3 – Neutral			

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q2 – Don't Know	I do have some thoughts on provisions for drainage, facilities, communications etc which I have detailed in further sections.	Yes. The draft development brief states that every effort will be made to protect existing trees and hedgerows wherever practicable.	None.
	Re Trees and hedges: Do you plan to keep as many of the existing trees / hedges as possible? I see that some of the proposed roads go through the hedges in places.		The draft development brief encourages additional suitable planting in appropriate locations in accordance with policies ENV 12 and ENV 25. However, additional planting on the existing Rhoose Point development is an entirely separate matter and is not relevant to this consultation. The hedgerows that you refer to are predominantly diseased and are therefore not worthy of retention. Their replacement will have to be considered if and when a planning application is submitted on the site.	None.
	How about any plans to plant more trees around the development and in the existing estate south of the railway line? Policies ENV12 and ENV27 suggest that this should be considered. I see on Appendix 6 shows that sites B5 and B6 have their hedges listed as to be removed, but there is no mention as to whether they will be replaced.		An existing public right of way currently provides such access over the railway line. Amendments made to the brief to require investigation of improvements to link the land to the north of the railway line to the employment site within Rhoose Point.	Paragraph 4.11 amended accordingly and insertion of new paragraph 6.19.
	Q3 - Yes Q4 – Yes	Will it be a pedestrian crossing or a tunnel or bridge over to the recreation land from the south side of the railway line? A crossing may be the least safe option. There is level crossing written on the map at the east end of the unused land adjacent to Maes y Gwenyn.		

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q5 – Don't Know	We believe there should be a new school to cater for all the children of families on Rhoose Point. We are glad to see that the developer will have to provide funds in order to cater for the increased demand. We hope that the assessed amounts will be enough to meet this demand. We also believe that any extra buildings regardless of location should be permanent structures and should not impinge on existing playing areas. I also think the developer should include plans to allow a pub to be built on the new development, one of the modern types that caters for families.	Noted. However, the Council's Education Department have confirmed that the preferred option is to extend the existing school.	None.
	Q6 – Don't Know	If there is a perceived need which the developers funds are not able to pay for then the Council will have to make up the difference. Re other community facility requirements, the village hall may need to be extended in order to cater for increased population or another hall built. A village notice board somewhere on Rhoose Point would also be a good idea.	Noted. The existing community hall in Station Road has recently been extended and a number of community notice boards are already provided in and around the village.	None.
	Q7 – Yes			
	Q8 – No	Bus route should extend to include at least one bus stop in the existing development south of the railway line.	Noted. However, turning facilities for buses within the existing Rhoose Point development are limited. The new bus stop / lay-by shown on the indicative master plan can be easily accessed by residents of the both sites.	None.
	Q.9	Our first thought is that we are not in favour of any more houses being built in this part of Rhoose in principle. However, if a development is to go ahead then we would like the thoughts and comments we have listed in the various sections to be considered:  What are the Council's plans re the adoption the existing roads and drains south of the railway line? Surely all of the outstanding issues should be resolved before allowing (another) developer to develop more land? The existing issue with the drains is highlighted in the draft page 19.  Where will the sewer and drainage from the new houses go? Is there a plan for another sewage pumping station or will the one at Rhoose Station have to take up the extra capacity? The only mention of this we found was allowing for some space along the north sid of the railway line which would be used for drainage purposes amongst other things. ENV27 and 7 require there to be proper drainage and waste management.	Noted.  This is an entirely separate matter and is not relevant to this consultation.  The Council has already had initial discussions with Dwr Cymru Welsh Water regarding the drainage on the site and has consulted with them on the draft development brief. The issue of drainage will	None.  None.  None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>I gather that the existing development had a section 102 agreement with Dwr Cymru (which is not formal) – whereas a section 104 would be a formal agreement. Will the new developer be required to enter into a 104 agreement? What about a second unhindered access road into the existing Rhoose Point Estate or are there any plans for future modifications to the level crossing at the west end?</p> <p>Are there plans to allow cable wire installation (NTL) into the new development – for some reason this was not done when the existing development went in – if this goes in in the future it will cause a lot of disruption to the roads, it would have been better for the developers to include it during the construction phase. As a modern technology this should be considered via policy ENV 27.</p> <p>Will the developer be able to erect mobile phone masts – or are there any applications in progress elsewhere in the village?</p> <p>Are there any plans/applications in place for commercial units e.g. – small supermarket, doctors etc...on the existing free land on Trem Echni? I gather that this land has been earmarked for light industry but appears to be still up for sale. Also what plans are there for the land by the station?</p>	<p>ultimately be resolved at the planning application stage when detailed layout plans are available.</p> <p>This is an entirely separate matter and is not relevant to this consultation.</p> <p>Cable wire installation would be up to the developer to decide and is not a land use planning matter.</p> <p>The acceptability of a mobile phone mast would be considered in due course by the Local Planning Authority if applicable.</p> <p>The land off Trem Echni is allocated in the adopted Unitary Development Plan for B1, B2 and B8 uses. The land adjacent to the transport interchange is identified for retail use on the Rhoose Point master plan and a planning application for a mixed residential / retail development is currently under consideration by the Council.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
<p><b>12: Dwr Cymru – Welsh Water</b></p>	<p>Letter and Two Drainage Plans</p>	<p>Further to the above consultation we would provide the following comments:-</p> <p>Thank you for your letter and enclosures dated the 27<sup>th</sup> July 2006 regarding the above, we would like to offer the following inresponse:</p>		

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p><u>Foul Sewerage</u> As your Authority may be aware, an assessment has been undertaken on the public sewerage system at the developer's expense, in order that solutions could be identified for draining the foul flows from this development.</p> <p>We can confirm that as a result of the assessment, a solution has been identified that would need to be progressed to a detailed stage and implemented before any foul flows from the development could be accepted.</p> <p>Whilst we acknowledge that a solution for the foul drainage is in existence, we currently have no alternative but to oppose the development proposals. Once the solution has been progressed to a detailed design stage and costed, we would suggest that it might be possible to impose a Section 106 Agreement, which would ensure that any necessary works on the public system are carried out prior to any foul connections being made.</p> <p><u>Surface Water Sewerage</u> The surface water flows from the proposed development, as we understand, will be discharged to a watercourse by the developer and therefore we have no comment to provided in relation to these proposals.</p> <p><u>Water Supply</u> As with the sewerage, the developer has paid for an assessment to be carried out on the clean water supply system to determine if the proposed development could be facilitated without causing any detriment to existing customers. The assessment did conclude that certain upgrading works are required to facilitate the development proposals and a budget cost for this work has been established.</p> <p>We would therefore be prepared to consider a Section 106 Agreement attached to the planning permission that will ensure these necessary works are carried out on the water supply network prior to the development being occupied.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Update paragraph 4.30 of the draft development brief and section 6 on planning application requirements.</p> <p>Update paragraph 4.30 of the draft development brief.</p> <p>Update paragraph 4.30 of the draft development brief and section 6 on planning application requirements.</p>
13: Environment Agency	Letter	We would request that the following issues are fully addressed within an environmental impact assessment:		

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p><u>Biodiversity Aspects:</u></p> <p>Ecological surveys should be carried out to identify the extent of any interests on site. These should include an assessment of impacts on otters, water voles, bats and other small mammals; birds, amphibians, reptiles and invertebrates. Surveys should also assess the importance of habitats and the flora present. The presence of species or habitats included in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan and local Biodiversity Action Plan should also be included. It is important that habitat / species surveys are carried out at the appropriate time of year so that the results are meaningful.</p> <p>Mitigation measures, environmental enhancements and future management of conservation features should also be considered. The development should aim to achieve net conservation gains as well as mitigation for any losses.</p> <p>This development is within 2Km of east Aberthaw Coast SSSI and Cliff Woods-Golden Stairs SSSI and therefore CCW should be consulted regarding the proposal.</p> <p>Local information on the conservation interests of this site is likely to be held by the local authority's ecologist who should be consulted at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>Development that interferes with any watercourse may require out Land Drainage Consent. In channel work is not usually permitted between 15<sup>th</sup> October and 15<sup>th</sup> May in order to protect migrating and spawning fish.</p> <p>We would encourage the retention of mature trees and hedgerows for their conservation and aesthetic value. Tree / hedgerow removal should not be undertaken during the months of March to June (inclusive) in order to protect breeding birds. Breeding birds are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted. CCW have been consulted on the draft development brief and will be re-consulted if and when a planning application is submitted on the site.</p> <p>Noted. The Council's Ecologist has assisted in the preparation of the draft development brief and will be re-consulted if and when a planning application is submitted on the site.</p> <p>Noted. However, no water courses or water bodies exist on the site.</p> <p>Noted. The draft development brief seeks the retention of trees, hedgerows and other vegetation wherever practicable.</p>	<p>Amend paragraphs 3.17 and 3.18 accordingly.</p> <p>Add additional bullet point at the end of the ecology section.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>If impacts on features of conservation interest cannot be avoided there should be appropriate mitigation so that there is no net loss of habitat. If necessary should involve the creation of features outside the development site.</p>	Agree.	Add additional bullet point at the end of the ecology section.
		<p>This site may contain Japanese Knotweed, an invasive plant, the spread of which is prohibited under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Care should be taken to prevent its spread during any operation relating to this proposal. It is important that any soil or hardcore that is imported onto the site is free of the seeds / roots / stem of the invasive plant Japanese Knotweed, the spread of which is prohibited under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.</p>	Noted.	Add new paragraph after paragraph 3.19.
		<p>You are reminded that under the terms of the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975, it is an offence to cause or knowingly permit to flow, or put, into any waters containing fish, any liquids or solid matter such an extent as to cause the water to be poisonous or injurious to fish or the spawning grounds, spawn or food of fish.</p>	Noted but not relevant as there are no water courses or water bodies on site.	None
		<p>It is also an offence under Section 85 of the Water Resources Act 1991 to cause or knowingly permit any poisonous, noxious or polluting matter or any solid waste matter to enter any controlled waters.</p>	Noted but not relevant as there are no water courses or water bodies on site.	None
		<p><u>Flood Defence Matters:</u></p>		
		<p>The Environment Agency is not aware of any flooding problems associated with this site north of the railway line. Other sources, for example Local Unitary Authorities, may be able to provide information on issues such as localised flooding from drains, culverts and small watercourses.</p>	Noted.	None
		<p>It is recommended that you consult with the Local Authority's Engineers Department in order to establish that should any surface water drainage from this site be discharged to a watercourse, ditch or culvert (excluding statutory main rivers) that such discharge will not cause or exacerbate any flooding in this catchment.</p>	Noted.	None
		<p>A scheme for the provision and implementation of a surface water regulation system must be approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme should be implemented to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority prior to the construction of any</p>	Noted.	Amend paragraph 4.30

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>impermeable surface draining to the system.</p> <p>Whatever regulation method is adopted to control the rate of surface water runoff from the development, it is essential that the developer makes suitable provision to ensure satisfactory long-term maintenance of the system/structure installed.</p> <p><u>Groundwater and Contaminated Land Matters</u></p> <p>For your information under Policy and Practice for the Protection of Groundwater (EA, 1998) the geology beneath the site is classed as being a minor aquifer of high vulnerability.</p> <p>We would advise that a desk study should be supplied with any future planning application for the site, which should identify historical land use with relation to potential contamination of soils, sub-soils and groundwater at the site. We acknowledge that some preliminary site investigations have taken place and support the recommendation that further site investigation and geophysical surveys should be undertaken by the developers prior to development commencing. This should include identifying the presence if groundwater beneath the site and include leachate testing of materials on the site.</p> <p>We would recommend that foul and surface water drainage from any proposed development be discharged to either an existing or new connection to the sewer system.</p> <p><u>Pollution prevention Matters:</u></p> <p>We would ask that we are permitted a site visit once construction has begun to provide pollution prevention advice.</p> <p>No pollution of land or water to occur during construction, please construct within the pollution prevention guidelines and to industry best practice.</p> <p>We would request that any discharges are consented or go to sewer with permission of the water authority that there is suitable volume available.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. This information would be relayed to the developers if planning permission were forthcoming.</p> <p>Noted. This information would be relayed to the developers if planning permission were forthcoming.</p> <p>Noted. This information would be relayed to the developers if</p>	<p>accordingly.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>Amend para 3.6 accordingly.</p> <p>Add to section 6 (outline planning permission)</p> <p>None</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>All waste used on, brought to or removed from, site should be carried by registered waste carriers, and taken to or from an appropriately licensed or exempted site and duty of care applies.</p> <p><u>Water resources Issues:</u></p> <p>Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, an impounding Licence may be required from the Agency for the impounding of any watercourse, ditch or stream (e.g. by dam, weir etc...) and an Abstraction Licence may be required from the Agency for the abstraction of water from any inland water or underground strata. This is dependent on water resources availability and may not be granted.</p> <p>It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that the development will not affect any existing legal water interests in the area.</p> <p>We would be happy to provide further comments at the scoping stage of the Environmental Impact Assessment.</p>	<p>planning permission were forthcoming.</p> <p>Noted. This information would be relayed to the developers if planning permission were forthcoming.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
14: Karen Gallimore	Letter	<p>1. Legality of the Draft Development Brief produced by the Local Authority</p> <p>As a consequence of concerns raised by residents prior to publication of the DDB, Members from across the political spectrum made vigorous objections to the DDB going forward to public consultation. Unfortunately, a heated debate at Full Council failed to stop the DDB going forward in its present form. I would point out that the Cabinet did agree to undertake a site investigation prior to the DDB going out for Public Consultation but there is no evidence that this took place.</p>	<p>Cabinet on the 10<sup>th</sup> May 2006 resolved to undertake a site inspection of the Rhoose Point development and the land to the north of the railway line (Min No. C2441 refers). To date, it appears that this has not been undertaken. However, a further recommendation is to be included in the report for Cabinet to undertake a site visit of the land to the north of the railway line.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>All the Cabinet positions are held by Conservatives – and two are held by the Ward Members for Rhoose namely the Leader, Councillor James, and Councillor Kemp. All Councillors will know that their first duty is towards the residents of their respective wards. Councillors James and Kemp have been fully aware of concerns on Rhoose Point for over 3 years. However, in their role as Cabinet Members they supported the DDB – despite being fully up to speed with residents concerns regarding drainage, flooding, pollution, contamination, planning irregularities and adoption. This could constitute a major conflict of interest. At the very least the Ward Members should have imparted to Cabinet the knowledge in their possession.</p> <p>However, the issues of the legality and content of the DDB go ‘above politics’ and are so serious that those with the power should bring about a vote of no confidence in the Cabinet. Senior Officers within the Local Planning Authority should also be brought to account.</p> <p>The residents invited by the Council to comment on the DDB have been duped. The Council has taken advantage of the fact that members of the public are not professional planners. It is also noticeable that the consultation period chosen is one when many are on holiday – and the Council is in recess! We are advised in the letters addressed to ‘The Occupier’ that the Brief has been prepared in accordance with recommendation 4.80 of the Inspectors report on the UDP - This is not true.</p> <p>Full Council accepted the Proposed Modifications to the UDP with regard to land north of the railway in October 2004 on the basis of the Inspectors recommendation that the future Development Brief be a joint project between the developers and the Vale. This issue became a matter of STATUTE when formal adoption took place in May 2005. Any departure from the adopted UDP should have been put to Council, agreed and minuted accordingly. It has not been made clear to the public that the preparation of the DDB solely by the Vale constitutes a departure from the UDP. The decision to ‘go it alone’ was not a matter for the LPA but should have gone through due process in consultation with Members. If the departure from the UDP had been agreed then it was only at that point that the LPA were under a remit to produce a one party Brief that then followed its course through the Committee Stages. In general terms Development Briefs become a material consideration when determining subsequent planning applications. This means that the DDB for the Land North of the Railway that has gone out to Public Consultation has no status as a material consideration.</p>	<p>The outstanding issues on Rhoose Point are considered to be a separate issue from the Draft Development Brief.</p> <p>It is inevitable that some consultations will take place over the Summer months. However, the Council believes that the 6-week consultation period gave interested parties sufficient time to respond to the draft development brief. The Unitary Development Plan Inspector recommended that a development brief was prepared for the site (Recommendation 4.80 refers).</p> <p>Disagree. The draft development brief was based on an original document prepared by the developers. However, as there were a number of concerns with it, the Council decided to prepare its own draft development brief in accordance with its approved procedures. This decision is not considered to represent a departure from the adopted Unitary Development Plan. The development brief will be a material consideration in the determination</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>Q1. In light of the above why have the Leader and fellow Ward Member endorsed and signed the 'To The Occupier' letter?</p> <p>Considerable work and expense would have been involved in preparing the DDB. In the light of what has happened the LPA could be deemed responsible for wasting taxpayers money on a DDB that is not worth the paper it is written on! Furthermore, The Leader, who is a ward member for Rhoose has stated through the press that the development on the North cannot be progressed until issues on the South are resolved (<i>Gem 23<sup>rd</sup> March 06</i>). He subsequently led the Cabinet in promoting the DDB who subsequently effectively overruled the decision of the Scrutiny Committee to support residents concerns and defer the DDB pending inquiries.</p> <p>Q2. How much has it cost to research, administer and publicise/exhibit the DDB?</p> <p>Q3. Why do existing residents need protecting from the developers? The Leader stated at Scrutiny on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 06 that the purpose of the DDB is, 'To protect existing residents from the developers'.</p> <p>It is a well-known fact, documented in meeting minutes and in the press, that the Department of Enterprise, Innovation and Networks (formerly the WDA) is less than happy with the DDB. Clearly, all the relevant parties should have dealt with any differences of opinion, achieved a consensus and put forward a DDB presented in such a way that the public could give informed comment. Also, now that the WDA has been reinvented as DEIN, the new organisation formed on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2006 will have a different set of parameters to the WDA. This could nullify any Inspectors recommendation or decisions made be Council when it was the remit of the WDA that was being taken into consideration.</p> <p>Tim Raine, originally Senior Land Manager for the WDA, said in a press release as far back as</p>	<p>of any future planning application on this site.</p> <p>In view of the above, it is appropriate that the local ward members signed the letter to all Rhoose residents.</p> <p>The draft development brief and subsequent public consultation has been carried out in-house by officers of the Planning and Transportation Division within the current budget for the division. If you require more detailed information, you will need to submit a separate FOI request.</p> <p>No comment as there is no minute to this effect.</p> <p>Disagree. As an interested party, DEIN have been consulted for their views on the draft development brief.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>October 2001 that no development of the north would take place until the impact of the then emerging Rhoose Point estate had been assessed. (<i>Gem 19<sup>th</sup> October 01</i>)</p> <p>Tim Raine, has attended meetings with residents and the Council and is fully aware that Rhoose Point is an infrastructure disaster beset with planning irregularities. The Council has adopted a stance of indifference, incompetence and inertia in dealing with and seeking solutions to remedy existing problems on Rhoose Point. So called 'High Level' meetings have simply paid lip service to the very real and genuine concerns existing residents in the vicinity of the Land North of the Railway have. In pursuance of the DDB the Council could be seen as putting existing residents at further risk.</p> <p>Q4. Why is DEIN (formerly WDA) dissatisfied with the DDB?</p> <p>1. Flooding, Contamination and Pollution</p> <p>Despite the fact that the site does not lie within the EA's indicative floodplain map or the Development Advice Map for the area (TAN 15: Development and Flood Risk refers), it is an undisputable fact that the Land North of the Railway Line is subject to significant flooding during periods of persistent moderate to heavy rainfall. There is no doubt that flooding combined with inadequate drainage systems will disturb any underlying contaminants in the area and overload existing drainage systems. Incidents of flooding, contamination and pollution have been reported to relevant authorities such as the Council, the Environment Agency and the Health and Safety Executive.</p> <p>Those within the Council that support the DDB have been known to say 'Development on the Land North of the Railway Line will solve the problems on Rhoose Point'. Indeed the Leader made reference to this in the <i>Gem</i> article dated 23<sup>rd</sup> March 06.</p> <p>Q5. What assurances will be given by the Council to protect existing and future residents on the very real prospect of flooding, contamination and pollution being exacerbated by any future development on the Land North of the Railway?</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The outstanding issues on Rhoose Point are considered to be a separate issue from the Draft Development Brief.</p> <p>Planning consultants White Young Green have responded on behalf of DEIN. Their comments are shown below for information.</p> <p>Noted. The Environment Agency have been consulted on the draft development brief and their comments in respect of flooding are shown above for information.</p> <p>If a planning application is submitted on this site, the Council will consult with the relevant bodies and ensure that appropriate measures are incorporated in the layout and design of the development to prevent any such issues.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>A video is available for anyone to view depicting a serious flood event on the North Fields. (I reserve the right to be in attendance at any showing of the video). It would be in the wider public interest that residents of Rhoose and Rhoose Point, members of the Local Planning Authority, Councillors, Environment Agency, developers and any other interest parties, view this video.</p> <p>Q6. Are there any Officers or Members of the Council that have actively promoted the DDB who would like to view the video coverage?</p> <p>2. Adoption of Sewers</p> <p>Whereas there has been some discussion with Welsh Water on the discharge of surface water, it is obvious that until such time as any development takes place on the Land North of the Railway, surface water generated by roofs, roads and drives does not yet exist.</p> <p>Q7 Will the fact that Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has stated in writing that drainage issues on Rhoose Point are so severe that section 104 adoption agreements cannot take place, impact on the proposed northern development?</p> <p>3. Land Drainage Authority</p> <p>It is a published fact, referred to in the Inspector's Report that a major aquifer of high vulnerability exists on the Land North of the Railway. Flooding in the northern fields is sourced from a combination of surface water, highway drainage run-off, green field flows, aquifer water and the result of soakaway systems on the Murlande Way development being overwhelmed. Surface water is defined as water diffused over the ground derived from falling rain and melting snow. Once surface water reaches well-defined channels where it merges with other water it ceases to be surface water but becomes part of the running waters of a stream i.e a natural groundwater drainage system. The northern fields are riddled with defined channels (ditches, natural land contours etc) that in certain conditions become raging torrents.</p> <p>It is not in the remit of Dwr Cymru Welsh Water to adopt groundwater/ land drainage systems.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>You will be contacted in due course by the relevant officer / member if required.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The outstanding issues on Rhoose Point are considered to be a separate issue from the Draft Development Brief. Nevertheless, Dwr Cymru Welsh Water have provided comments on the draft development brief and will be re-consulted if and when a planning application is submitted for the site.</p> <p>The Environment Agency have confirmed that the geology beneath the site is classed as being a <u>minor</u> aquifer of high vulnerability. The draft development brief will therefore be amended accordingly.</p> <p>The Council's Engineering</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>It is the responsibility of the Council in its role as Land Drainage Authority to approve such systems and to ensure that measures are in place for the maintaining if the flows. The DDB makes no reference to the Local Drainage Authority having been consulted despite the fact that the Officer responsible for Land Drainage has undertaken site investigations and been involved with correspondence connected to flooding from the Land North of the Railway for over 3 years. The failure by the Local Planning Authority to ensure that a groundwater condition formed part of the original outline consent and the subsequent reserved matters applications for Rhoose Point has had the most serious environmental implications – flooding, contamination and pollution - that quite frankly go against the whole ethos of sustainable development.</p> <p>Q8. Will there be a groundwater condition in any future planning application for the Land North of the Railway Line?</p> <p>Groundwater on the north is already being diverted into a purpose built artificial land drainage system on Rhoose Point. This system required planning permission and should have been the subject of an environmental impact assessment as a stand-alone project in its own right. However, the system was allegedly built in the absence of the knowledge and consent of either the Land Drainage Authority or the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority was alerted over 3 years ago to the 'existence' of the comprehensive groundwater system and had an opportunity to carry out enforcement action prior to residential on Rhoose Point being completed.</p> <p>Q9. Why did the Council take the decision not to proceed with enforcement action when it was clear that unauthorised construction activities had taken place?</p> <p>It is also a documented fact that, whilst the unauthorised construction of the comprehensive land drainage scheme was being undertaken, railway structures were seriously interfered with without the knowledge or consent of the Rail Authorities. Unauthorised connections have been made into existing railway culverts/drains and stipulations made by the Railway Authority at the Development Brief Stage for Rhoose Point to protect the long term health and safety of the embankment were breached. Some culverts/drains were blocked; the 'toe' to the south of the railway embankment was hacked into; soakaway systems were installed at the base of the embankment and ground levels were lowered to accommodate development. One effect has been an alteration to the water tables and natural drainage paths in the area. This has affected the stability of the embankment and contributed to flooding issues on Rhoose Point. One particularly large 30-inch railway culvert seems to have totally disappeared. No definitive</p>	<p>Department will be consulting on any forthcoming planning application on the site.</p> <p>This will depend on the comments received by relevant consultees if and when a planning application is submitted on the site.</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the works to which you refer either have the benefit of planning consent or are classified as deminimus. Therefore no enforcement action has been taken.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>that in the full knowledge of the publication of the DDB being imminent the representatives of the Vale in attendance at the meeting actually accepted the excuse. The minutes to this meeting were only recently made available. The contents have direct implications on the Land North of the Railway and should have been available for Members to consider whilst the DDB was going through the Committee stages.</p> <p>Q13. Why did the Director of Visible Services, who attended the meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2006, fail to ensure that the minutes were published in a timely manner?</p> <p>Q14. Will the Vale be ensuring that all matters relating to Land Drainage on Rhose Point are fully investigated and resolved prior to the determining of any future planning application on the North?</p> <p>The Main Access to the proposed development North of the Railway is via Pentir y De. This road is yet to be adopted. Access is fundamental to any planning application. According to the Cabinet Member for Visible Services a section 38 agreement for the new access road up as far as the first mini roundabout on Rhose Point is in place. However, at the meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> June 06, referred to above, the Vale acknowledged that technical approval is yet to be granted for highways on Rhose Point. Furthermore there is no section 104 in place for the adoption of drainage on the access road. It has been a matter of media coverage that it is standard practise that sewerage agreements have to be in place prior to highway agreements being entered into.</p> <p>Q15. Who signed the Section 38 agreement and when?</p>	<p>This matter is not relevant to the consultation on the draft development brief and should be pursued directly with Committee Services.</p> <p>The outstanding issues on Rhose Point are considered to be a separate issue from the Draft Development Brief. Nevertheless, it is possible that the developers may suggest a comprehensive drainage solution that will encompass both sites.</p> <p>Noted. However, this issue is not strictly relevant to the consultation on the draft development brief.</p> <p>This issue is not relevant to the consultation on the draft development brief and needs to be pursued directly with the Highway Department.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None.</p>



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>Q15a. How was a section 38 agreement entered into in the absence of technical highways approval and a section 104 agreement being in place?</p>	As previous.	None.
		<p>Q15b. In view of the adoption difficulties what will be the impact on the proposed development on the North that is to share this main access route?</p>	<p>This issue will be dealt with as part of a forthcoming planning application on the site.</p>	None.
		<p>A development of 600+ houses would of course require a safe second access. Again the Vale has failed to learn from mistakes made on Rhoose Point where a safe secondary access was not established during the Development Brief Stage – and to this day is the cause of much controversy. Setting aside the common sense fact that a level crossing can never be deemed 'safe', assurances were given by the Ward Members that the level crossing would not be used as a thoroughfare and residents of Rhoose Village would continue to benefit from the quiet enjoyment of their homes. Rhoose Point still has no legal secondary vehicular access albeit that vehicles regularly pass over it in the absence of legal consent. Residents have raised objections to this illegal activity with all relevant authorities, including the Council, on health and safety grounds. Suffice it to say 'blind eyes have been turned' whilst the Council does everything in its power to 'legalise' the level crossing for public vehicular use. I fail to see where within the DDB a safe secondary access point – 365 days a year - has been considered. Despite the fact that Cabinet has stated that the issues over the level crossing are not central to matters relating to the North, I suspect that this is not the case. For the record a barrister's opinion was sought some years ago by the Council on the issue of consent for public vehicular use over the level crossing.</p>	<p>The draft development brief states that access into the development for up to 600 houses can be achieved via a new roundabout on the existing link road Pentir y De. However, once the development reaches the completion of 300 house, an additional access for emergency purposes will need to be made available. The emergency access is clearly shown on the indicative master plan. The outstanding issues on Rhoose Point are considered to be a separate issue from the Draft Development Brief.</p>	None.
		<p>Q16. Will the Council give any consideration to a proposal by developers that the level crossing at Rhoose Station can be used as a second access point to serve any future development on the North? If the answer is 'Yes' how will the Council overcome the legal issues of no public vehicular consent being in place?</p>	No.	None.
		<p>An historical Public Rights of Way – Penmark Number 1 – exists at the level crossing. The PROW has already been seriously interfered with to the detriment of pedestrians – especially those that are elderly and infirm. Construction activity undertaken by the Council prior to planning permission having been granted is so extensive that part of the PROW no longer exists and/or is impossible to pass over. This amenity enjoyed by many residents for</p>	<p>This issue is not relevant to the consultation on the draft development brief.</p>	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>generations has all but been destroyed.</p> <p>Q17. Has a traffic impact assessment been undertaken to assess the feasibility of the level crossing being used as a secondary access point for future development on or in the vicinity of Rhoose Point?</p> <p>Q17a. If legal public vehicular consent is achieved for the level crossing how will foot passengers accessing the platforms and people wishing to utilise the PROW be protected from the resultant increase in traffic over the crossing?</p>	<p>The development brief states that the developer will need to undertake and submit a traffic impact assessment to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and to identify appropriate transport solutions.</p> <p>This issue is not relevant to the consultation on the draft development brief.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
15: Mrs E Thompson	<p>Q1.1 – Good</p> <p>Q1.2 – Neutral</p> <p>Q1.3 – Good</p> <p>Q2 – No</p> <p>Q3 - Yes</p> <p>Q4 – Don't Know</p>	<p>Too many houses are planned for the site. The Rhoose point development is like a rabbit warren and this will be similar.</p> <p>If the open space is developed as stated in the plan, it will be good.</p> <p>Is the youth shelter like a bus shelter? If so it will be useless.</p>	<p>The adopted Unitary Development Plan anticipates that the site is capable of yielding approximately 600 dwelling units. The Council will seek to ensure that the best possible layout is achieved on this site.</p> <p>Support is welcomed.</p> <p>It is likely to be significantly larger than a bus shelter with integrated seating.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q5 – No	The proposals are too vague; the developers must hand over some financial contribution after a percentage of the houses are built. Great promises were made before Rhoose Point was developed, but once the houses were built and they forgot about them and the council seemed powerless to do anything about it.	Section 6 of the draft development brief specifies the Section 106 requirements that the Council is seeking on this site. Information is also provided on the timings of the contributions some of which are required before, during and after the completion of the development.	None.
	Q6 – Yes			
	Q7 – Yes			
	Q8 – No	In the plan there is no specific commitment to a bus service in that area. This should be sorted out and bus stops and shelters built by the developers.	The draft development brief stipulates that the developer will be required to provide a bus shelter prior to the occupation of any of the residential units and also seeks financial contributions to subsidise a bus service to the site for up to 5 years after the commencement of development.	None.
	Q.9	I have a letter dated April 2003 from our MP John Smith in which he states, 'The village of Rhoose has already reached its capacity, further developments will add an unnecessary strain on local services and infrastructure' I totally agree. Medical and dental services will struggle to cope and the school will be over whelmed. Parking to drop off children at school or to do shopping is becoming very difficult now without a great influx of residents. Rhoose is becoming a town with the infrastructure of a village.	Noted. The draft development brief recognises that the proposed development will place additional pressure on existing infrastructure and community facilities in the locality. Consequently, the developer(s) will be required to enter into a Section 106 agreement to ensure that either appropriate new facilities are provided or the necessary financial contributions are made towards the upgrading of existing facilities.	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
16: M J Davis	<p>Q1.1 – Very Good</p> <p>Q1.2 – Very Good</p> <p>Q1.3 – Very Good</p> <p>Q2 – Yes</p> <p>Q3 - Yes</p> <p>Q4 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q5 – Yes</p> <p>Q6 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q7 – No</p> <p>Q8 – No</p>	<p>What provision has been made for parking at the public open space?</p> <p>The village has door-to-door collections of recycled items; this would appear to be more environmentally beneficial than many short journeys being made by car to a recycling site by both homeowners at the point and elsewhere within the village. Such a site could be detrimental to the estate's appearance.</p> <p>The location of the bus stop does not help access for people on the lower Rhoose Point development or those less mobile. Lack of facilities in the area means mobility is more of an issue than in other areas. What steps will be taken to make the central cycleway / footpath useable in all weathers? Also what provision will be made to ensure pedestrians, cyclists safety in the event of use by everyday vehicles?</p>	<p>The public open space will incorporate parking facilities. The draft development brief states that parking facilities should be provided in accordance with the Council's approved parking guidelines.</p> <p>Noted. However, the recycling site will provide an additional facility for those households who wish to use it. The location, near the site's main entrance is desirable as it is easy for the Council to access. Consideration will be given to suitable screening of the facility if necessary.</p> <p>Planning obligations must be directly related to the proposed development and it would therefore be unreasonable to expect the developer to provide a bus stop on the Rhoose Point development as part of any forthcoming planning</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q9	<p>Clarification is needed as to how the existing footpath can be adapted to provide emergency access. This is a valuable green resource within the site; I feel that it should be enhanced with additional planting (overall Rhoose is lacking in trees). I fear that the multiple demands placed upon it will comprise it.</p> <p>There definitely needs to be a footbridge over the railway to link this path to the Rhoose Point development. This will allow safe access to the public open space for those living at the Point.</p>	<p>permission. In addition, turning facilities for buses are limited within the existing Rhoose Point development. Nevertheless, it is considered that the proposed bus stop within the new site is reasonably accessible to residents of the existing Rhoose Point development as well. The Council will seek to ensure that the cycleways / footways will be finished in a suitable material that will enable them to be used in all weathers. It is not envisaged that vehicles will use these routes in the interests of road safety.</p> <p>All highway and engineering works will need to be agreed with the Council in due course. However, the indicative master plan shows that the emergency access will consist of a 3m surfaced area with a 1m margin on either side (specification to be agreed). The draft development brief states that existing trees, hedgerows and other vegetation should be retained wherever possible and encourages appropriate additional planting where required.</p> <p>An existing public right of way currently provides access over the railway line. Amendments made to the brief require investigation of improvements to link the land to the north of the railway line to the employment site within Rhoose</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.11 amended accordingly and insertion of new paragraph</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>If no bus stop is to be provided at the point the location of the stop needs to be reviewed and could be nearer the railway crossing and open space.</p> <p>Education – clarification will be needed on how the existing school can be extended to provide for the increased number of pupils. It is likely that many of the pupils will come to school by car causing congestion within the village. There will also be increased traffic on the roads out of the village. Has any thought been given to the provision of adult education within the village?</p>	<p>Point.</p> <p>Noted. It is envisaged that those living on the western site of the site will access the existing bus stops on Porthkerry Road via the central cycleway / footway / emergency access.</p> <p>The Council's Education department have confirmed that the current preferred option is to extend the existing school. The development brief also states that the developer will need to undertake and submit a traffic impact assessment to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and to identify appropriate transport solutions. Possible improvements to adult education provision will be considered by the Education department if and when a planning application is submitted on the site.</p>	<p>6.19.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
<p>17: Colin James Barlow, Stoneleigh, Upper Farm</p>	<p>Q1.1 – Very Good Q1.2 – Very Good Q1.3 – Good</p> <p>Q2, Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6, Q7, Q8 – All Good</p>			

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q.9	Request to Modify Site boundary line –  Further to our meeting with Emma Harvey we hereby request the site boundary be changed to include the section of our garden highlighted in figure 2 (on submitted plan, south west corner of the site).	Agreed in part. The site plans contained within the draft development brief must reflect the residential allocation shown in the adopted Unitary Development Plan.	Amend site boundary on all plans in the appendices accordingly.
18: D. W. Porter	Letter	<p>I would refer to the recent Draft Development Brief (Land to the North of the Railway Line, Rhoose) of a consultation document which requests comments from interested parties. Regarding the proposed housing I live at 35 Murlande Way, Rhoose which is located at the bottom of the first cul-de-sac on the right hand side. My garden follows the boundary of the proposed development and therefore, I am an interested party.</p> <p>For the first six months after I moved into 35 Murlande Way (I bought the house from new) I experienced flooding to my drive, garage, garden and water almost came over the doorstep of my house whenever there was heavy rain. Water also came up through the drains. This prompted me to try to reduce the risk of flooding to my house and garage by removing part of my garden and building a concrete channel from the bottom of my drive along the side of my garage and onto my garden. The effect of the channel has helped protect my house and reduced the flooding of the garage, but it has not stopped the flooding to my drive or garden or the erupting drains. The floodwater now travels down my drive, some of it going down the channel I have built and the rest going around the other side of the house, then across the garden and on to the fields of the future development. My neighbour also experiences similar flooding.</p> <p>One of the main reasons for this flooding is the discharge of large quantities of floodwater from the Airport fields to the north of Porthkerry Road. The water floods across Porthkerry Road opposite Murlande Way, down Murlande Way and some of it into my Cul De Sac. Due to the lack of adequate drainage on our site and the use of highway and private storm water soakaway drains, most of the flood water, which must be contaminated, ends up on the fields of the proposed development. Section 3.5 of the Brief states that soakaway drains would not be suitable for the proposed development and therefore, could be one of the reasons for flooding on our site.</p> <p>In view of the sensitive nature of the area in question I quote from your draft Development Brief, "As the Environment Agency has indicated that the site is located on a major aquifer of high vulnerability no discharge of foul or contaminated run off must be made to ground", the existing flooding should be addressed before progressing with the new development. This may</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The Environment Agency have now confirmed that the geology beneath the site is classed as being a <u>minor</u> aquifer of high</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		avoid a repeat of the situation that exists with flooding to the south of the railway, which is probably exasperated by floodwater from our site and the Airport.	vulnerability. The draft development will therefore be amended accordingly. The drainage issues on other sites in the vicinity are considered to be a separate issue from the Draft Development Brief. Nevertheless, it is possible that the developers may suggest a comprehensive drainage solution that will address drainage problems on existing sites in the vicinity.	
19: Jane Clarke and Shane Dinsdale	Letter	<p>With reference to your draft development brief and comment form, this letter is a clear objection to your plans for the site.</p> <p>Your comment form is vague and nondescript, and with this in mind I have not completed such. In any event, the answer to many of your questions would be no or poor. Also I am not in a position to be able to offer alternative suggestions for your draft development brief, as I am not a Surveyor, Planner, Local amenity expert, architect or other.</p> <p>We live at Number 33 Murlande Way, where the rear of our property is adjacent to, and overlooking the field north of the railway line. In this position we enjoy rural views, with cattle grazing freely on this land, and a sea view beyond. We are not overlooked by any neighbours, walkers, golfers, and cyclists or children playing etc... we enjoy quiet and complete privacy.</p> <p>Any of your suggestions outlined for this land, that takes away a natural, green, rural environment for grazing, and introduces a noisy and intrusive environment, taking away our privacy would be a severe downturn in any form of environmental planning, thus depriving us of the very reason we live here.</p> <p>Any development between Rhoose Village and Rhoose Point would create an ugly skyline</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>When considering a planning application for this site, the Council will ensure that the layout and design of buildings respects the privacy of existing adjoining occupiers. It should be noted that the draft development brief does state that where privacy is not demonstrable, it may require developers to provide more than 21 metres between properties.</p> <p>The draft development brief states</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>denying the people of Rhoose the beautiful sea views it has always afforded.</p> <p>It has to be noted that past plans and promises for the Rhoose Point development, have been insincere and much has never been implemented. Therefore this draft development plan can only be interpreted in the same misleading way as the Rhoose Point development. With this in mind the best suggestion we would offer on your comment form would be to first complete and fulfil all promises for the Rhoose Point Development i.e. Golf Course, Pub amenities etc...</p> <p>If this land were to be developed, joining Rhoose Point to Rhoose Village the area would become a small town, without the facilities, i.e. shops, banks, schools, restaurants, places of work etc...</p> <p>With regards to a view, it is to be noted that the development agencies have developed and sold the most expensive properties on Rhoose Point seaward facing with a view, i.e. location, location, location, being of prime importance to the price of these properties – proportionate to those you may build in front!</p> <p>Our main concern for this development is that of flooding. From our own experience we can confirm that in cases of heavy rain, the drains around our house are inadequate. In a heavy downpour, water flows down our drive and floods our garage. The measures we have had to take help to reduce this problem (but it is not eradicated) is to redirect the flood water around the side of the house over the vegetable patch, where it gradually soaks away or runs down o the development site in question.</p>	<p>that developers should give careful consideration to the views from the site. It also restricts building heights to 2.5 storeys unless it can be demonstrated that a 3 storey building would have no unacceptable impact on surrounding uses and landscape. The facilities to which you refer at Rhoose Point are dependant on market forces beyond the Council's control.</p> <p>The draft development brief recognises that the proposed development will place additional pressure on existing infrastructure and community facilities in the locality. Consequently, the developer(s) will be required to enter into a Section 106 agreement to ensure that either appropriate new facilities are provided or the necessary financial contributions are made towards the upgrading of existing facilities.</p> <p>Noted. The drainage issues on other sites in the vicinity are considered to be a separate issue from the Draft Development Brief. Nevertheless, it is possible that the developers may suggest a</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>We have been informed that the soakaway drains around our property are inadequate in these adverse conditions.</p> <p>We understand the water table around the Rhoose area to be relatively high due to the lower underground rock formations, and the cliffs that Rhoose village sits upon. This is clearly evident in the Rhoose point development where flooding properties is a continuous problem. This was shown on a recent TV documentary, highlighting this fact. To date, properties still flood in Rhoose Point.</p> <p>As a senior Airline Captain and owner of a private plane that frequently flies into Cardiff International Airport, I have seen hard evidence of the flood plains of this area, viewed from above. In our opinion, developing the land in question will have a devastating effect on the environment of Rhoose, exacerbating the effects of the high water table and resulting constant flooding.</p>	<p>comprehensive drainage solution that will address drainage problems on existing sites in the vicinity.</p>	
20: Michael G Moon	<p>Q1.1 – Good Q1.2 – Neutral Q1.3 - Good</p> <p>Q2 – Yes Q3 - Yes Q4 – No</p> <p>Q5 – No</p>	<p>I assume that the youth shelter referred to is on the recreational land off Ceri Road and not Ceri Avenue. There is already a skateboard park on this recreational land if a youth shelter is to be constructed (which I understand to be similar to a bus shelter) then it should be constructed in the vicinity of the skateboard park.</p> <p>Revision should be made for the construction and installation of a pedestrian footbridge at Rhoose railway station and additional safety weakness at the rail crossing referred to as the level crossing on Appendix 7.</p>	<p>Yes. Comments noted.</p> <p>The construction of a pedestrian footbridge at the railway station is not relevant to the consultation on the draft development brief. However, amendments made to the</p>	<p>Amend draft development brief accordingly.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.11 amended accordingly and insertion</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q6 – Yes  Q7 – Yes Q8 – Don't Know	Permanent buildings should be constructed at Rhoose school to cater for the increased population of school children in the newly constructed houses.	<p>brief require investigation of improvements to link the land to the north of the railway line to the employment site within Rhoose Point.</p> <p>Noted. This is a matter which will be resolved through the Section 106 agreement in consultation with the Director of Learning and Development.</p>	<p>of new paragraph 6.19.</p> <p>None.</p>
21: Pauline Moon	Q1.1 – Good Q1.2 – Neutral Q1.3 - Good  Q2 – Yes  Q3 - Yes  Q4 – No  Q5 – No	<p>I assume that the youth shelter is on the recreational land off Ceri Road and not Avenue. I do not agree with the siting of the youth shelter on this land, as I believe it only encourages teenagers to hang around and it would probably be vandalised, therefore becoming unsightly. If it does go ahead on this land may I suggest that it be sited near to the skateboard park that already exists?</p> <p>I would like to suggest that a pedestrian footbridge be constructed at Rhoose railway station. Also that additional safety measures be provided at the railway crossing referred to as the level crossing in appendix 7.</p>	<p>Yes. Such a facility would suit the needs of older children in the locality and hopefully reduce the likelihood of them hanging around on the streets. The preferred siting is noted.</p> <p>The construction of a pedestrian footbridge at the railway station is not relevant to the consultation on the draft development brief. However, the document does state</p>	<p>Change reference from Ceri Ave to Ceri Road.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q6 – Yes  Q7 – Yes  Q8 – Don't Know	Permanent buildings should be constructed at Rhoose school to cater for the increased population of school children that will occur when new houses are constructed.	that the developer will be required to investigate and, if appropriate fund a footpath link from the site over or under the railway linking with the Rhoose Point development.  Noted. This is a matter which will be resolved through the Section 106 agreement in consultation with the Director of Learning and Development.	None.
22: Mr & Mrs Griffin	Q1.1 –Very Poor Q1.2 – Poor Q1.3 – Very Poor  Q2 – No	Rhoose as a whole should not be further developed until a better transport and school infrastructure are in place together with sorting out current major drainage problems. These need to be in place before development not after, because things don't seem to happen after the building works, such as the golf course we are still waiting for.	Noted. The draft development brief states that a Traffic Impact Assessment of the site will need to be undertaken to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and to identify transport solutions. In addition, the document refers to the educational contributions that are required to accommodate the proposed development. The document also acknowledges that there appear to be drainage problems in the area and that this issue will need to be carefully	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q3 - No	You have only chosen this site due to the drainage problems north of the railway line, but the development north of the open space area will cause major problems with the soakaways from Murlande Way and this problem will filter through to the open play area and make it a marsh land that won't be used.	considered in the development of the site.  Disagree. This council agreed with the UDP Inspector's conclusions in respect of this site and subsequently decided to allocate it for housing. The comments regarding drainage are noted.	None.
	Q4 – Yes			
	Q5 – No	Rhoose has no facilities in place and a badly funded school.Massive investment is required.	Noted. However, the development of this site will make an effective and positive contribution to the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the local community.	None.
	Q6 – Yes	All.		
	Q7 – Yes			
	Q8 – No	We havent got acceptable security at the train station and would not leave my car there hence it is of no use to me.	Security at the station is a separate issue to the draft development brief but will hopefully be improved with the planned installation of CCTV cameras.	None.
	Q.9	Despite huge public condemnation of the development of Rhoose, it has continued to resurface time and time again and been railroaded through by the WDA (natial assembly) who own the land and stand to make large profits from the sale of it. Any planning should be for the benefit of Rhoose but creating a traffic bottle neck and massive drainage issues isnt helping anyone.	Noted.	None.
23: Mrs Colligan	Q1.1 – Good			None.
	Q1.2 –			

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Neutral  Q1.3 – Good  Q2 – Don't Know	I have concerns about the size of the development. There is a danger that Rhoose Point will be seen as a large housing estate, with little else to offer.	Noted. However, given the size of the site, it is reasonable to assume that it can accommodate approximately 600 dwellings. The Council is determined to ensure that the development of this site makes an effective and positive contribution to the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the local community.	None.
	Q3 – Don't Know	Not sure of the purpose of the 'youth shelter', or its potential use. Would changing facilities be of better use with football pitches?	The youth shelter would provide an area for older children to meet and socialise. They are typically semi-open structures with seating. The draft development brief states that a permanent changing facility will need to be provided to serve the sports pitches.	None.
	Q4 – Don't Know	I do not think that the children of Rhoose Point would make very much use of facilities tucked away behind Ceri Avenue.	Noted.	None.
	Q5 – No	The land north of the railway is on a gradient, and at times of heavy rain, floodwater pours through the embankment, threatening the homes in Maes y Gwenyn. The Council needs to ensure that the Developer provides independent evidence to confirm that these issues will be addressed before work begins on the site.	Noted. The draft development brief acknowledges that there appears to be significant flooding problems in the area and that this issue will need to be carefully considered in the development of the site.	None.
		The Developer must be prepared to finance adequate and robust drainage systems, which will divert the floodwater away from the embankment. It is important that this issue is addressed at all stages of the build, if properties south of the railway are not to be threatened or put at risk.	See comment above.	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q6 – Don't Know Q7 – No Q8 – Don't Know	<p>Weekly kerbside collecting facilities provide every householder with the opportunity to recycle. A designated site within the development will not guarantee its use, and is more likely to attract youths looking to vandalise it.</p> <p>Cycle lanes already exist in Rhoose Point, but I have yet to see any of them used.</p> <p>Additional comments received by hand 07/09/06 –</p> <p>Although broadly in support of the development of land north of the railway. I do have reservations about the size (i.e. number of dwellings)</p> <p>However, my over riding concerns relate to the flooding issues (all ready well documented and known to the Council). I would hope that this development would resolve theses problems, by incorporating a robust drainage system, capable of dealing with normal run off, but also built to deal with the large amount of rain fall that we can expect. The developer must be made aware of these problems before any work commences, otherwise the current problems can only be exacerbated.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The Council is committed to encouraging travel by cyclists and pedestrians in the interests of sustainability.</p> <p>Noted. See comment above.</p> <p>Noted. See comment above.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
24: Kelvin Grice	Q1.1 – Good Q1.2 – Neutral Q1.3 – Neutral Q2 – No	<p>The phrase "Safeguarding the residential amenity of adjoining exiting properties" should specifically highlight "views across the Bristol Channel".</p>	<p>The draft development already acknowledges that the orientation of buildings should take advantage of the principal views across the Bristol Channel.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q3 – Yes	The plan for sustainability should have higher expectations. For example, a modern, well-insulated house will not obtain significant benefit from passive solar gain. Additionally, in the summer passive solar gain results in over-heating and increases the demand for resources through the use of air-conditioners, etc. For a large, new development the use of PV roof tiles to generate electricity will not be significantly more costly and will offset the resource demands of the development.	Noted. Paragraph 5.1 of the draft development brief refers to the advice contained within TAN 12 and the DEIN's 'Creating Sustainable Places' document. In addition, the Council has produced a sustainable development SPG which requires developers to submit a sustainability statement with any planning application on the site.	Add reference to Sustainable development SPG in paragraphs 2.13 and 5.1.
	Q4 – No	Adjacent to the Community Centre on Stewart Road. It is likely that young people will congregate around the 'dedicated youth facility' even when it is not open. It is unlikely that a shelter at Ceri Avenue will get significant use and young people will still congregate in the centre of Rhoose.  Areas where young people are expected to congregate should be monitored by CCTV.	Noted.  Disagree. The Police have been consulted on the draft development brief and have not raised this as an issue. Furthermore, the Council does not have the resources to monitor such a facility. Accordingly, the Council will seek to ensure that any proposed site layout is designed to reduce the risk and fear of crime.	None.  None.
	Q5 – No	The community facilities referred to in 4.36 do not provide sufficient detail of the scope (though it may be available elsewhere) to answer this question. For example, the extent of modernising and upgrading of the library is unclear.	The Council considers that the level of detail provided in the draft development brief is appropriate. Exact details will need to be agreed in due course with the developers.	None.



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q6 – No	Funding should be provided for a pedestrian bridge over the railway at Station Road.	Noted. However, the safety of the level crossing by the station is considered to be a separate issue from the draft development brief.	None.
		Areas where young people are expected to congregate should be monitored by CCTV.	See comment above.	None
	Q7 – Yes			
	Q8 – No	There should be a cycle route from Rhoose to Cardiff Airport and to Barry. This should be funded by the developers and should be constructed at an early stage (prior to completion of 100 <sup>th</sup> unit). This will ensure adequate cycleways in this area even if Sustrans National Route 88 is delayed. The cycle route through the development should extend along the lines of the track/footpath across the railway via a bridge or subway and into Rhoose Point.	Noted. The existing PROW is currently only for pedestrians but consideration will also have to be given to allowing cyclists to use the route if a bridge or subway is proposed.	None.
	Q9.	There are obvious conflicts between security and landscape. For example, the requirement for houses having to overlook the public open space and to front onto the track, whilst protecting hedgerows and providing trees. This is an admirable aim, but difficult to achieve the desirable balance, particularly as the aspects will change as the site develops.	Noted.	None.
		The cycle route/footpath through the development should extend along the lines of the track/footpath over the railway (with a subway or suitable bridge) and into Rhoose Point. This will allow cyclists and pedestrians with pushchairs etc. to move safely between the site and Rhoose Point.	Noted. See comment above.	None.
25: Steve Hall	Email	1. The development brief should consider and include provisions for ensuring the current noise levels generated by the railway and experienced by those living immediately to the south of the line do not increase due to reflected noise from new buildings to the north.	Noted. Environmental Health will be consulted for their views on any forthcoming planning application given the proximity of the development to the railway line.	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>2. Para 4.11. <i>"The developers will also be required to investigate and, if appropriate, fund a footpath link from the site over or under the railway linking with the Rhoose Point development."</i> - Change this to "The developers <u>shall</u> provide a footpath link from the site over or under the railway linking with the Rhoose Point development."</p> <p>A separated pedestrian railway crossing in place of the existing level footpath crossing is essential for the following reasons -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) There will be increased use of this crossing by pedestrians from the new houses to/from the coast and any possible commercial development (supermarket?) at Rhoose Point. The crossing exists between two bends in the railway thereby reducing visibility. For safety the pedestrians and trains should be separated;</li> <li>b) This crossing is currently used as an illegal access point to the railway line by pedestrians who then walk along the line to/from Rhoose. It should therefore be removed;</li> <li>c) Because this crossing exists between two bends in the railway, "Whistle" signs were placed either side of it (in 2005) requiring trains to sound their horns both day and night. The whistle sign for eastbound trains is positioned behind Mayes Slows Leyes, causing extra disturbance to the surrounding residents. A separated pedestrian crossing would alleviate the need for these signs, thereby reducing noise levels from the railway for both existing and new residents.</li> </ul> <p>The crossing should be a subway as a) this would suit the site (railway on an embankment) - less visual impact than a foot bridge - better for disabled requirements; b) Safer as items can not be dropped on to the track; c) Increased privacy for surrounding properties.</p> <p>3. Para 4.11. The developers shall be required to upgrade and complete an off carriageway cycle and footpath between Rhoose and the Airport (Sustrans Route 88). Between the new site/Rhoose Point and the airport is a reasonable walking/cycling distance - many airport employees live in Rhoose. The road around the end of the airport is a 60mph limit and is unsafe for cyclists. The current footpath is narrow and only extends between Rhoose and Porthkerry leaving a long distance with no cycle/pedestrian facilities.</p> <p>4. With the increasing popularity of Rhoose Railway Station, the developers shall provide a separated pedestrian crossing of the railway (again preferably a subway for the reasons in 2).</p> <p>5. During construction limits must be placed on working hours, noise levels, dust levels, access</p>	<p>Agreed. Amendments made to the brief to require investigation of improvements to link the land to the north of the railway line to the employment site within Rhoose Point.</p> <p>Noted. As stated in the draft development brief, the developer will need to provide a financial contribution to Route 88 by the completion of the 250<sup>th</sup> residential unit.</p> <p>Noted. However, the safety of the level crossing by the station is considered to be a separate issue from the draft development brief.</p> <p>Noted. Such requirements can be</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 4.11 and insert new paragraph 6.19 accordingly.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		routes and the like.	conditioned on any forthcoming planning approval.	
26: Mr and Mrs E G Lovering	Q1.1 – Very Poor Q1.2 – Very Poor Q1.3 – Very Poor Q2 – No  Q3- don't Know Q4 – don't know Q5 – don't know Q6 – don't know Q7 & 8 – no answer  Q.9	There should be no more house building in Rhoose, it is not a village now.	Noted. However, the Council accepted the UDP Inspector's reasoning for allocating this land for housing and it is now included in the adopted Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011. The Council will seek to ensure that the development of this site makes an effective and positive contribution to the social, economic and environmental well being of the local community.	None.
	Q.9	When Rhoose Point Plans were shown to Rhoose villagers there were plans for a Golf Course, a pub, school and small factory units and shops. What has happened to these plans? Its just houses, houses and more houses.	Noted. Although the adopted UDP protects land at Rhoose Point for informal recreation and employment	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
			purposes, market forces determine whether sites are developed and the Council cannot influence this.	
27: Rhoose Resident	Q1.1- no answer Q1.2 – Very Poor Q1.3 no answer  Q2 – No   Q3 – Don't Know  Q4 – Don't Know  Q5 – No Q6 – No Q7 – Yes Q8 – No  Q9 – no answer	Keep earlier promises first           Lower names expenses - more for Rhoose  Lower expenses claims first    More school facilities, complete properly original plans first.	Noted. This is not strictly relevant to the consultation. The adopted UDP protects land to the west of Rhoose Point for informal recreation purposes and a site within Rhoose Point for employment purposes. However, the market determines the implementations of such facilities and the Council cannot influence this.           The draft development brief sets out the Council's requirements for educational provision to serve the development.	None.           None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
28: Paul Hinam	<p>Q1.1 – Good</p> <p>Q1.2 – Good</p> <p>Q1.3 – Good</p> <p>Q2 – No</p> <p>Q3 – Yes</p> <p>Q4 – Yes</p> <p>Q5 – No</p>	<p>The proposals and document do not consider essential support and provision for local private business development i.e. start up units.</p> <p>No real planning gain detailed for the considerably needed community facilities.</p> <p>The focus on youth is welcomed but why so age orientated?</p> <p>Complete the existing development and provide a new multi function sports centre / community centre as has been successfully provided in Cowbridge as an example of a similar sized town / village.</p>	<p>Noted. However, grants can be obtained from other sources for such enterprises and there are considered to be sufficient existing facilities locally. In addition, there is an allocated employment site on Rhoose Point in the UDP.</p> <p>Disagree. Section 6 of the draft development brief seeks new / improvements to several community facilities.</p> <p>There is a noticeable lack of facilities for this age group within the village.</p> <p>Noted. Although the adopted UDP protects land at Rhoose Point for informal recreation and employment purposes, market forces determine whether sites are developed and the Council cannot influence this. In terms of leisure facilities, the existing Fontygary Leisure Park is in close proximity to the site and it would not be unreasonable to</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q6 – Yes Q7 – Yes Q8 – Yes	Please incorporate sustainable energy policies.	<p>assume that residents may also choose to visit nearby Llantwit Major and Barry leisure centres which are easily accessible by public transport.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1 of the draft development brief refers to the advice contained within TAN 12 and the DEIN's 'Creating Sustainable Places' document. In addition, the Council has produced a sustainable development SPG which requires developers to submit a sustainability statement with any planning application on the site.</p>	Add reference to Sustainable Development SPG and UDP Strategic policy 2.
	Q9.	There is no mention within the document of the virtually non-integration of the south point residents. Clear reasons why – School not large enough No reasonable facilities for sport, leisure facilities are considered inferior to ones in Barry and Cardiff.	Disagree. The site enjoys a close physical and visual relationship with the existing built development in Rhose. Furthermore, it will help to integrate the settlement of Rhose with its coastline. The draft development brief sets out the Council's requirements for educational provision to serve the development. In addition, it recommends the provision of new sports pitches within the area of public open space shown on the indicative master plan.	None.
		Nothing to do for children and parents have to drive everywhere. Result – high turnover of house occupation relative to other areas (information from local estate agents)	Disagree. Rhose has good public transport, shopping, leisure and employment facilities. In addition, the re-opening of the Vale of	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		Phase 1 South Point is a commuter ghetto, non-sustainable and detrimental to the whole village inclusive of South Point.	Glamorgan railway line to passengers has given Rhoose residents excellent access to other facilities in Bridgend, Cardiff and Barry.  Disagree. Please see comment above.	None.
29: Mr and Mrs M J Thomas	Q1.1, 1.2, 1.3 – Good  Q5 – Don't Know  Q2, Q3 Q4 Q6, Q7, Q8 – All Yes  Q9.	We would like to clarify that the land to of the rear of the Tithe Barn is to be included in the draft plan. This does not appear to be included in appendix 7, which was not shown in yellow. But is included in appendix 6.	Agree. The site plans contained within the draft development brief must reflect the residential allocation shown in the adopted Unitary Development Plan.	Amend site boundary on all plans in the appendices accordingly.
30: A A Baker	Q1.1 – Good Q1.2 – Good  Q1.3 – Good			

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q2 – No	<p>Site A2 should not be built on because –</p> <p>It goes outside the present eastern boundary of Rhoose</p> <p>It will increase the drainage problems for Rhoose Point</p> <p>It will suffer from aircraft noise that has increased considerably</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council concurred with the UDP Inspector that the Rhoose Point access road provides an appropriate, defensible and logical boundary for the residential settlement boundary of Rhoose. The land has subsequently been allocated for residential development in the adopted UDP. The draft development brief acknowledges that there appear to be significant drainage problems in the area and this issue will need to be carefully considered in the development of the site. Environmental Health will be consulted on any future planning application with regard to possible mitigation measures in terms of noise pollution from the airport.</p>	None.
	Q3 – Yes			
	Q4 – No	The youth shelter should be located in a more central position e.g. in the public open space area.	It is proposed to locate the on-site youth shelter in this area.	None.
	Q5 – Don't Know			
	Q6 – Yes	The landscaping of the areas promised for Rhoose Point.	Noted but not relevant to the consultation on this draft development brief.	None.
	Q7 – Yes			
	Q8 – Yes			
	Q9.	No mention has been made about aircraft or airport noise, which has increased beyond any ones expectations.	Please see comment above.	None.



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>The whole development on this scale is out of all proportion to the present facilities and is going to lead to congestion in many areas.</p> <p>The building on green field sites is a backward step and is just further progresses in linking Rhoose to Barry.</p> <p>The eastern boundary of Rhoose should not be extended.</p>	<p>The draft development brief sets out the Section 106 contributions that the Council is seeking to ensure that adequate community facilities are provided to serve the new development. In addition, it states that the developer will be required to submit a traffic impact assessment in order to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and identify appropriate highway solutions.</p> <p>It is inevitable that some new development will take place on greenfield sites. As stated above the Rhoose Point access road provides an appropriate, defensible and logical boundary for the residential settlement boundary of Rhoose. The land to the east of this road, between Rhoose and Barry is protected from development in the adopted UDP as it is designated as countryside and as a green wedge.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
31: Natalie Turner	Q1.1 – Very Poor			
	Q1.2 – Very Poor			
	Q1.3 – Poor			
	Q2 – No	There is lack of detail contained within the draft and any plans put forward for earlier (i.e. Rhoose Point) have not been actioned. Existing industrial units would be used writing the vale boundary.	The Council believes that the draft development brief does contain sufficient detail about the site and the proposed planning and transportation requirements. The issues on Rhoose Point are a separate matter to the consultation on the draft development brief.	None.
Q3 – No	The open space should be used as a buffer against the existing houses.	Disagree. The area of public open space needs to be centrally located within the site so that it is accessible by all residents. The draft development brief acknowledges that the privacy of existing adjoining residents needs to be safeguarded and in some circumstances it may be necessary to have more than 21m between properties.	None.	
Q4 – No	This will make the area unsocial as kids will congregate and cause damage and put my children at risk. It will be adjacent to a children's play area, just look at the skateboard park.	Disagree. The off site youth shelter will provide a valuable facility for older children. The proximity of nearby houses should reduce the risk of this facility being damaged.	None.	

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q5 – No	There is lack of detail within the plan, plus the Rhoose Point agreement has not come to life. There is a lack of trust.	Please see comment above.	None.
	Q6 – Yes	The council should be upgrading facilities and building ones to replace the closed ones.	The draft development brief seeks developer contributions to upgrade and / or provide new community facilities in Rhoose.	None.
	Q7 – No	Recycling facilities should be active now.	Rhoose already benefits from a kerbside re-cycling service.	None.
	Q8 – No	I do not have a plan only items for consideration	Noted.	None.
	Q9.	At the presentation at the community hall I saw a lot of good ideas and points being explained to the staff who did not take any notes. No experienced staff were at the hall, only new starters who needed the money because of low pay. A very bad attitude was shown by some members of staff.	Disagree. Staff of varying levels of seniority were in attendance from the planning and transport section to answer queries on the draft development brief. Attendees were requested to complete the comment forms provided so that they could be carefully considered in due course by officers and members.	None.
32: Cllr Kerry R J Green	Q1.1 – Very Good Q1.2 – Good Q1.3 – Very Good			
	Q2 – No	Going on increased private car ownership I can well foresee this development could house anything up to 1,000 private cars. Most employment opportunities exist in Cardiff adding to the already badly congested routes.	The site has good rail access to Bridgend, Cardiff and Barry. Nevertheless, the draft development brief states that the developer will be required to submit	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	<p>Q3 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q4 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q5 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q6 – Yes</p> <p>Q7 – Yes</p> <p>Q8 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q9.</p>	<p>As a committed and practicing environmentalist, I am disappointed with central and local government bodies.</p> <p>We have to reduce drastically the production of green house gasses. All new dwellings being constructed must make total use of natural energy sources, to provide heating for all consumer requirement.</p>	<p>a traffic impact assessment in order to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and identify appropriate highway solutions.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree. Paragraph 5.1 of the draft development brief refers to the advice contained within TAN 12 and the DEIN's 'Creating Sustainable Places' document. In addition, the Council has produced a sustainable development SPG which requires developers to submit a sustainability statement with any planning application on the site.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Add reference to Sustainable Development SPG and UDP Strategic policy 2.</p>
33: Kit Harris	Q1.1 – Neutral			

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q1.2 – Neutral			
	Q1.3 – Poor			
	Q2 – No	<p>Too many houses.</p> <p>No emphasis on eco-friendly building.</p> <p>Drainage issues appear to have been neglected.</p> <p>Roads not adequate.</p>	<p>Disagree. A site of this size is capable of accommodating 600 houses.</p> <p>Disagree. Paragraph 5.1 of the draft development brief refers to the advice contained within TAN 12 and the DEIN's 'Creating Sustainable Places' document. In addition, the Council has produced a sustainable development SPG which requires developers to submit a sustainability statement with any planning application on the site.</p> <p>Disagree. The draft development brief states that there appears to be significant drainage problems in the area and this issue will need to be carefully considered in the development of this site.</p> <p>The draft development brief states that the developer will be required to submit a traffic impact assessment in order to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and identify appropriate highway solutions.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Add reference to Sustainable Development SPG and UDP Strategic policy 2.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q3 – No	Should be more centralised to the built up area and not the estate.	Disagree. The area of public open space needs to be centrally located within the site so that it is accessible by all residents.	None.
	Q4 – No	Definitely not. Youth shelter?? A youth club is needed. Porthkerry Road is far too dangerous for youngsters to cross over to Ceri Road.	Noted.	None
	Q5 – Don't Know	Council should be providing more – they are the ones who benefit from ever growing Council tax.	Disagree. Section 106 contributions should be sought from the developer.	None.
	Q6 – Yes	Youth clubs.		
	Q7 – No	The council should be collecting all recycling.	A kerbside re-cycling facility already exists in Rhoose. The proposed facility will help to increase levels of re-cycling.	None.
	Q8 – No	Ok, the new site gets cycle paths but what about the rest of the village.	The draft development brief is seeking a financial contribution to Route 88 which is part of the National Cycle Network. This would benefit all residents of Rhoose.	None.
	Q9.	Environmentally friendly materials should be used for building (solar heating etc..)	Paragraph 5.1 of the draft development brief refers to the advice contained within TAN 12 and the DEIN's 'Creating Sustainable Places' document. In addition, the Council has produced a sustainable development SPG which requires developers to submit a sustainability statement with any planning application on the site.	Add reference to Sustainable Development SPG and UDP Strategic policy 2.
		Road infrastructure is not good enough; there should be at least two main access roads.	The draft development brief states	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		No bungalow schemes included.	<p>that the developer will be required to submit a traffic impact assessment in order to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and identify appropriate highway solutions.</p> <p>The draft development brief does not specify house types on the site. However, it does refer to the heights of buildings that will be deemed acceptable.</p>	None.
34: Miss Denise Davies	<p>Q1.1 – Very Poor</p> <p>Q1.2 – Very Poor</p> <p>Q1.3 – Neutral</p> <p>Q2 – No</p>	<p>There are serious drainage problems on the Rhoose point site, which if not put right will create a bigger problem in the future. This will affect my property amongst others.</p> <p>Rhoose itself is up to capacity and I see the proposed size of the development putting huge pressure on the infrastructure. If Rhoose has to be developed then it should be on a lower scale and with full consultation with residents.</p>	<p>The problems on Rhoose Point are a separate issue to the consultation on the draft development brief. Nevertheless, the draft development brief states that there appears to be significant drainage problems in the area and this issue will need to be carefully considered in the development of this site.</p> <p>A site of this size is capable of accommodating 600 houses. The Council will seek to ensure that the development of this site makes an effective and positive contribution to the social, economic and</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	<p>Q3 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q4 – Yes</p> <p>Q5 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q6 – Yes</p> <p>Q7 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q8 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q9.</p>	<p>What is being done about the ground water problems that exist on Rhoose Point? What assurances can the council give us that the proposed development will not cause further compounded drainage problems in the future?</p> <p>It is alarming that Welsh water has not entered into a Section 104 agreement with the developers for Rhoose Point. Also I understand they will not entertain the surface water system, until the required adoption standards parameters are met. Furthermore the Vale Council has yet to adopt the road system. Looking at the current problems I personally have no confidence in the Vale of Glamorgan Council to do what is right for the residents of Rhoose.</p> <p>No Development should go ahead until all the range and other problems in the area are fully resolved to everyone's satisfaction.</p> <p>What about shops, leisure facilities etc... where are the planning gains promised for the original Rhoose Point development?</p>	<p>environmental well being of the local community.</p> <p>Please see comment above.</p> <p>Please see comment above.</p> <p>The problems on Rhoose Point are a separate issue to the consultation on the draft development brief.</p> <p>Although the adopted UDP protects land at Rhoose Point for informal recreation and employment purposes, market forces determine whether sites are developed and</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
35: Johanna Hopkins	Q1.1 – Neutral		the Council cannot influence this.	
	Q1.2 – Good			
	Q1.3 – Good			
	Q2 – No	I do not agree with the development of the site. Rhoose has too many houses already.	Noted.	None.
	Q3 – Yes	Not entirely clear what a youth shelter is.	The youth shelter is likely to comprise of an open structure with seating on a tarmacadam base which will suit older children.	None.
	Q4 – No	I presume that you mean Ceri Road, I'm surprised that you have made this mistake. We already have problems with young adults congregating at the skate park and also using this facility late in the night – up to 12 O'clock	Noted.	Change reference to Ceri Road.
	Q5 – Don't Know	I can't see how you can guarantee planning gain this after Rhoose's experiences of the development of Rhoose Point.	Although the adopted UDP protects land at Rhoose Point for informal recreation and employment purposes, market forces determine whether sites are developed and the Council cannot influence this.	None.
	Q6 – Yes	Facilities which should be upgraded are the Community Hall, Library, School, Ceri Road / Celtic Way sports field and the bowling green at Celtic way.	Noted. The draft development brief already seeks section 106 contributions to upgrade the library and school. A new off site youth shelter is proposed at Ceri Road. The existing community hall has recently been extended.	None?
Q7 – Yes	I agree with the recycling site as long as it is carefully monitored.	Support is welcomed.	None.	

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q8. – no answer Q9.	The residents of Rhoose have had promises mad by developers before that did not materialise. I fail to see how any of these proposals will happen.  Your inability to force the developers of Rhoose Point to get the roads to a standard that you will accept them doesn't not bode well for any of this brief to happen.	Please see comment above.  Noted. The problems on Rhoose Point are a separate issue to the consultation on the draft development brief	None.  None.
36:Mr A S Batty	Q1.1 – Good Q1.2 – Good Q1.3 – Good Q2 – No Q3 – Yes Q4 – Don't Know Q5 – No Q6 – Yes	Why does this site require an emergency access no other sites built over the last 30 or so years have one. Leave the lane as it is.  Get as much as you can off the developers because the village gained nothing off Rhoose Point.	Developments exceeding 300 dwellings require an additional access for emergency purposes.  The Council will seek to ensure that the development of this site makes an effective and positive contribution to the social, economic and environmental well being of the local community.	None.  None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q7 – Yes Q8 – Don't Know  Q.9	Ecology 3.18 Bats. I have bats flying about the garden most nights at dusk.	Noted. However, a bat survey carried out in September 2004 revealed that no bats were present on the site.	None.
37: Rebecca Turner	Q1.1 – Poor  Q1.2 – Poor  Q1.3 – Very Poor  Q2 – No   Q3 – No   Q4 – No	Brownfield sites should be used before green field sites.   More centralised to the village as a whole.   No shelter required for drug-takers / glue sniffers - youth club needed.	Agree but it is inevitable that some new development will take place on greenfield sites. The adopted UDP states that planning permission will not be granted for the development of this site until 80% beneficial occupation of the residential units on the Rhoose Point site has been achieved.  Disagree. The area of public open space needs to be centrally located within the site so that it is accessible by all residents.  Noted. It is unreasonable to assume that the youth shelter will	None.   None.   None?

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q5 – No	Enforce 106 agreement for Rhoose Point before even thinking about this one.	be used for antisocial behaviour. The problems on Rhoose Point are a separate issue to the consultation on the draft development brief.	None.
	Q6 – Yes	Roads / cycle paths – green areas.	The draft development brief is seeking a financial contribution to Route 88, which is part of the National Cycle Network. This would benefit all residents of Rhoose.	None.
	Q7 – No	Council should collect.	A kerbside re-cycling facility already exists in Rhoose. The proposed facility will help to increase levels of re-cycling.	None.
	Q8 – Don't Know			
	Q.9	No bungalows for an aging population	The draft development brief does not specify house types on the site. However, it does refer to the heights of buildings that will be deemed acceptable.	None.
		No buffer zone exclusions – no departure form Council's approved amenity standards.	The draft development brief acknowledges that the privacy of existing adjoining residents needs to be safeguarded and in some circumstances it may be necessary to have more than 21m between properties.	None.
38: Mrs M P Lavis	Q1.1 – Neutral Q1.2 – no			

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	<p>answer Q1.3 – Poor</p> <p>Q2 – No</p>	<p>Road infrastructure and insisting on a buffer zone next to existing house however much space is already in existence in the for of garden. No high storey buildings behind bungalows. What about the existing house views.</p>	<p>The draft development brief states that the developer will be required to submit a traffic impact assessment in order to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and identify appropriate highway solutions.</p> <p>The draft development brief acknowledges that the privacy of existing adjoining residents needs to be safeguarded and in some circumstances it may be necessary to have more than 21m between properties. The document also states that no building on the site will be higher than 2.5 storeys unless it can be demonstrated that the 3 storey buildings would have no unacceptable impact on surrounding uses and the landscape.</p> <p>Finally the draft development brief also makes reference to the views out and into the site and states that these should be carefully considered by the developers.</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>Q3 – No</p>	<p>Nearer to the heavily built up area of Station Road / Torbay Terrace. This would then be more central to the built up area – not just the new estate.</p>	<p>Disagree. The area of public open space needs to be centrally located within the site so that it is accessible by all residents.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q4 – No	There is no provision for safe road crossing from the new site to Ceri Road via zebra crossing or speed control of traffic.  If the new proposed zebra crossing is sited near the second roundabout – people will not walk that far down the road to cross over.	Noted.	None
	Q5 – Don't Know	The Council should be paying for improved services through our extortionate Council tax payments.	Disagree. Section 106 contributions should be sought from the developer.	None.
	Q6 – Yes	The Council should be seeking a youth club.	Noted.	None
	Q7 – No	The Council already collects recycling and hopefully will offer better services in the future in line with English Councils.	Noted.	None.
	Q8 – Don't Know			
	Q.9	Total lack of thought into road infrastructure. One main road is not sufficient. This would mean anyone living on the new estate would have to drive down Porthkerry Road to school, shops, etc... Porthkerry Road is already a dangerous road for speeding with no speed restrictions implemented.  Two and a half storey houses are not acceptable – this is supposed to be a village not a town and the houses should be in keeping with current ones. There is no mention of the Bungalow Scheme as in England.	It is hoped that residents will make these journeys by bike or on foot. Nevertheless, the draft development brief states that the developer will be required to submit a traffic impact assessment in order to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and identify appropriate highway solutions.  Disagree. This scale of development is considered to be appropriate on the site. It is anticipated that a range and choice of house types will be provided on the development.	None.  None.
39: John Lavis	Q1.1 – Poor			

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q1.2 – Poor			
	Q1.3 – Very Poor			
	Q2 – No	Build on a Brownfield site first	Agree but it is inevitable that some new development will take place on greenfield sites. The adopted UDP states that planning permission will not be granted for the development of this site until 80% beneficial occupation of the residential units on the Rhoose Point site has been achieved.	None.
		If building must go ahead, only low building to match surroundings (some existing housing is one story)	The document states that no building on the site will be higher than 2.5 storeys unless it can be demonstrated that the 3 storey buildings would have no unacceptable impact on surrounding uses and the landscape.	None.
		Consider impact on traffic safety	The draft development brief states that the developer will be required to submit a traffic impact assessment in order to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and identify appropriate highway solutions.	None.
	Q3 – No	The open space should be used as a buffer against the existing low storey housing.	Disagree. The area of public open space needs to be centrally located within the site so that it is accessible by all residents. However, the draft development	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
			brief acknowledges that the privacy of existing adjoining residents needs to be safeguarded and in some circumstances it may be necessary to have more than 21m between properties.	
		The youth shelter will allow the cognation of bored kids. Money would be better spent in facilities to educate / employ or entertain.	Noted. However, such facilities are popular with older children as it provides them with a place to meet up.	None.
	Q4 – No	None. As just a shelter, see above.		
	Q5 – No	There is a lack of detail in section 6, very poor presentation of submission requirements.	Disagree. The level of detail provided is considered to be sufficient for a development brief.	None.
		Section 106 requirements not implemented for Rhoose Point – start there!	Although the adopted UDP protects land at Rhoose Point for informal recreation and employment purposes, market forces determine whether sites are developed and the Council cannot influence this.	None.
	Q6 – Yes	The council should be seeking financial contributions for all community facilities as most have been closed to public use over the last 20 years. Apart from the community hall which is used for publicity for one member of the Council.	The Council will seek to ensure that the development of this site makes an effective and positive contribution to the social, economic and environmental well being of the local community.	None.
	Q7 – No	The recycling facility will not be put into use until the site is full completed – we need it now.	A kerbside re-cycling facility already exists in Rhoose.	None.
	Q8 – No	There has been no planning for low emission travel outside of the village / town. This plan is taking away green areas and replacing it with pollution. Where is the Green Policy now?	Disagree. Rhoose has good local public transport, shopping, leisure and employment facilities. In addition, the re-opening of the Vale	None.



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q9	<p>Very poor site shape, allowing for dumping areas in the corners adjacent to Porthkerry Road and the Western boundary.</p> <p>No planning consideration to the controlled access to the emergency road. It will be a blind access to the main road. How will only emergency transport use this access?</p> <p>Only one access road for 600 – 700 houses. This road leads to Rhoose Point, which holds 600 houses. A child can see the problem.</p> <p>No traffic calming for the additional 2,000 cars on Porthkerry Road.</p> <p>* Please contact me directly for additional details as this form is too small and lacks detail (01446 710139).</p>	<p>of Glamorgan railway line to passengers has given Rhoose residents the opportunity to access other facilities in Bridgend, Cardiff and Barry by rail. The indicative master plan includes a large area of public open space within the site.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Adequate visibility splays will need to be provided onto Porthkerry Road. The bollards shown on the indicative master plan will prevent the use of the lane by unauthorised vehicles.</p> <p>The draft development brief states that the developer will be required to submit a traffic impact assessment in order to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and identify appropriate highway solutions.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
40: Leslie Marsh	<p>Q1.1 – Good</p> <p>Q1.2 – Neutral</p> <p>Q1.3 – Neutral</p> <p>Q2 – Don't Know</p>			

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	<p>Q3 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q4 – Don't know</p> <p>Q5 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q6 – No answer</p> <p>Q7 – No</p> <p>Q8 – Yes</p> <p>Q9.</p>	<p>Experience suggests that recycling sites are useless, unless they are in a manned location i.e. sully became untidy and all rubbish is left not just the recyclable products and collection / clean up schedules do not keep up with issue. Not even a local pride in community would solve problem, as non-residents will travel to dump.</p> <p>Biggest concern is the Council are not holding the contractors accountable for delivering on the promises and the requirements of the plan. When I moved to Rhose I was promised a list of improvements and amenities and apart for the rail link (5 years later) none have been enforced by the Council. So why should this development be any different, where is the protection for the local residents? Too often we suffer from a NIMBY attitude particularly from the more influential area of the Vale. A key propriety should be M4 Junction 34 to Barry to relive current problems.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Although the adopted UDP protects land at Rhose Point for informal recreation and employment purposes, market forces determine whether sites are developed and the Council cannot influence this.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None.</p>
41: Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust LTD	Letter	The section of the Brief relating to Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (sections 3.22 to 3.25) is in accordance with the advice we gave you in our letter of the 15 <sup>th</sup> March when we were consulted on an earlier draft. Consequently we have no further comment on this section of the current draft brief. However, it is suggested that you consider adding our contact details to section 7 of the current details in order to assist prospective developers in contacting us.	Noted but the contact details relate to the Council contacts only.	None.
42: White Young Green	Q1.1 – Good			

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
Planning on behalf of:  The National Assembly for Wales; Bellway plc; and Persimmon Homes (Wales) Ltd	Q1.2 – Good			
	Q1.3 – Good			
	Q2 – Yes	While the overall master plan for the development of the site is supported, the consortium has a number of concerns regarding the overly prescriptive nature of parts of the draft development brief. Those concerns are detailed in the additional comment sheets that are attached to this consultation response.	Noted.	None.
	Q3 – Yes	Discussions with the Council's Leisure Department indicated that the Council required the on-site open space to be centrally located. This was reflected in the development framework concept that was originally prepared by White Young Green in consultation with officers of the Council and which is now included in the Council's version of the development brief.	Noted.	None.
	Q4 – No	<p>The draft development brief prepared by the Council also refers to the provision of a youth shelter in the public open space and Appendix 9 provides a schedule of proposed play/sport equipment. The Council should acknowledge in the development brief that the provision of any such community facilities would need to be agreed as part of the preparation of any Section 106 agreement for the site.</p> <p>No justification for an off-site youth shelter as a result of the proposed development has been provided.</p> <p>It is inappropriate in a development brief for the Council to be prescriptive about the detailed provisions of a Section 106 agreement for the site. The development brief should provide a broad indication of the type and range of community facilities that may be required as part of the proposed development. However, the detailed requirements listed in paragraphs 6.4 - 6.19 are inappropriate in a development brief and should be deleted. The Council should acknowledge in the development brief that the provision of any community facilities or other provisions will need to be agreed as part of the preparation of any Section 106 agreement for the site. In addition, the scale and type of any planning obligations will need to be agreed between the developers and the local planning authority in accordance with the guidelines set out in Welsh Office Circular 17/97 Planning Obligations. The brief should also state that the timing for the provision of matters to be contained in planning obligations will also need to be agreed with the Council as part of the negotiations on the section 106 agreement.</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.7 of the draft development brief makes reference to the provision of the youth shelter in terms of the Section 106 requirements.</p> <p>Disagree. The provision of a youth shelter off Ceri Road by the developer is considered to be reasonable as children on the new development are likely to utilise the existing recreational facilities on the site.</p> <p>Disagree. The Council believes this level of detail is appropriate to include in a development brief particularly given the sensitivity of this site.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q5 – No answer	<p>It is inappropriate in a development brief for the Council to be prescriptive about the detailed provisions of a Section 106 agreement for the site. The development brief should provide a broad indication of the type and range of community facilities that may be required as part of the proposed development. However, the detailed requirements listed in paragraphs 6.4 - 6.19 are inappropriate in a development brief and should be deleted. The Council should acknowledge in the development brief that the provision of any community facilities or other provisions will need to be agreed as part of the preparation of any Section 106 agreement for the site. In addition, the scale and type of any planning obligations will need to be agreed between the developers and the local planning authority in accordance with the guidelines set out in Welsh Office Circular 17/97 Planning Obligations. The brief should also state that the timing for the provision of matters to be contained in planning obligations will also need to be agreed with the Council as part of the negotiations on the section 106 agreement.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council believes this level of detail is appropriate to include in a development brief particularly given the sensitivity of this site.</p>	None.
	Q6 - No	<p>Delete requirement (Question 6; Should the council be seeking financial contributions for the upgrading of any other local community facilities).</p> <p>It is inappropriate in a development brief for the Council to be prescriptive about the detailed provisions of a Section 106 agreement for the site. The development brief should provide a broad indication of the type and range of community facilities that may be required as part of the proposed development. However, the detailed requirements listed in paragraphs 6.4 - 6.19 are inappropriate in a development brief and should be deleted. The Council should acknowledge in the development brief that the provision of any community facilities or other provisions will need to be agreed as part of the preparation of any Section 106 agreement for the site. In addition, the scale and type of any planning obligations will need to be agreed between the developers and the local planning authority in accordance with the guidelines set out in Welsh Office Circular 17/97 Planning Obligations. The brief should also state that the timing for the provision of matters to be contained in planning obligations will also need to be agreed with the Council as part of the negotiations on the section 106 agreement.</p>	<p>Disagree. The section 106 requirements in relation to bus and cycle improvements in the vicinity (paragraphs 6.17 and 6.18 refer) are considered to be necessary to serve the new development.</p>	
	Q7 – Yes			
	Q8 – Yes	<p>The Council should acknowledge in the development brief that the provision of any such improvements would need to be agreed with the applicants as part of the preparation of any Section 106 agreement for the site.</p>		

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q9.	<p>Additional Comments (Question 9);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Paragraph 3.14:</b> A detailed badger survey has been undertaken. Details will be provided in the Environmental Statement for the proposal. Document should be updated accordingly.</li> <li>• <b>Paragraph 3.15:</b> A detailed dormouse survey has been undertaken. Details will be provided in the Environmental Statement for the proposal. Document should be updated accordingly.</li> <li>• <b>Paragraph 3.16:</b> A breeding bird survey has been undertaken. Details will be provided in the Environmental Statement for the proposal. Document should be updated accordingly.</li> <li>• <b>Paragraphs 3.19 and 3.20:</b> An ecological assessment of the site has been undertaken. Details of the survey, assessment and proposed mitigation will be provided in the Environmental Statement for the proposal. Document should be updated accordingly.</li> <li>• <b>Paragraph 3.25:</b> A geophysical survey has been undertaken. No further archaeological investigation is warranted from the results. Details will be provided in the Environmental Statement for the proposal.</li> <li>• <b>Paragraph 4.1:</b> A Planning and Development Brief will accompany an application for outline planning permission. The requirement for street scenes at the outline application stage is inappropriate and such matters of details should be properly considered at the approval of reserved matters' stage.</li> <li>• <b>Paragraph 4.6:</b> Discussions have been held with the Highway Authority and agreement reached on the main and emergency accesses to the site. It is only the detailed design that remains to be agreed; the principles have been agreed already.</li> </ul>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The draft development brief stipulates that a design statement must be submitted with any forthcoming outline planning application. It is perfectly reasonable to request illustrations of street scenes as part of this statement (TAN 12 refers).</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Update paragraph 3.14 accordingly.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 3.15 accordingly.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 3.16 accordingly.</p> <p>Update paragraph 3.19 accordingly.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="427 244 1547 363">• <b>Paragraph 4.10:</b> A transport assessment for the proposal has been completed. The assessment indicates that minor improvements to the Porthkerry Road/Pentir y De junction will be required. Details will be provided in the Transport Assessment for the proposal. Document should be updated accordingly.</li> <li data-bbox="427 459 1547 547">• <b>Paragraph 4.11:</b> the last sentence of this paragraph should be amended to read: "The developers will be required to investigate improvements to the existing footpath crossing to the Rhoose Point development."</li> <li data-bbox="427 707 1547 802">• <b>Paragraph 4.13:</b> The proposed area of open space is sufficient to accommodate one football pitch only. The development brief should refer to a football "pitch" rather than "pitches".</li> <li data-bbox="427 898 1547 1106">• <b>Paragraphs 4.24 -4.29:</b> The Local Education Authority has advised that the preferred option would be to extend the existing primary school in Rhoose rather than to a build a new school and that a financial contribution towards such educational provision will be required. With regard to secondary education, any financial contribution will only be made where a proven need has been demonstrated. The Council should acknowledge in the development brief that the provision of any such improvements will need to be agreed with the applicant as part of the negotiations on any section 106 agreement for the site.</li> <li data-bbox="427 1145 1547 1265">• <b>Paragraph 4.30:</b> The last sentence implies that the land to the north of the railway line has significant drainage problems. This is not the case and the last sentence of para. 4.30 should be deleted. A detailed drainage report has been prepared by the applicants and will be submitted in support of the planning application.</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1570 244 2007 395">Noted. However, it would not be appropriate to update the draft development brief with the findings before they have been verified by the Local Highway Authority.</p> <p data-bbox="1570 459 2007 675">Disagree. This existing public right of way will form an essential pedestrian link between the 2 major housing developments and will undoubtedly need amending / upgrading as part of the development on this site.</p> <p data-bbox="1570 707 2007 794">Disagree. The pitch will be multi purpose and it is therefore appropriate to refer to it as pitches.</p> <p data-bbox="1570 890 2007 1042">Disagree. Paragraphs 4.28 and 4.29 in the draft development brief clearly justify why developers would be required to fund additional additional classrooms.</p> <p data-bbox="1570 1137 2007 1439">The last sentence states that "there appears to be significant drainage problems in the area" and does not refer specifically to the site in question. The relevant bodies (i.e. Dwr Cymru Welsh Water, Environment Agency and the Council's Engineering department) will be consulted for advice on this issue if a planning application is</p>	<p data-bbox="2018 244 2186 395">None.</p> <p data-bbox="2018 459 2186 675">None.</p> <p data-bbox="2018 707 2186 794">None</p> <p data-bbox="2018 890 2186 1042">None.</p> <p data-bbox="2018 1137 2186 1439">None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Paragraph 4.35:</b> Any contribution towards public art will need to be agreed with the applicant pursuant to a condition or as part of any section 106 agreement for the proposed development.</li> <li>• <b>Paragraphs 4.36 - 4.37:</b> The development brief does not include any justification for the provision of such facilities. It is inappropriate in a development brief for the Council to be prescriptive about the detailed provisions of any section 106 agreement for the site. The development brief should provide a broad indication of the type and range of community facilities that may be required as part of the proposed development. However, the detailed requirements listed in paragraphs 4.36 - 4.39 are inappropriate in a development brief and should be deleted. The Council should acknowledge in the development brief that the provision of any such community facilities will need to be agreed with the applicant as part of the negotiations on any Section 106 agreement for the site and be subject to proven need. In addition, the development brief should state that the scale and type of any planning obligations will need to be agreed between the applicants and the local planning authority in accordance with the guidelines set out in Welsh Office Circular 17/97 Planning Obligations.</li> <li>• <b>Paragraph 5.3 Gardens:</b> Boundaries to the street should also allow for the provision of railings.</li> <li>• <b>Paragraph 5.9:</b> Any public art installed on site would need to be adopted by the Council and should therefore be located in adoptable areas.</li> </ul>	<p>received.</p> <p>Noted. However, as stated in the draft development brief it is Council policy to seek a minimum of 1% of the costs of all capital developments for public art where the development exceeds £250000.</p> <p>Disagree. The adopted Unitary Development Plan clearly states that the development should make an effective and positive contribution to the social, economic and environmental well being of the local community and provide community facilities for the wider area. This is considered to be perfectly reasonable given that the new development will undoubtedly place additional pressures on the existing facilities and infrastructure in the village. The Council believes that the requirements set out in paragraphs 4.36 to 4.37 are reasonable and appropriate to include in the development brief particularly given the concerns expressed by local residents.</p> <p>Agree. Railings may be appropriate in some locations.</p> <p>Disagree. The future maintenance details of any public art is a matter that will have to be considered in</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 5.3 accordingly.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Paragraph 5.10:</b> It should be noted that there is a practical restriction on tree planting due to the proximity of Cardiff International Airport.</li> <li>• <b>Paragraph 5.12:</b> There is a potential conflict between tree planting and overlooking of the open space.</li> <li>• <b>Paragraphs 5.15 – 17:</b> In the event of open space being offered for adoption by the Council, the applicants' understanding is that the developer would be expected to maintain such space for the first 5 years and that any commuted sum calculation would be based on 15 (rather than 20) years.</li> <li>• <b>Paragraph 6.1:</b> This states that an outline planning application should be identical to the boundary shown in Appendix 1. This should be amended to state that the application area should be "broadly similar" to that shown in Appendix 1. The precise planning application boundary will be determined by land under the control of the applicants and land required for access and other works.</li> </ul>	<p>due course by the developers and the Council. However, it is not desirable to have public art features sited in the adopted highway areas for highway safety reasons.</p> <p>Noted. The airport would be consulted for their views on any future planning application.</p> <p>Disagree. Developers should ensure that the landscaping scheme includes appropriate planting for the location / use concerned. The draft development brief also points out that the open space must be overlooked by dwellings in the interests of security.</p> <p>Disagree. The draft development brief specifies that it is based on 20 years.</p> <p>Disagree. The draft development brief is appropriately worded as it relates to the housing allocation identified in the adopted UDP.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council's draft development brief for the site has been prepared in accordance with the Council's approved procedures and the intention now is to adopt it for</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None.</p>



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>A Transport Assessment has been prepared and will accompany the planning application. However, the preparation of a detailed travel plan would be impracticable at the outline planning stage and this requirement should be removed from the brief.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Paragraph 6.2:</b> The requirement for the planning application to be accompanied by a list of proposed planning obligations is inappropriate. There is no statutory or regulatory requirement for such a list to be provided as part of an outline planning application and therefore this paragraph should be deleted from the draft brief.</li> <li>• <b>Section 106 requirements:</b> It is inappropriate in a development brief for the Council to be prescriptive about the detailed provisions of any section 106 agreement for the site. The development brief should provide a broad indication of the type and range of community facilities that may be required as part of the proposed development. However, the detailed requirements listed in paragraphs 6.4 - 6.19 are inappropriate in a development brief and should be deleted. The Council should acknowledge in the development brief that the provision of any such community facilities will need to be agreed with the applicant as part of the negotiation of any section 106 agreement for the site and be subject to proven need. In addition, the development brief should state that the scale and type of any</li> </ul>	<p>development control purposes. Any planning and development brief submitted with a forthcoming planning application would therefore not hold any significant weight. The draft development brief states that any outline application must be accompanied by a comprehensive landscaping strategy and this is considered to be acceptable given the sensitivity of this site.</p> <p>Disagree. The travel plan needs to be prepared at this stage as it will form an integral part of the traffic impact assessment.</p> <p>Disagree. One of the main purposes of preparing development briefs is to improve the efficiency of the planning process. The requirement to submit a list of proposed planning obligations with any forthcoming outline planning application is therefore considered to be appropriate given the sensitivity of this site.</p> <p>Disagree. Please see response above.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>planning obligations will need to be agreed between the applicants and the local planning authority in accordance with the guidelines set out in Welsh Office Circular 17/97 Planning Obligations. The brief should state that the timing for the provision of matters to be contained in any planning obligations will need also to be agreed between the applicants and the Council as part of the negotiations on any section 106 agreement.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above comment, Paragraph 6.8 states that the LAPs must be completed prior to the beneficial occupation of any of the houses on the phase they are located. It would be more appropriate for this to be linked to the occupation of housing adjoining the LAP to ensure that the LAP is not located within the middle of a building site, with associated health and safety risks.</p> <p>Paragraphs 5.15 and 5.16 do not provide details of the commuted sums.</p> <p>The suggested requirements for community facilities (paras. 6.11-6.14) are not substantiated by any proven need or justification.</p>	<p>Disagree. The LAPS need to be linked to the phase of the development. This is considered to be appropriate to secure the proper planning of the development.</p> <p>It is considered that the draft development brief provides sufficient detail on this matter. Precise sums can be discussed at the planning application stage.</p> <p>It is inevitable that a development of this size will place additional pressures on existing local infrastructure and community facilities. The upgrading and provision of new community facilities listed in paras 6.11 to 6.14 are therefore considered to be justified.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
<p><b>43: Derek and Gemma Evans</b></p>	<p>Q1.1 – Good Q1.2 – Good Q1.3 – Good Q2 – No Q3,4,5, 6,7, 8- No answer</p>	<p>Please see section 9 for full explanation.</p>		

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q9.	<p>Unfortunately for us residents in Rhoose Point, the prospect of doubling the size of the overall development is certainly unappealing. Too many promises which were made years ago have never been fulfilled, and by agreeing to this proposed development would be allowing these promises (i.e. a golf course) to be forgotten with. It is not just the above example that makes us against the proposal, but after almost three years living here, roads still aren't complete, building areas are barren; the streets are dirty with litter and weeds, etc.</p> <p>We moved to this area to live in a fairly rural setting. By implementing the development, it will no longer remain a village, and traffic congestion toward Cardiff will become far worse that already being experienced during peak hours. The village already is unable to cope with the demands being placed upon it, such as there are limited places in the children's nursery and primary schools.</p> <p>What happens to our house prices? Surely they will lose value as there will be more choice for homebuyers and the market will become more competitive. We may sound completely biased and negative, but we only want what we feel is right. If the council kept their promises and fully completed the first phase, then perhaps we (and many other residents whom we have spoken with) would feel differently. Prove us wrong and complete what the council said it would before we moved here initially. Maybe then consider expanding the area.</p>	<p>Noted. The problems on Rhoose Point are a separate issue to the consultation on the draft development brief. However, it should be noted that although the adopted UDP protects land at Rhoose Point for informal recreation and employment purposes, market forces determine whether sites are developed and the Council cannot influence this.</p> <p>It is anticipated that a large proportion of the residents of the new development will travel to Cardiff by train. However, the draft development brief states that the developer will need to undertake and submit a traffic impact assessment to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and to identify appropriate transport solutions.</p> <p>Noted. However, personal issues such as house prices are not planning issues.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
44: Gareth Davies Development Manager Cadarn	Q2 – Yes Q3 – Don't Know Q4 – Don't			

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
Housing Group	Know Q5 – Don't Know Q6 – Don't Know Q7 – Yes Q8 – Don't Know	<p>Q9. As a partner Housing Association who develop, own and manage properties throughout the Vale of Glamorgan, we are chiefly concerned with the provisions for affordable housing. The brief deals with this under section 4.23 on page 18. In order to strengthen the Council's requirements on the provision, we believe that early involvement of an Association will be required in order to help develop the housing proposals in a comprehensive and co-ordinated way. This will thereby ensure that the eventual scheme provides a thoroughly balanced approach to tenure, and that it provides for a sensible and pragmatic solution in determining the most suitable siting of all housing types. This will conform to the mixed communities and sustainability agenda, and also improve the management of what will be a large development. In summary, all stakeholders must be given the opportunity to contribute to the design development.</p> <p>We would like the minimum requirement of 20% of the total number of dwellings for affordable housing to be reviewed. This is a massive development site, and it is a crucial opportunity for the Council to ensure that its affordable housing requirements are being met on an important strategic site.</p>	<p>Agree. The Council's Housing Department will be consulted if and when a planning application is submitted on the site. It is normal practice for them to liaise with local housing associations in such instances so that their views can be taken on board.</p> <p>Noted. However, this statement is contained in Policy HOUS 12 in the adopted Unitary Development Plan and cannot therefore be amended at this stage. Nevertheless, the Council will be reviewing existing policies as part of the Local Development Plan process and will bare this comment in mind.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
45: Carol Stockham	Letter	1. Legality of the Draft Development Brief produced by the Local Authority		

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>As a consequence of concerns raised by residents prior to publication of the DDB, Members from across the political spectrum made vigorous objections to the DDB going forward to public consultation. Unfortunately, a heated debate at Full Council failed to stop the DDB going forward in its present form. I would point out that the Cabinet did agree to undertake a site investigation prior to the DDB going out for Public Consultation but there is no evidence that this took place.</p>	<p>Cabinet on the 10<sup>th</sup> May 2006 resolved to undertake a site inspection of the Rhoose Point development and the land to the north of the railway line (Min No. C2441 refers). To date, it appears that this has not been undertaken. However, a further recommendation is to be included in the report to Cabinet to undertake a site visit of the land to the north of the railway.</p>	None.
		<p>All the Cabinet positions are held by Conservatives – and two are held by the Ward Members for Rhoose namely the Leader, Councillor James, and Councillor Kemp. All Councillors will know that their first duty is towards the residents of their respective wards. Councillors James and Kemp have been fully aware of concerns on Rhoose Point for over 3 years. However, in their role as Cabinet Members they supported the DDB – despite being fully up to speed with residents concerns regarding drainage, flooding, pollution, contamination, planning irregularities and adoption. This could constitute a major conflict of interest. At the very least the Ward Members should have imparted to Cabinet the knowledge in their possession.</p>	<p>The outstanding issues on Rhoose Point are considered to be a separate issue from the Draft Development Brief.</p>	None.
		<p>However, the issues of the legality and content of the DDB go 'above politics' and are so serious that those with the power should bring about a vote of no confidence in the Cabinet. Senior Officers within the Local Planning Authority should also be brought to account.</p>		
		<p>The residents invited by the Council to comment on the DDB have been duped. The Council has taken advantage of the fact that members of the public are not professional planners. It is also noticeable that the consultation period chosen is one when many are on holiday – and the Council is in recess! We are advised in the letters addressed to 'The Occupier' that the Brief has been prepared in accordance with recommendation 4.80 of the Inspectors report on the UDP - This is not true.</p>	<p>It is inevitable that some consultations will take place over the Summer months. However, the Council believes that the 6-week consultation period gave interested parties sufficient time to respond to the draft development brief. The Unitary Development Plan Inspector recommended that a development brief was prepared for</p>	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>Full Council accepted the Proposed Modifications to the UDP with regard to land north of the railway in October 2004 on the basis of the Inspectors recommendation that the future Development Brief be a joint project between the developers and the Vale. This issue became a matter of STATUTE when formal adoption took place in May 2005. Any departure from the adopted UDP should have been put to Council, agreed and minuted accordingly. It has not been made clear to the public that the preparation of the DDB solely by the Vale constitutes a departure from the UDP. The decision to 'go it alone' was not a matter for the LPA but should have gone through due process in consultation with Members. If the departure from the UDP had been agreed then it was only at that point that the LPA were under a remit to produce a one party Brief that then followed its course through the Committee Stages. In general terms Development Briefs become a material consideration when determining subsequent planning applications. This means that the DDB for the Land North of the Railway that has gone out to Public Consultation has no status as a material consideration.</p> <p>Q1. In light of the above why have the Leader and fellow Ward Member endorsed and signed the 'To The Occupier' letter?</p> <p>Considerable work and expense would have been involved in preparing the DDB. In the light of what has happened the LPA could be deemed responsible for wasting taxpayers money on a DDB that is not worth the paper it is written on! Furthermore, The Leader, who is a ward member for Rhoose has stated through the press that the development on the North cannot be progressed until issues on the South are resolved (<i>Gem 23<sup>rd</sup> March 06</i>). He subsequently led the Cabinet in promoting the DDB who subsequently effectively overruled the decision of the Scrutiny Committee to support residents concerns and defer the DDB pending inquiries.</p> <p>Q2. How much has it cost to research, administer and publicize/exhibit the DDB?</p>	<p>the site (Recommendation 4.80 refers).</p> <p>Disagree. The draft development brief was based on an original document prepared by the developers. However, as there were a number of concerns with it, the Council decided to prepare its own draft development brief in accordance with its approved procedures. This decision is not considered to represent a departure from the adopted Unitary Development Plan. The development brief will be a material consideration in the determination of any future planning application on this site.</p> <p>In view of the above, it is appropriate that the local ward members signed the letter to all Rhoose residents.</p> <p>The draft development brief and subsequent public consultation has been carried out in-house by officers of the Planning and Transportation Division within the current budget for the division. If</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>undisputable fact that the Land North of the Railway Line is subject to significant flooding during periods of persistent moderate to heavy rainfall. There is no doubt that flooding combined with inadequate drainage systems will disturb any underlying contaminants in the area and overload existing drainage systems. Incidents of flooding, contamination and pollution have been reported to relevant authorities such as the Council, the Environment Agency and the Health and Safety Executive.</p> <p>Those within the Council that support the DDB have been known to say 'Development on the Land North of the Railway Line will solve the problems on Rhoose Point'. Indeed the Leader made reference to this in the <i>Gem</i> article dated 23<sup>rd</sup> March 06.</p> <p>Q5. What assurances will be given by the Council to protect existing and future residents on the very real prospect of flooding, contamination and pollution being exacerbated by any future development on the Land North of the Railway?</p> <p>A video is available for anyone to view depicting a serious flood event on the North Fields. (I reserve the right to be in attendance at any showing of the video). It would be in the wider public interest that residents of Rhoose and Rhoose Point, members of the Local Planning Authority, Councillors, Environment Agency, developers and any other interest parties, view this video.</p> <p>Q6. Are there any Officers or Members of the Council that have actively promoted the DDB who would like to view the video coverage?</p> <p>5. Adoption of Sewers</p> <p>Whereas there has been some discussion with Welsh Water on the discharge of surface water, it is obvious that until such time as any development takes place on the Land North of the Railway, surface water generated by roofs, roads and drives does not yet exist.</p> <p>Q7 Will the fact that Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has stated in writing that drainage issues on Rhoose Point are so severe that section 104 adoption agreements cannot take place, impact on the proposed northern development?</p>	<p>development brief and their comments in respect of flooding are shown above for information.</p> <p>If a planning application is submitted on this site, the Council will consult with the relevant bodies and ensure that appropriate measures are incorporated in the layout and design of the development to prevent any such issues.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>You will be contacted in due course by the relevant officer / member if required.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The outstanding issues on Rhoose Point are considered to be a separate issue from the Draft Development Brief. Nevertheless,</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p data-bbox="479 427 815 456">6. Land Drainage Authority</p> <p data-bbox="427 491 1547 762">It is a published fact, referred to in the Inspector's Report that a major aquifer of high vulnerability exists on the Land North of the Railway. Flooding in the northern fields is sourced from a combination of surface water, highway drainage run-off, green field flows, aquifer water and the result of soakaway systems on the Murlande Way development being overwhelmed. Surface water is defined as water diffused over the ground derived from falling rain and melting snow. Once surface water reaches well-defined channels where it merges with other water it ceases to be surface water but becomes part of the running waters of a stream i.e a natural groundwater drainage system. The northern fields are riddled with defined channels (ditches, natural land contours etc) that in certain conditions become raging torrents.</p> <p data-bbox="427 799 1547 1129">It is not in the remit of Dwr Cymru Welsh Water to adopt groundwater/ land drainage systems. It is the responsibility of the Council in its role as Land Drainage Authority to approve such systems and to ensure that measures are in place for the maintaining if the flows. The DDB makes no reference to the Local Drainage Authority having been consulted despite the fact that the Officer responsible for Land Drainage has undertaken site investigations and been involved with correspondence connected to flooding from the Land North of the Railway for over 3 years. The failure by the Local Planning Authority to ensure that a groundwater condition formed part of the original outline consent and the subsequent reserved matters applications for Rhoose Point has had the most serious environmental implications – flooding, contamination and pollution - that quite frankly go against the whole ethos of sustainable development.</p> <p data-bbox="427 1166 1547 1225">Q8. Will there be a groundwater condition in any future planning application for the Land North of the Railway Line?</p> <p data-bbox="427 1321 1547 1439">Groundwater on the north is already being diverted into a purpose built artificial land drainage system on Rhoose Point. This system required planning permission and should have been the subject of an environmental impact assessment as a stand-alone project in its own right. However, the system was allegedly built in the absence of the knowledge and consent of</p>	<p data-bbox="1576 240 1995 395">Dwr Cymru Welsh Water have provided comments on the draft development brief and will be re-consulted if and when a planning application is submitted for the site.</p> <p data-bbox="1576 491 1995 671">The Environment Agency have confirmed that the geology beneath the site is classed as being a <u>minor</u> aquifer of high vulnerability. The draft development brief will therefore be amended accordingly.</p> <p data-bbox="1576 799 1995 922">The Council's Engineering Department will be consulting on any forthcoming planning application on the site.</p> <p data-bbox="1576 1166 1995 1289">This will depend on the comments received by relevant consultees if and when a planning application is submitted on the site.</p>	<p data-bbox="2029 491 2101 520">None.</p> <p data-bbox="2029 799 2101 828">None.</p> <p data-bbox="2029 1166 2101 1195">None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>either the Land Drainage Authority or the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority was alerted over 3 years ago to the 'existence' of the comprehensive groundwater system and had an opportunity to carry out enforcement action prior to residential on Rhoose Point being completed.</p> <p>Q9. Why did the Council take the decision not to proceed with enforcement action when it was clear that unauthorised construction activities had taken place?</p> <p>It is also documented fact that, whilst the unauthorised construction of the comprehensive land drainage scheme was being undertaken, railway structures were seriously interfered with without the knowledge or consent of the Rail Authorities. Unauthorised connections have been made into existing railway culverts/drains and stipulations made by the Railway Authority at the Development Brief Stage for Rhoose Point to protect the long term health and safety of the embankment were breached. Some culverts/drains were blocked; the 'toe' to the south of the railway embankment was hacked into; soakaway systems were installed at the base of the embankment and ground levels were lowered to accommodate development. One effect has been an alteration to the water tables and natural drainage paths in the area. This has affected the stability of the embankment and contributed to flooding issues on Rhoose Point. One particularly large 30-inch railway culvert seems to have totally disappeared. No definitive answers to questions about where this culvert is sited and what has happened to the water that used to pass through it have yet been obtained.</p> <p>Q10. Prior to the publishing of the DDB was Network Rail approached to give a view on how future development on the Land North of the Railway will impact on its structures and how this will affect passenger safety?</p> <p>The comprehensive land drainage system passes through the properties of homeowners – and in some cases is under their houses. A view is held within the Council that homeowners are financially responsible for the maintenance and control of this system that was purpose built to take the flows from the North and therefore protect Rhoose Point from flooding.</p> <p>Q11. Will the Council agree to potential future developers on the North utilising the land drainage/flood defence system South of the embankment to serve their own needs?</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the works to which you refer either have the benefit of planning consent or are classified as deminimus. Therefore no enforcement action has been taken.</p> <p>Network Rail were consulted for their views on the draft development brief and their comments are included for information. They will of course be re-consulted if and when a planning application is submitted on the site.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This matter will need to be investigated as part of a forthcoming planning application on</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>Q11a. If the answer to question 8 is 'Yes' then what measures will there be in place to protect residents on the South from the onerous burden of cost that will be involved to maintain and control the comprehensive land drainage system?</p> <p>The Leader was approached over three years ago for information regarding the comprehensive land drainage system on Rhoose Point - including the obtaining of plans. A meeting was convened in Chambers where officers of Planning and Visible Services attended. Various promises were made to seek and obtain related information. Instead various tactics of avoidance, obstruction and outright refusal have been used – including the serious fact that Officers lied to the Ombudsman during an investigation into the land drainage issues.</p> <p>Q12. Why has the Chief Executive refused to view the evidence that Officers made false statements to the Ombudsman when the opportunity was afforded him in March of this year?</p> <p>At a meeting with Visible Services on 13<sup>th</sup> June 06 one developer who was party to the construction of the comprehensive land drainage system, Cofton, pleaded 'work load' issues as being the reason the numerous information requests made over a period in excess of 3 years remain unanswered. The weakness of this excuse is unbelievable but of even more concern is that in the full knowledge of the publication of the DDB being imminent the representatives of the Vale in attendance at the meeting actually accepted the excuse. The minutes to this meeting were only recently made available. The contents have direct implications on the Land North of the Railway and should have been available for Members to consider whilst the DDB was going through the Committee stages.</p> <p>Q13. Why did the Director of Visible Services, who attended the meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2006, fail to ensure that the minutes were published in a timely manner?</p> <p>Q14. Will the Vale be ensuring that all matters relating to Land Drainage on Rhoose Point are fully investigated and resolved prior to the determining of any future planning application on the North?</p>	<p>the site.</p> <p>Not known at this stage.</p> <p>This matter is not relevant to the consultation on the draft development brief.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This matter is not relevant to the consultation on the draft development brief and should be pursued directly with Committee Services.</p> <p>The outstanding issues on Rhoose Point are considered to be a separate issue from the Draft Development Brief. Nevertheless, it</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>The Main Access to the proposed development North of the Railway is via Pentir y De. This road is yet to be adopted. Access is fundamental to any planning application. According to the Cabinet Member for Visible Services a section 38 agreement for the new access road up as far as the first mini roundabout on Rhoose Point is in place. However, at the meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> June 06, referred to above, the Vale acknowledged that technical approval is yet to be granted for highways on Rhoose Point. Furthermore there is no section 104 in place for the adoption of drainage on the access road. It has been a matter of media coverage that it is standard practise that sewerage agreements have to be in place prior to highway agreements being entered into.</p>	<p>is possible that the developers may suggest a comprehensive drainage solution that will encompass both sites.</p>	
		<p>Q15. Who signed the Section 38 agreement and when?</p>	<p>Noted. However, this issue is not strictly relevant to the consultation on the draft development brief.</p>	<p>None.</p>
		<p>Q15a. How was a section 38 agreement entered into in the absence of technical highways approval and a section 104 agreement being in place?</p>	<p>This issue is not relevant to the consultation on the draft development brief and needs to be pursued directly with the Highway Department.</p>	<p>None.</p>
		<p>Q15b. In view of the adoption difficulties what will be the impact on the proposed development on the North that is to share this main access route?</p>	<p>As previous.</p>	<p>None.</p>
		<p>A development of 600+ houses would of course require a safe second access. Again the Vale has failed to learn from mistakes made on Rhoose Point where a safe secondary access was not established during the Development Brief Stage – and to this day is the cause of much controversy. Setting aside the common sense fact that a level crossing can never be deemed 'safe', assurances were given by the Ward Members that the level crossing would not be used as a thoroughfare and residents of Rhoose Village would continue to benefit from the quiet enjoyment of their homes. Rhoose Point still has no legal secondary vehicular access albeit that vehicles regularly pass over it in the absence of legal consent. Residents have raised objections to this illegal activity with all relevant authorities, including the Council, on health and safety grounds. Suffice it to say 'blind eyes have been turned' whilst the Council does</p>	<p>This issue will be dealt with as part of a forthcoming planning application on the site.</p>	<p>None.</p>
			<p>The draft development brief states that access into the development for up to 600 houses can be achieved via a new roundabout on the existing link road Pentir y De. However, once the development reaches the completion of 300 house, an additional access for emergency purposes will need to be made available. The emergency</p>	

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>everything in its power to 'legalise' the level crossing for public vehicular use. I fail to see where within the DDB a safe secondary access point – 365 days a year - has been considered. Despite the fact that Cabinet has stated that the issues over the level crossing are not central to matters relating to the North, I suspect that this is not the case. For the record a barrister's opinion was sought some years ago by the Council on the issue of consent for public vehicular use over the level crossing.</p> <p>Q16. Will the Council give any consideration to a proposal by developers that the level crossing at Rhoose Station can be used as a second access point to serve any future development on the North? If the answer is 'Yes' how will the Council overcome the legal issues of no public vehicular consent being in place?</p> <p>An historical Public Rights of Way – Penmark Number 1 – exists at the level crossing. The PROW has already been seriously interfered with to the detriment of pedestrians – especially those that are elderly and infirm. Construction activity undertaken by the Council prior to planning permission having been granted is so extensive that part of the PROW no longer exists and/or is impossible to pass over. This amenity enjoyed by many residents for generations has all but been destroyed.</p> <p>Q17. Has a traffic impact assessment been undertaken to assess the feasibility of the level crossing being used as a secondary access point for future development on or in the vicinity of Rhoose Point?</p> <p>Q17a. If legal public vehicular consent is achieved for the level crossing how will foot passengers accessing the platforms and people wishing to utilize the PROW be protected from the resultant increase in traffic over the crossing?</p>	<p>access is clearly shown on the indicative master plan. The outstanding issues on Rhoose Point are considered to be a separate issue from the Draft Development Brief.</p> <p>No.</p> <p>This issue is not relevant to the consultation on the draft development brief.</p> <p>The development brief states that the developer will need to undertake and submit a traffic impact assessment to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and to identify appropriate transport solutions.</p> <p>This issue is not relevant to the consultation on the draft development brief.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
46: Sarah Furness	Email	I have little faith that anything I, a mere resident of Rhoose Point, say will have any bearing on the actions of a council bent on developing the village of Rhoose into a large town without the infrastructure to support it But here goes.	Noted.	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>When we bought a house on the Point 3 years ago we were excited by the plans to incorporate a golf club, pub and leisure facilities into the estate. We waited for other facilities to be erected i.e. children's play areas and eventually they were. Still no signs of the promised tees and greens. And precious little else really. We recognised the stark beauty of our surroundings and the difficulty the landscape poses in providing the amenities a new estate should have; however there are still areas left undeveloped (which can only be described as eyesores at present) that need utilising properly before you start ploughing up the wonderful green fields that frame this former quarry. Surely the 'land allocated to employment' could be used to provide a pub/restaurant incorporating children's indoor Wacky Warehouse type play area, an outdoor adventure play area with skate park and a coffee bar to provide something for the teenagers to do. There are many younger children living on the estate but they won't be under 12's forever. They need a place to hang out that they can 'own' and is safe.</p> <p>So now you propose adding more homes to the equation? <i>Please</i> there is a desperate need for someone to look further than profit potential. Before you think of placing another 600 families in the village from whom community charges will roll in, stop and consider what infrastructure you actually have or intend to have to support them. None, a couple of newsagents, a Spar and 3 Estate Agents a town doth not make!</p> <p>It seems entirely wrong to me to be planning the next phase of development in a small village before the first phase is properly finished (our road has yet to be adopted) and without considering the consequences. All these extra houses will mean more children attending the local primary school that will necessitate extending further, presumably onto the school playing field. One of the reasons my children attend Rhws Primary is that, in addition to sound education, they have an unspoilt field in which to run, explore and play. The government tell us that outdoor play is vital to a child's development so please don't deny my children their right to it by placing extra classrooms on the field. Consider where a separate Junior school could be placed, what about a senior school?</p>	<p>Noted. The problems on Rhoose Point are a separate issue to the consultation on the draft development brief. However, it should be noted that although the adopted UDP protects land at Rhoose Point for informal recreation and employment purposes, market forces determine whether sites are developed and the Council cannot influence this. The proposed youth shelter on the public open space will provide a purpose built facility for older children to meet.</p> <p>Noted. The draft development brief seeks various Section 106 contributions from the developers which seek to either upgrade or provide new infrastructure and community facilities in Rhoose.</p> <p>As stated above, the problems on Rhoose Point are a separate issue to the consultation on the draft development brief. The draft development brief states that the preferred option is to extend the existing school but if this is not possible then a new primary school may need to be provided within the development. The document also deals with secondary school implications and concludes that both Llantwit Major comprehensive and Barry Comprehensive Schools will need extending to accommodate pupils generated by the new development.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		It is imperative that all these considerations are taken into account before any planning for more houses is entertained, otherwise we will be creating not a desirable place to live but another housing estate latched onto a village straining at the seams. It seems to me to be a recipe for disaster.	Noted.	None.
47: Melanie Rowlands / Christopher Allen	Q1.1 – Poor Q1.2 – Neutral Q1.3 – Neutral Q2 – No Q3 – No Q4 – Yes Q5 – Don't Know Q6 - Yes Q7 – No	<p>In point 5.3 – it states “Small scale flatted development might also be appropriate”. I do not agree with the mix of flats and housing, as it does not look pleasant in a rural location. It is also important to maintain the executive feel of Rhoose point and mainly provide semi detached – detached properties, which are non-uniform, low rise.</p> <p>I believe the public open space will increase youth/motorcycle annoyance in the area. If this area is included in plans it is vital to maintain as noted in 5.3 “buildings must front onto the open space to provide natural surveillance”</p> <p>There is a facility in place at the moment for recycling; this does not need to be changed.</p>	<p>It is important that new residential developments offer a range and choice of housing to meet local need. Flats built in accordance with the advice set out in the draft development brief are considered to be acceptable in this location.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. However, the proposed facility will help to increase levels of</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q8 – Don't Know Q.9	<p>A community-recycling site would look unsightly and not appropriate in a housing development. It would also produce unpleasant odours.</p> <p>In para 3.1 it states "Rhoose Point will comprise a development of approximately 500 dwellings" This should read no more than 500 dwellings, otherwise Rhoose Point will lose its executive feel and become too large for a village.</p> <p>Paras 3.7 and 3.8 mention the "excellent views to the Bristol channel" appendix 4 needs to be amended as – the views towards the channel are fantastic as you drive from the roundabout past points 18, 17, 19, 21 and 20 on plan. The pink arrows should be included at the point you leave the roundabout. These views need to be unobstructed with vegetation and low-level houses to maintain these views.</p> <p>Recommend the closure of the level crossing and to incorporate a footbridge. This is mainly for safety, as children and adults regularly climb over the crossing and with the increase of trains this will progressively deteriorate.</p> <p>Affordable housing if proposed should be shared ownership.</p>	<p>re-cycling. Noted.</p> <p>This statement refers to the existing Rhoose Point development on the south side of the railway line and is factually correct.</p> <p>Agree in part. The plan in Appendix 4 show the location and angle that the photographs in Appendix 5 were taken from.</p> <p>Noted. The construction of a pedestrian footbridge at the railway station is not relevant to the consultation on the draft development brief. However, amendments made to the brief to require investigation of improvements to link the land to the north of the railway line to the employment site on Rhoose Point.</p> <p>Affordable housing on the site will need to be provided in accordance with the Adopted Affordable Housing SPG.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Add cross reference to appendices 4 and 5 in paragraph 5.3.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 4.11 of the brief and insert new paragraph 6.19.</p> <p>None.</p>
48: Countryside	Letter	The Countryside Council for Wales (CCW) is the statutory adviser to government on sustaining natural beauty, wildlife and the opportunity for outdoor enjoyment throughout Wales	Noted.	None.



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
<p>Council for Wales</p> <p>Scott Hand – Senior Conservation Officer (Vale and Valleys)</p>		<p>and its inshore waters. With English Nature and Scottish Natural Heritage, CCW delivers its statutory responsibilities for Great Britain as a whole, and internationally, through the Joint Nature Conservation Committee.</p> <p>This response is without prejudice to comments we may wish to make when formally consulted on any planning application on the site. We welcome the various ecological surveys that have taken place already and are proposed as part of the development.</p> <p>We would wish to point out that Great Crested Newts are present in the area and we note that the brief does not make reference to the species.</p>	<p>Support is welcomed.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Add reference to Great Crested Newts in paragraph 3.21.</p>
<p>49: Hephher Dixon</p> <p>Andrew Boyd Senior Planner</p>	<p>Letter</p>	<p>We are writing on behalf of our client Cofton Ltd to make representations on the Draft Development Brief for the Land to the North of the Railway Line, Rhose.</p> <p>Cofton Ltd has had a long-standing involvement in the area and the development of the nearby and adjacent Rhose Point site. As you are in no doubt aware, Cofton Ltd still control undeveloped land immediately to the South of the railway line.</p> <p>We consider that reference should be made within the development brief to the potential for linkages between the existing Rhose Point development and undeveloped parcel within it to the south of the Railway line and the proposed development to the north, the subject of this brief.</p> <p>In this regard this parcel of land, controlled by Crofton Ltd, may provide an opportunity to act as a 'conduit' linking the two sites in the future and thereby contributing to the wider proper planning area. This opportunity is particularly relevant given open space proposals in the development brief and possible inks to the recreation areas within the Rhose Point site, footpath networks, the long distance coastal footpath and the beaches / coastline.</p> <p>Accordingly, we contend that consideration should be given to the inclusion of text and</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree. Amendments made to the brief to require investigation of improvements to link the land to th north of the railway line to the employment site on Rhose Point</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 4.11 and insert new paragraph 6.19</p> <p>See above change.</p> <p>See above</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		illustrative material /annotation acknowledging this potential.		change.
50: Network Rail  Stephen Austin Town Planner	Letter	<p>The comments relate specifically to Network Rail's role as the agency responsible for delivering a reliable and safe rail network and also to maintain, improve and upgrade every aspect of the railway infrastructure. Network Rail has a diverse and significant property portfolio, and, where not required operationally, it is generally used to fund improvements to the rail network through maximising the commercial value of its estate by redevelopment or enhancement of the existing portfolio wherever possible.</p> <p>With the increase in population at Rhoose as a result of the development of 600 dwellings, Network Rail would welcome the results of a transport assessment to be completed by the developer. Where an increase in rail patronage is identified and subsequently the railway station facilities / infrastructure at Rhoose would require improvements to accommodate the rise, developer contributions would be sought.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The draft development brief states that any outline planning application on the site must be accompanied by a traffic impact assessment and comprehensive travel assessment including a travel plan. The assessment will need to assess the impact of the development in terms of modal split, public transport, pedestrian and cycle facilities. Nevertheless, it is considered that the new development will help to sustain the new train station. In addition, the new station was built with the new development in mind.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
51: Sustrans  Vinny Mott Area Manager, South East Wales	Letter	<p>I note that Policy Tran 10 protects land and provides for cycle routes including links to the National Cycle Network. It is also important to ensure that any developments are also designed to provide walking and cycling routes <i>through</i> the site creating a permeable network. This will allow direct and convenient access by sustainable travel modes from a number of directions, rather than a circuitous route around a site to a single access point, which would discourage walking and cycling. A fully permeable network would make cycling the most attractive way to travel around the local area and increasing popularity would also increase the potential use of the proposed National Cycle Network for access to communities further afield.</p> <p>Question 8 – Do you feel that the proposed enhancements to local bus and cycle facilities are adequate?</p>	Noted.	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>No - The Cycle way / footpath shown on the Indicative Master plan will provide a good basis for safe and convenient cycling, but needs to ?</p> <p>Any development of the individual sites within the overall must also ensure that walking and cycling links can be made directly from one individual site to another, (preferably via traffic-free paths) and directly to the main spine route, to ensure that any permutation of trip start and destination can be made conveniently by foot or cycle. This should also apply to links connecting to adjacent existing residential or other areas of Rhoose, e.g. a link through the northwest corner of the site.</p>	Noted.	None.
<b>52: Frances Murphy</b>	<p>Q1.1 – Neutral</p> <p>Q1.2 – Neutral</p> <p>Q1.3 – Neutral</p> <p>Q2 – No</p> <p>Q3 – Don't Know</p>	<p>Limited existing services – next to nothing local employment. The airport between October to April has a winter service.</p> <p>Cul-de-sacs are a pain in the neck – there are too many</p> <p>There is a need for proper children's playing grounds – similar to the one on cliff walk Penarth.</p> <p>Youth shelter – something like a bus shelter without windows – allowing drinking and drugs...</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. However, the road layout shown on the illustrative masterplan is the Local Highway Authority's preferred arrangement.</p> <p>The draft development brief states that the area of public open space will incorporate a LEAP to serve younger children and a NEAP to serve children aged older children.</p> <p>Noted. The youth shelter will provide a much needed facility for older children in the area to meet</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q4 – No	There is a need for an indoor sporting and recreational facility with an indoor swimming pool.	up.  Disagree. In terms of leisure facilities, the existing Fontygary Leisure Park is in close proximity to the site and it would not be unreasonable to assume that residents may also choose to visit nearby Llantwit Major and Barry leisure centres which are easily accessible by public transport.	None.
	Q5 – Yes	As long as the Vale of Glamorgan follows through the money coming forward for school, library, playground.  Where is the pitch and putt golf course promised, pub and shops from the quarry development?	The draft development brief seeks section 106 contributions from the developer of the site to secure the upgrading / provision of such community facilities.  The problems on Rhoose Point are a separate issue to the consultation on the draft development brief. However, it should be noted that although the adopted UDP protects land at Rhoose Point for informal recreation and employment purposes, market forces determine whether sites are developed and the Council cannot influence this.	None.  None.
	Q6 – Don't Know			
	Q7 – Yes	The community recycling facility should have adequate parking.	Noted.	None.
	Q8-	OK	Noted.	None.

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q9.	<p>Don't let the Welsh Assembly Government rush the Vale of Glamorgan into anything – so they can get their money via the WDA</p> <p>600 houses, 600 cars on Porthkerry Road, did the AM member come along there at a busy time. He didn't even look at the site at all.</p> <p>Rhoose is now a town – more residents than Cowbridge and Llanblethian. Where are the shops and indoor leisure facilities comparable to Cowbridge? Parents have to transport children to Barry or Llantwit tennis courts – virtually unusable – teenagers and youngsters damage the nets – there has been no community tennis for two years. People have to go to Llantwit.</p>	<p>The draft development brief states that the Council will require a Traffic Impact Assessment of the site to be undertaken in order to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and to identify appropriate transport solutions.</p> <p>Noted. As stated above, the draft development brief seeks section 106 contributions from the developer of the site to secure the upgrading / provision of such community facilities.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None</p>
53: Leslie Miskin	Email	<p>Phase one of Rhoose Point has sewage problems and a lack of promised facilities.</p> <p>It is thus difficult to believe that any promises about facilities for phase two will be kept</p> <p>Please complete phases one satisfactorily before considering the second phase.</p>	<p>The problems on Rhoose Point are a separate issue to the consultation on the draft development brief. However, it should be noted that although the adopted UDP protects land at Rhoose Point for informal recreation and employment purposes, market forces determine whether sites are developed and the Council cannot influence this.</p>	None.
54: Mr R. D. Atwell	Q1.1 – Poor Q1.2 – Poor			

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q1.3 – Poor			
	Q2 – No	<p>Development plans should not be entertained as proposed until the full adoption of the existing roads and sewage systems on Rhoose Point.</p> <p>If a Section 38 Agreement is now partially in place, how has this been achieved as there is no Section 104 Agreement in place in relation to the Pentir y De access road to the development?</p> <p>Also, has a traffic impact assessment been undertaken to assess future traffic flows, as well as the feasibility of the railway level crossing at the existing development being used as a secondary access point for future development.</p>	<p>The problems on Rhoose Point are a separate issue to the consultation on the draft development brief.</p> <p>The draft development brief states that the Council will require a Traffic Impact Assessment of the site to be undertaken in order to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and to identify appropriate transport solutions.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
	Q3 – No	This should only be considered once access and adoption issues on the existing site have been resolved, including a proper traffic impact assessment.	Noted. Please see above.	None.
	Q4 – Yes			
	Q5 – No	There have been no facilities for residents as promised in relation to the existing development at Rhoose Point and they should be put in place before further development plans are entertained and even more residents arrive.	Noted. Although the adopted UDP protects land at Rhoose Point for informal recreation and employment purposes, market forces determine whether sites are developed and the Council cannot influence this.	None.
	Q6 - Yes			
	Q7 – Yes			

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	Q8 – No	<p>The rail facility should be improved with properly monitored CCTV coverage, more visible presence in policing disorder and damage in that vicinity, and also a footbridge should be installed to enable safe crossing by members to enable safe crossing by members of the public. At present, the barriers are frequently lowered well before the arrival of a train, and passengers frequently see their train arrive and depart but are unable to get to it before the barriers are raised again as there is no footbridge.</p> <p>There are many outstanding issues in relation to the present Rhoose Point development, most recently brought up by residents at the Councillors' Surgery at Rhoose Community Hall (02/09/06). These should be resolved before considering further development north of the railway line, which would only put even more pressure on the existing infrastructure in relation to sewerage, drainage and vehicular access. The present lack of facilities and amenities together with the continued issues of long-term unadopted roads and drainage, should be addressed to service existing residents and could then form the basis for a future development application north of the railway line to be realistically evaluated.</p>	<p>Noted. The existing station is currently covered by CCTV and the Council is seeking planning permission to install additional CCTV cameras to monitor the transport interchange. The safety of the existing level crossing at the station is a separate issue to the draft development brief.</p> <p>Noted. The draft development brief seeks section 106 contributions from the developer of this site to facilitate upgrading and / or provision of new infrastructure and community facilities required as a result of the new development.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
55: David Evans  Late Response (Received 13 <sup>th</sup> September)	<p>Q1.1 – Poor</p> <p>Q1.2 – Poor</p> <p>Q1.3 – Poor</p> <p>Q2 – No</p>	<p>Before considering draft development plan for proposed side serious considerations required regarding drainage and sewerage. Current problems on existing Rhoose Point Site after 6 years it is a disgrace that the Council have not adopted the roads / sewers etc. Sort this out first and advise intentions regarding the two open space sites on the estate.</p>	<p>Noted. However, the problems on Rhoose Point are a separate issue to the consultation on the draft development brief. The parcel of land adjacent to the transport interchange is identified for retail use on the Rhoose Point master plan and the parcel of land adjacent to the David Wilson Development is allocated for employment use in the adopted UDP.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
	<p>Q3 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q4 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q5 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q6 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q7 – No</p> <p>Q8 – Don't Know</p> <p>Q. 9</p>	<p>Try Fontygary or Fonmon Road for the location of the recycling site.</p> <p>Major concerns about –</p> <p>Exploration of existing aquifer, natural water flow over under fields.</p> <p>Increase in traffic leadings out of proposed site onto existing main perimeter road and congestion at main road roundabout i.e. – Rhoose Barry</p> <p>Overload on existing sewer system (problems enough already) leading to increase potential for flooding</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. However, the draft development brief acknowledges that there appears to be significant flooding problems in the area and that this issue will need to be reconsidered in the development of the site.</p> <p>The draft development brief states that the Council will require a Traffic Impact Assessment of the site to be undertaken in order to assess the potential impact of the development on the existing highway network and to identify appropriate transport solutions.</p> <p>Noted. Dwr Cymru Welsh Water and the Environment Agency have been consulted on the draft development brief (see above) and will be re-consulted on any</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>



Name / Organisation	Question Number	Comment	Council's Response	Changes
		<p>The Vale of Glamorgan Council, Arriva Trains Wales, WDA/WAG and Cofton estates after six years cannot come to any arrangement / agreement on adoption. What change therefore will there be on the new site agreements?</p> <p>Lack of local shops and recreation facilities for 10 to 14 year olds.</p>	<p>forthcoming planning application in respect of this site.</p> <p>Noted. However, as stated above, the problems on Rhoose Point are a separate issue to the consultation on the draft development brief. The draft development brief clearly sets out the planning and transportation requirements for this site and should therefore improve the efficiency of the planning process.</p> <p>The site already benefits form good access to local retail and recreation facilities. In addition, the new rail service provides residents with the opportunity to access additional facilities in Llantwit Major, Bridgend, Barry or Cardiff by public transport. In addition, the area of public open space shown on the indicative master plan incorporates a youth shelter, which will appeal to older children.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>



Prepared by  
The Vale of Glamorgan Council,  
Directorate of Environmental & Economic Regeneration,  
Dock Office, Barry Dock, Barry. CF63 4RT

[www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk](http://www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk)