

*The Vale of Glamorgan
Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011*

*The Council's Responses to Representations
Made to the Proposed Modifications
February 2003*

And

*The Further Proposed Modifications
October 2004*

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Issue: Affordable Housing

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 37 **Accession No.** 2960 **Modification No.** E51

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Affordable Housing

Organisation Welsh Assembly Government **Contact** Mrs. Elaine Ancrum

Representor No. 244 **Representation No.** 39 **Accession No.** 2837 **Modification No.** E48

Representation

(1) Proposed modification E48 does not seem to have been carried through to the related paragraph 4.2.7 (page 62) of the 1998 Deposit plan, which refers to "the inclusion of an element of affordable housing in a scheme where the site is suitable." The retained supporting text from the 1998 Deposit plan (para. 4.4.68, page 75) refers to a housing needs survey in 1994 and states that "the results of this survey assist in forming a more comprehensive means of identifying the level and geographical distribution of housing needs." There is no mention of any later survey in any of the subsequent modifications. It is uncertain whether a more up-to-date survey has been completed and taken into account. Similarly, paragraph 4.4.75 (page 77) refers to a "rural needs housing survey" which the "Council is to undertake during 1998/99." There do not appear to be subsequent modifications to this paragraph to update this information and again it is uncertain whether this survey has been carried out. (2) Policy HOUS 13 also states that "clear and adequate arrangements should be made to ensure that the benefits of such housing are secured for initial and subsequent occupants." However, it is noted that there is no mention in the supporting paragraphs of how this will be achieved, for example through Section 106 agreements. (3) Paragraph 4.4.68 (page 75) refers to the 1991 Census. It is presumed that this information is being updated to take account of the 2001 Census.

Desired Change

Clarify 1 - 3 accordingly.

Recommendation

Details regarding how the Council will seek to secure affordable housing will be subject to supplementary planning guidance, which the Council is currently preparing. This will also contain updated information on affordable housing needs as identified in the latest housing needs survey, as these figures will be subject to periodic review, the Council considers it inappropriate to include such data within the UDP.

On the basis of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Affordable Housing

Organisation Welsh Assembly Government **Contact** Mrs. Elaine Ancrum

Representor No. 244 **Representation No.** 40 **Accession No.** 2838 **Modification No.** E49

Representation

(1) Proposed modification E48 does not seem to have been carried through to the related paragraph 4.2.7 (page 62) of the 1998 Deposit plan, which refers to "the inclusion of an element of affordable housing in a scheme where the site is suitable." The retained supporting text from the 1998 Deposit plan (para. 4.4.68, page 75) refers to a housing needs survey in 1994 and states that "the results of this survey assist in forming a more comprehensive means of identifying the level and geographical distribution of housing needs." There is no mention of any later survey in any of the subsequent modifications. It is uncertain whether a more up-to-date survey has been completed and taken into account. Similarly, paragraph 4.4.75 (page 77) refers to a "rural needs housing survey" which the "Council is to undertake during 1998/99." There do not appear to be subsequent

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

modifications to this paragraph to update this information and again it is uncertain whether this survey has been carried out. (2) Policy HOUS 13 also states that "clear and adequate arrangements should be made to ensure that the benefits of such housing are secured for initial and subsequent occupants." However, it is noted that there is no mention in the supporting paragraphs of how this will be achieved, for example through Section 106 agreements. (3) Paragraph 4.4.68 (page 75) refers to the 1991 Census. It is presumed that this information is being updated to take account of the 2001 Census.

Desired Change

Clarify 1 - 3 accordingly

Recommendation

WITHDRAWN

Issue: Affordable Housing

Organisation Llandow Community Council **Contact** Mrs. Jean Fairclough
Representor No. 246 **Representation No.** 24 **Accession No.** 1891 **Modification No.** E51

Representation

We support modification E51 because we consider that exceptional sites for affordable housing should be permitted if all the criteria in Policy HOUS 14 are met and we support the criteria requiring adequate community and utility services (9) to be available. We have social housing in Llandow and we have first hand experience of the rural deprivation that can occur if there are inadequate community facilities. Similarly, in Sigingstone, we have experienced the adverse environmental impacts of inadequate utility services-no mains drainage.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Affordable Housing

Organisation Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru **Contact** Ryan Bowen
Representor No. 293 **Representation No.** 23 **Accession No.** 2779 **Modification No.** E51 (9)

Representation

From a water and sewerage undertaker's standpoint, the use of "community and utility" gives a more defined definition of services.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

AGRICULTURAL LAND

Issue: Agricultural Land

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 24 **Accession No.** 2947 **Modification No.** D017

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Agricultural Land

Organisation Land Division, Welsh Development Agency **Contact** Mike Cuddy

Representor No. 232 **Representation No.** 18 **Accession No.** 2828 **Modification No.** D017

Representation

The Council proposes to modify Policy ENV 2 such that best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected from irreversible development save where "exceptional overriding need" can be demonstrated. This wording does not correspond with national planning policy guidance, as now set out in Planning Policy Wales (March 2002). Paragraph 2.8.1 of that document refers to "overriding need" and not to "exceptional overriding need." The use of the word "exceptionally", which was included in former guidance - Planning Guidance Wales: Planning Policy – First Revision (April 1999) - has been omitted from the latest guidance.

Desired Change

Replace "Exceptional overriding need" with "overriding need."

Recommendation

AGREED. The Council accepts your recommendation to replace "exceptional overriding need" with "overriding need" in Policy ENV 2. This change reflects national planning guidance set out in paragraph 2.8.1 of Planning Policy Wales 2002.

Issue: Agricultural Land

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 121 **Accession No.** 2888 **Modification No.** D017

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Agricultural Land

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry **Contact** Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376 **Representation No.** 49 **Accession No.** 3063 **Modification No.** D017

Representation

We object to the new wording, particularly the word "irreversible" and the final use of "agricultural" instead of "development".

Desired Change

Delete irreversible; change final "agricultural".

Recommendation

The amendments made to Policy ENV2 are in line with the Inspector's recommendations (REC 3.15 and 3.16). The Inspector reasoned that the Policy overlooked the need to accommodate minerals development, subject to other minerals Policies. The Council accepts this reasoning and has amended the policy accordingly (MOD D017).

Therefore the insertion of the word 'irreversible' provides consistency between the plan policies and is in line with national guidance. In addition the wording of the latter part of the policy including the final 'agricultural' is in line with PCD006 which has been accepted by the former Welsh Office and the Inspector when he concluded that the change established an "important distinction concerning the degree of protection to be accorded features meriting conservation".

The word 'agricultural' is present to clarify that, whilst land may be considered low quality in agricultural terms, there may be other considerations, such as high landscape value, which outweigh the agricultural consideration that it is low quality. This matter is clarified in the supporting text.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Agricultural Land

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 3 **Accession No.** 2992 **Modification No.** D017

Representation

WTSWW support this modification

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Agricultural Land

Organisation **Contact** Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668 **Representation No.** 5 **Accession No.** 3084 **Modification No.** D017

Representation

1) Cofton Limited support the changes made to Policy ENV 2 and note in particular that the best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected from irreversible development, save where an exceptional overriding need can be demonstrated. 2) Cofton Limited consider that there is no overriding need to allocate land for development on the north of the railway line site in Rhoose (Policy HOUS1 (22)). This land is currently used for productive agricultural use and Cofton Limited considers that there is no overriding need for it to be developed. 3) Cofton Limited has elsewhere concurred with the overall strategy for development within the Vale of Glamorgan that is to focus development along the "Waterfront Strip" which includes settlements such as Rhoose. However, Cofton Limited considers that other more sustainable options for development in Rhoose have not been fully explored. There are other and better opportunities for more sustainable levels of development in Rhoose during the Plan period to 2011, which do not irreversibly destroy the County's best and most versatile agricultural land. 4) Other representations submitted by Cofton Limited propose the reallocation of land in Rhoose to more sustainable and less environmentally sensitive locations.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support in relation to MOD D017 is welcomed.

Please refer to the Council's other responses to your representations with regard to the revised Rhoose residential settlement boundary and the new housing allocation to the north of the railway line, Rhoose (Rep. Nos. 1668.8, 1668.9, 1668.24 and 1668.25 refer).

ARCHAEOLOGY

Issue: Archaeology

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 23 **Accession No.** 2946 **Modification No.** D009

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Archaeology

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 29 **Accession No.** 2952 **Modification No.** D049

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Archaeology

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 30 **Accession No.** 2953 **Modification No.** D050

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Archaeology

Organisation Dinas Powys Community Council **Contact**

Representor No. 262 **Representation No.** 12 **Accession No.** 2817 **Modification No.** M006

Representation

Support

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Issue: Built Environment

Organisation Cowbridge Local History Society **Contact** Mr. A.J.L Alden

Representor No. 13 **Representation No.** 6 **Accession No.** 1853 **Modification No.** D045

Representation

We support the modification but in the interests of accuracy the following should be noted: 1) "the development of Cowbridge directly relates to the Burgage plot pattern" (not "burgess" as in text). 2) "the walls enfold the important group of building facing Church Street...the South Gate, an ancient monument" (not "...South Gate; and ancient monument as in text).

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Built Environment

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 27 **Accession No.** 2950 **Modification No.** D045

Representation

The Town Council are pleased to see this amendment which they consider will be of great use to prepare a future appraisal and be protective of the conservation area.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Built Environment

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 28 **Accession No.** 2951 **Modification No.** D046

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

Issue: Built Environment

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 31 **Accession No.** 2954 **Modification No.** D053

Representation

The Town Council supports this representation.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Built Environment

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 32 **Accession No.** 2955 **Modification No.** D054

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Built Environment

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 109 **Accession No.** 2876 **Modification No.** D048

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Built Environment

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 110 **Accession No.** 2877 **Modification No.** D046

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Built Environment

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 123 **Accession No.** 2890 **Modification No.** C007

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Built Environment

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 142

Accession No. 2909

Modification No. D055

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Built Environment

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 143

Accession No. 2910

Modification No. D052

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Built Environment

Organisation Environment Agency

Contact Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247

Representation No. 92

Accession No. 3121

Modification No. D053

Representation

The re-use of demolition materials is supported.

Desired Change

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Built Environment

Organisation Environment Agency

Contact Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247

Representation No. 93

Accession No. 3122

Modification No. D055

Representation

The Agency supports the inclusion of the text. It is important that issues such as the creation of pathways for polluted materials to follow whilst developing on site, is addressed.

Desired Change

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Built Environment

Organisation Environment Agency **Contact** Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247 **Representation No.** 105 **Accession No.** 3134 **Modification No.** D052

Representation

Although the Agency supports the inclusion of reference to ponds and streams in criterion v of Policy ENV 18, we consider that this should be broadened to protect all water features and any flora and fauna dependant upon those features. Therefore the Agency objects to the proposed modifications to this Policy.

Desired Change

Criterion v - text amended to: "water features and associated flora and fauna."

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Built Environment

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry **Contact** Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376 **Representation No.** 53 **Accession No.** 3067 **Modification No.** D009

Representation

We object as the changed quotation is different and does not contain ref. to policies that "Development Plans should set out". The reason given "update guidance" is inadequate.

Desired Change

Delete and substitute a proper equivalent or comparable quote.

Recommendation

The proposed modification to paragraph 3.2.7 is a consequence in a change in national policy following the publication of Planning Policy Wales (March 2002). The paragraph that you are objecting to is a direct quotation from Planning Policy Wales, paragraph 6.1.2. This does not include the wording "Development Plans should set out". Consequently your objection refers to previous guidance, which is no longer valid.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Built Environment

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 13 **Accession No.** 3002 **Modification No.** D052

Representation

WTSWW support this modification

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

COASTAL ZONE

Issue: Coastal Zone

Organisation Barry Town Council

Contact Mr. Ian Harris

Representor No. 33

Representation No. 16

Accession No. 1752

Modification No. N001

Representation

The Council is of the opinion that the area of the town of Barry identified as developed coast (under Policy ENV 5 - East Vale Coast) includes certain anomalies in the way in which it relates to Barry Island. 1) It includes the area of informal open space that surrounds the ongoing residential development on Nell's Point. This land should be protected from future development at all costs. 2) It excludes the Island's principal tourist/visitor area (Paget Road, Friars Road and the Amusement Park) which is clearly "developed" and where future appropriate tourism projects should be encouraged.

Desired Change

The boundary of the area identified, as developed coast under MODN001 should be redrawn to - 1) Exclude the area of public open space which surrounds the residential development on Nell's Point. 2) Include Paget Road, Friars Road, the Amusement Park and the narrow strip of land between the railway and Station Approach Road.

Recommendation

The comments made by Barry Town Council in respect of the developed and undeveloped coastal zone designations are noted.

However, the Council considers that the public open space is directly associated with the residential development at Nells Point and that its inclusion within the designated developed coast area is justified. In addition, the concerns expressed are considered unwarranted as the area identified has been designated as public open space and remains within the ownership of the Vale of Glamorgan Council. The retention of this land for public amenity and its relationship with the development site was one of the key issues in the development brief for the site and its retention will be ensured by the application of policies within the Plan such as Policy REC 1 - PROTECTION OF EXISTING RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.

With regard to the exclusion of Paget Road from the designated developed coast area, the developed coast, the Council accepts the recommendation made by Barry Town Council and has amended the area accordingly to include the built up area between Barry Old Harbour, the promenade and the former Butlin's Holiday Camp within the area designated as developed coast.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the area identified as developed coast at Nells Point while the developed coast designation at Paget Road is amended as described.

CHANGE AS DESCRIBED

Issue: Coastal Zone

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 118

Accession No. 2885

Modification No. D027

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

Issue: Coastal Zone

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 119

Accession No. 2886

Modification No. D023

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

Issue: Coastal Zone

Organisation Environment Agency

Contact Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247

Representation No. 103

Accession No. 3132

Modification No. D023

Representation

It is noted that Policy's ENV5 - East Vale Coast forth bullet point does not protect the development itself against the risk of flooding.

Desired Change

The bullet point should either be expanded to include reference to the protection of the development itself or the policy is cross-referenced to Policy ENV 6.

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Coastal Zone

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 44

Accession No. 3058

Modification No. D025

Representation

We object that the study was not "comprehensive" but just looked at too narrow an "initial area" and did not put this out for public consultation. It needs to be done properly, with regard to shoreline management and conservation features and the Coastal Zone re-determined.

Desired Change

Put out new study for public consultation.

Recommendation

The Council is of the view that the representation by the Friends of the Earth Barry is not duly made as it proposes a new study and related public consultation to define a coastal zone for the Vale of Glamorgan. The Council has already defined a Coastal Zone for the Vale of Glamorgan and this has been subject to scrutiny and public consultation as part of the UDP process. In accordance with the Inspector's recommendation 3.26, the Council has made amendments to paragraph 3.4.17 merely to clarify the methodology used in defining the coastal zone boundary.

The Council is therefore of the view that while the current representation is pertinent to MOD D025, this does not allow for representors to seek wholesale reviews of those parts of the Plan that have already been considered by the Inspector.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Coastal Zone

Organisation Middleton Farm Trust

Contact Mr. Ian Hardy

Representor No. 521

Representation No. 1

Accession No. 1769

Modification No. N001

Representation

I support Proposed Modification N001 to the Vale of Glamorgan UDP (Deposit Draft), which proposes that the amendment of the developed/undeveloped coast at Rhoose. This Proposed Modification accords with the UDP Inspector's Recommendation (no. 3.27 and 4.81).

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Coastal Zone

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 5 **Accession No.** 2994 **Modification No.** D027

Representation

WTSWW support this modification

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Coastal Zone

Organisation **Contact** Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668 **Representation No.** 22 **Accession No.** 3101 **Modification No.** N001

Representation

1) Cofton Limited objects to the redefinition of the developed/undeveloped coast. Land north of the railway line at Rhoose should be returned to the undeveloped coast designation as set out in the Deposit Draft. This recommendation concurs with the other Representations submitted by Cofton Limited to delete the residential allocation of land at North of the Railway Line, Rhoose.

Desired Change

Recommendation

In his report on the objections received into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considers at 3.6, Policy ENV 5 - THE EAST VALE COAST. The Inspector concludes that as Policy ENV 5 makes a clear distinction between the developed and the undeveloped coast this distinction should also be evident on the Proposals Map (see Inspector's REC 3.27), this recommendation has been fully accepted by the Council.

The Inspector's report also considers at paragraph C19.3 the Issue: of the land between Porthkerry Road and Rhoose Point and concludes "that the access road to the Rhoose Point development provides a more appropriate, defensible and logical boundary for the residential settlement boundary of Rhoose. The development of Rhoose Point will clearly urbanise the character of this part of Rhoose and when approaching from the east the area will clearly be seen as lying beyond this access road which will need to be elevated in order to cross the railway line. Consequently, the visual effect of any new housing to the west of the road would be insignificant, either on the Coastal Zone or the overall setting of Rhoose."

Following on from his previous recommendation in respect of Policy ENV 5 (REC 3.27 refers) the Inspector further concluded that the development of the land to the north of the railway line site "would have no significant detrimental visual impact on the coast." and that "the boundary of the Coastal Zone should be the railway in that it is a consistent physical feature running along this part of the coast. The proposed development area at Rhoose Point should be designated as part of the developed coast as should be other developed areas in Rhoose."

The Inspector therefore recommended at REC 4.79 that the identified site is allocated for housing under Policy HOUS 1 and subsequent REC 4.81 removes the Coastal Zone designation and designates this land as part of the developed coast.

The Council accepts the Inspector's reasoning and recommendations on both these Issue: s and has redefined the developed and undeveloped coast and the allocated housing sites accordingly.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

COMMUNITY & UTILITIES

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation The National Grid Co Plc

Contact

Representor No. 7

Representation No. 3

Accession No. 1899

Modification No. L013

Representation

National Grid previously agreed with the Vale of Glamorgan Council on the insertion of a new paragraph 11.4.16 in the plan (proposed in April 1999), and withdrew their objection on this basis. In light of its inclusion in the proposed modifications document, National Grid would like to express their support for this.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Barry Town Council

Contact Mr. Ian Harris

Representor No. 33

Representation No. 18

Accession No. 1754

Modification No. L022

Representation

The inclusion of Policy COMM XXX - Additional Burial Land within the Unitary Development Plan is welcomed.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council

Contact Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52

Representation No. 21

Accession No. 2944

Modification No. C008

Representation

The Town Council supports this Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council

Contact Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52

Representation No. 49

Accession No. 2972

Modification No. L011

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 50 **Accession No.** 2973 **Modification No.** L006

Representation

The Town Council supports this Modification. However, it is understood that with effect from 27 March 2003 there are no longer day care facilities available at Southways and therefore the statement is factually incorrect. Those using the facility now have to travel outside the area.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Please note that paragraph 11.4.3 will be amended as a factual update to read: "The Rondel Resource Centre for the Elderly is located at Maes y Cwm Street, Barry. Additional day care provision is available at the Penarth Gardenhurst Resource Centre on Holmsdale Place. Further day care provision is available in the west Vale, though its location and service provider are currently being reviewed."

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 51 **Accession No.** 2974 **Modification No.** L017

Representation

The Town Council supports the proposed modification.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 52 **Accession No.** 2975 **Modification No.** L019

Representation

The Town Council supports the proposed modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 64 **Accession No.** 2943 **Modification No.** B011

Representation

The Town Council supports this modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Penarth Town Council **Contact** Edward Vick

Representor No. 234 **Representation No.** 6 **Accession No.** 1939 **Modification No.** L022

Representation

Penarth Town Council, as the Burial Authority for Penarth, fully supports and welcomes the proposed policy relating to additional burial land in the terms outlined. However, concern is expressed in relation to the supporting text - see separate representation form.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Penarth Town Council **Contact** Edward Vick

Representor No. 234 **Representation No.** 7 **Accession No.** 1940 **Modification No.** L022

Representation

Concern is expressed over the wording of the supporting text although the policy itself is welcomed (see separate representation). The site-specific reference to the Cogan Hall Farm development in the first paragraph of the text is worded in positive terms yet land previously identified for possible use would no longer appear to be available or suitable. Indeed the Vale of Glamorgan Council itself has sought planning permission to extend one parcel of land as part of Cosmeston Lakes Country Park (application number. 02/00062/FUL) and to develop another parcel of land as public open space (application no. 02/00061/FUL). Furthermore, there could well be drainage problems associated with the site and archaeological considerations. My understanding is that no other land has been identified for burial purposes as part of the Cogan Hall Farm developments. However, if land is definitely to be made available elsewhere, possibly in or around the Cogan Hall Farm site as a result of the land swap negotiated by the Vale of Glamorgan Council prior to the housing development coming on line, the text is supported. If not, a change in wording is needed.

Desired Change

In the light of comments in section 5 the reference to Cogan Hall Farm may require reconsideration. In the light of current uncertainty, the second paragraph of the text should include Penarth Town Council alongside Barry Llantwit Major Town Councils.

Recommendation

The Council notes the concerns expressed by Penarth Town Council in respect of additional burial land at Cogan Hall Farm. However, it remains the Council's intention to investigate this Issue: further as the development progresses and also to examine other opportunities within the Penarth area. Notwithstanding this, the Council accepts the difficulties in providing additional burial land on the site that have been brought about due to the change in circumstances that have occurred since the

inception of the policy and the granting of outline planning permission for the development.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 100 **Accession No.** 2867 **Modification No.** L022

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 101 **Accession No.** 2868 **Modification No.** LO21

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 102 **Accession No.** 2869 **Modification No.** L020

Representation

Desired Change

None]

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 103 **Accession No.** 2870 **Modification No.** L019

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 104

Accession No. 2871

Modification No. L011

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 105

Accession No. 2872

Modification No. L010

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 124

Accession No. 2891

Modification No. B011

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Welsh Assembly Government

Contact Mrs. Elaine Ancrum

Representor No. 244

Representation No. 45

Accession No. 2843

Modification No. L020

Representation

The Council consider that there are no suitable sites for windfarms within the authority area (reasoned justification of the

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Deposit plan para 11.4.35) but have included a policy addressing individual wind generators and turbines. On the Inspector's recommendation criterion I) of this policy now includes the phrase "areas of high landscape importance". However, there is nothing in the reasoned justification to explain what such an area is, and these needs clarifying. This may only require cross-referencing from the reasoned justification to the appropriate landscape protection policy or a brief explanation in the reasoned justification itself. As the policy is currently drafted the meaning of the phrase is unclear.

Desired Change

Clarify accordingly.

Recommendation

Welsh Assembly Government guidance on UDP's and sustainable energy contained within Planning Policy Wales 2002, states that in considering wind energy technologies, UDP's "may where possible and practicable, indicate broad locations or specific areas where wind energy developments are likely to be permitted. In defining such areas, it will be appropriate to balance the scale and contribution of such developments to certain levels of renewable energy against the sensitivity of the receiving environment."

The Council has therefore assessed the opportunities for wind farms and concluded that on a commercial basis at least, such opportunities do not currently exist within the Vale of Glamorgan. However, while this is considered the current position, changes in technology and siting requirements of such developments may occur and it is conceivable that suitable locations may become available in the future. Notwithstanding this, the Council is required to include policies on sustainable energy within their UDP's and policies COMM 5 and COMM 6 therefore meet this requirement and address wind generating schemes and other forms of sustainable energy.

The WAG's observation in respect of "areas of high landscape value" is noted. However, the Council considers that applications for development will be considered against all policies within the Plan. In this regard, policies within the environment chapter such as Policies ENV 4 - THE GLAMORGAN HERITAGE COAST and ENV XXX - SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS clearly indicate those areas of high landscape character and value within the Vale of Glamorgan.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Environment Agency

Contact Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247

Representation No. 99

Accession No. 3128

Modification No. L017

Representation

The text supports Planning Policy Wales Chapter 13, (May need to expand further rather than just quote PPW text).

Desired Change

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Environment Agency

Contact Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247

Representation No. 100

Accession No. 3129

Modification No. B010

Representation

Criterion ii should read: "Re-use of waste"

Desired Change

Recommendation

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Environment Agency **Contact** Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247 **Representation No.** 110 **Accession No.** 3139 **Modification No.** L022

Representation

The Agency objects to the proposed modifications to the above Policy. Burial sites have the potential to adversely impact upon the quality of water resources. This policy should be cross-referenced to Policy ENV6.

Desired Change

Policy to be cross-referenced to Policy ENV6.

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru **Contact** Ryan Bowen

Representor No. 293 **Representation No.** 18 **Accession No.** 2774 **Modification No.** D029

Representation

The inclusion of "quarrying operations" as an example underlines a typical engineering activity that should have regard to its operations which would degrade groundwater sources (a highly important source of potable water after treatment) to residents of the Vale of Glamorgan.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru **Contact** Ryan Bowen

Representor No. 293 **Representation No.** 32 **Accession No.** 2788 **Modification No.** L017

Representation

We fully support this new paragraph. As a statutory Water and Sewerage Undertaker, we always try to ensure that sufficient infrastructure exists for domestic developments. Where such facilities are stretched, Capital Investment under our 5 year Investment Plans usually remedy the problem. However, our planned investment is dictated by our Regulators, the Environment Agency and Ofwat, and therefore there may be instances where our planned investment may not coincide with development needs for which "lead in" times are required. The optimum use of existing infrastructure will ensure that developments proceed without detriment to existing customers. Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) reinforces this, in

particular the contents of Chapter 12. We would support the use of Planning Conditions and Related Section 106 Agreements of Town & Country Planning Act which may enhance the quality of development and enable proposals to go ahead which might otherwise be refused. Where development will create a need for extra facilities, in advance of an Undertaker's Regulatory investment, it may be reasonable for developers to meet or contribute towards the cost of providing such facilities.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Barry College

Contact

Representor No. 350

Representation No. 4

Accession No. 2915

Modification No. L010

Representation

Whilst the new policy is generally acceptable, and provides the College scope for marketing the site with the option of putting the facility to a potentially new use, they still have reservations regarding the exact wording of the policy, and the wording of the supporting text. (1) In respect of the wording of the policy itself, they are concerned that the criterion 6 badly states: "Highways and pedestrian access are improved to the appropriate standard." The criteria, potentially makes the College a hostage to fortune, as the College does not own or control any part of the adjoining highway frontage to Five Mile Lane. Consequently, the ability of the College to undertake access improvements is particularly limited, and in the event of such improvements being a pre requisite of any re-development and re-use of the site this would obviously create a ransom situation and may substantially prejudice proposals for the site. In the light of the fact that the site was initially used as an isolation hospital and has for many years been utilised as an educational facility as an annex to Barry College, it should be recognised that new uses which are no more intensive, or less intensive than the present educational usage should not require substantial access improvements. This would suggest that the paragraph in the supporting text should be amended to recognise this situation. (2)

Further, the need for criterion 7 requiring additional landscaping is somewhat unnecessary, as the whole site is surrounded by mature woodland and the existing buildings are largely invisible from the outside of the site itself. The need for any additional landscaping could be considered under the terms of the development brief and/or any planning consent that might be granted. (3) Whilst on the basis of the Inspector's Report in respect of COMM 2 and the proposed new policy, it is accepted that redevelopment of the site for residential purposes is not to be countenanced, given the type and nature of the permanent buildings already on site, the College would wish to maintain as a fallback position the option of utilising and converting the buildings for residential usage. This would permit the College a backstop in the event of the options for a more intensive redevelopment of the site not being realised. We should remind you that there are presently two dwellings on the site, the caretaker's house, an what must have originally been the Superintendent's house, but which is currently utilised as an office. In addition, there are three isolation wards, which could arguably be potentially converted to residential use under the terms of Policy ENv7. Such a use would provide a total of five dwellings served off a private drive, and the relatively low-key nature of the usage would obviate the need for highway improvements. Such a scenario would at least ensure that the College has a tenable fallback position in the event of all major re-development proposals for the site proving unsuccessful.

Desired Change

(1) The policy criteria should be qualified by inserting after improved "in respect of any major redevelopment" and the supporting text to read: "Where proposals involve a substantial increase in traffic over and above that associated with the existing use, the Council may require improvements to the existing vehicular/pedestrian access. Dependent on the buses proposed, such improvements may require the upgrading of the existing vehicular access and the creation of safe public linkages. All vehicular and pedestrian access improvements shall be undertaken in a manner that reflects the sensitivity of the site. (2) Delete criterion (7), which is superfluous. (3) In the supporting text in the last sentence of the paragraph 3, the words "re-use" should be omitted so that only the possibility of re-development of the site for residential purposes were discounted. This would, however, leave the avenue of a small-scale conversion/change of use option to the College, should other options prove unsuccessful.

Recommendation

MOD L010 is made as a result of Inspector's Rec. 11.4. The wording of Criterion (6) is considered to be appropriate given the Council's commitment to improving highway safety on 5 Mile Lane.

The Council considers that landscaping should play a critical part in the redevelopment of the site given its sensitive location, within a Special Landscape Area (UDP Policy ENVXXX refers).

The Council considers that the re-use and development of the site for residential purposes is inappropriate. Such a use would be contrary to national policy guidance contained within PPW and the sustainability objectives of the UDP. In addition, it would be contrary to several of the policies contained within the environment and housing chapter of the UDP.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.
NO CHANGE.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 20

Accession No. 3034

Modification No. L016

Representation

It should say that any new 132kV line via Sully and Penarth would have to be underground. Otherwise the alternative route following existing lines over to Leckwith and then down the Ely valley must be taken. Within the Vale's sensitive areas for environmental and landscape reasons, such new overhead lines must be carried on modern wooden trident-carrying poles. It should also restore mention of the old 33kV line, which the Council will seek to have this removed or at least carried via modern wooden trident-carrying poles.

Desired Change

It should say that any new 132kV line via Sully and Penarth would have to be underground. Otherwise the alternative route following existing lines over to Leckwith and then down the Ely valley must be taken. Within the Vale's sensitive areas for environmental and landscape reasons, such new overhead lines must be carried on modern wooden trident-carrying poles. It should also restore mention of the old 33kV line, which the Council will seek to have this removed or at least carried via modern wooden trident-carrying poles.

Recommendation

Para 11.4.16, of the Proposed Modifications document states that the Council will seek to minimise the effects of the provision of utility services on the environment through consultation with the relevant stakeholders. It proceeds, "In particular, new utility services in conservation areas, areas of attractive landscape and sites of wildlife importance should where feasible be placed underground or diverted so as to minimise their impact. Where services are placed underground, adequate measures should be taken to restore the land to harmonise with its surroundings. Where services are placed underground sites of nature conservation interest and archaeological importance should be avoided."

With specific reference to the Aberthaw Cardiff Bay route the Inspector, in his report (para.11.7.5 refers), states that "(the) line defined by the Plan is an indicative one and will fall to be examined in detail in relation to both its siting and its nature in the course of the statutory development control process". The Inspector also states that PCL005 "... provide(s) suitable guidance for the consideration of such proposals"(Rec. 11.8 refers). It is therefore considered that the use of wooden trident-carrying poles would be examined through the development control process.

The omission of the last sentence of Para.11.4.19 is as a result of an earlier objection made by SWALEC, for the amendment of paras. 11.4.17 - 11.4.19 to reflect current electricity supply development (and was supported by the Inspector).

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 21

Accession No. 3035

Modification No. L014

Representation

It should say that any new 132kV lines should be underground or, at worst, carried on modern wooden trident-carrying poles.

Desired Change

It should say that any new 132kV lines should be underground or, at worst, carried on modern wooden trident-carrying poles.

Recommendation

The Council has modified Para 11.4.19 in accordance with the Inspector's Rec. 11.8 to provide certainty about the operational requirements and improvements needed in the electricity distribution system in the Vale of Glamorgan during the plan period and also to conform with national planning policy. The form of this development will be considered in the course of the statutory development control process when matters relevant to planning can be addressed.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 22

Accession No. 3036

Modification No. L013

Representation

We propose adding that because of the environmental and landscape impacts; the Council will seek to have the old-style steel pylons replaced by modern wooden trident-carrying poles as is feasible for all but the highest grid.

Desired Change

We propose adding that because of the environmental and landscape impacts; the Council will seek to have the old-style steel pylons replaced by modern wooden trident-carrying poles as is feasible for all but the highest grid.

Recommendation

Whilst the Council supports the principle of replacing all but the highest grid voltage, old style steel pylons with modern wooden trident carrying poles, it is considered that it would be unreasonable to require statutory undertakers to do this. However, the Council will actively encourage their use through the statutory development control process, to reduce visual impact.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 23

Accession No. 3037

Modification No. L008

Representation

It should recognise other policies in the plan e.g. on coastal erosion (Sully hospital) and protection of ancient woodlands on the sites. In referring to Sully hospital. It should state that the Council prepared a planning brief and put it out for public consultation (but made no changes).

Desired Change

It should recognise other policies in the plan e.g. on coastal erosion (Sully hospital) and protection of ancient woodlands on the sites. In referring to Sully hospital it should state that the Council prepared a planning brief and put it out for public consultation (but made no changes).

Recommendation

Paragraph 11.4.7 seeks to provide greater clarity and certainty about the future use of Hensol and Sully Hospitals and the manner in which resultant planning applications will be assessed. It refers to a range of acceptable re-uses and forms of re-development at both sites and recognises other relevant policies in the Plan such as ENV 1 and in the case of Sully Hospital, policy ENV 5. Site specific Issue: s such as coastal erosion and the protection of ancient woodlands will be addressed in the respective development briefs. Therefore, the desired change is considered to be inappropriate.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 50

Accession No. 3064

Modification No. D015

Representation

Object to saying that reuse and redevelopment of redundant hospitals satisfies the criteria of ENV1.

Desired Change

Delete this item.

Recommendation

The insertion of a new paragraph after paragraph 3.4.2 was made in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation number 3.6. The Inspector states that "as both Hensol and Sully Hospitals occupy extensive sites outside settlements it is in my view illogical to omit buildings subject to policies COMM 2 and TOUR 1 from the permissible categories in policy ENV 1." The Inspector goes to state that "citation as an additional category under policy ENV 1 would be consistent with the reference to policy COMM 2 in PCD004, save for the insertion of 'redevelopment' in the new paragraph to be inserted. I consider that those changes are consistent with the protection of the countryside which policy ENV 1 fosters." The Council concurs with the views of the Inspector and has modified the supporting text accordingly. It is considered that MOD DO15 clarifies the appreciation of Policy ENV 1 and is consistent with the requirements of policy COMM 2.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation Orange Personal Communications Services Ltd. **Contact**

Representor No. 522 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 1771 **Modification No.** L019

Representation

Suggest that it could be better written to reflect TAN 19 and Planning Policy Wales.

Desired Change

Amend wording to reflect TAN 19 and Planning Policy Wales.

Recommendation

Withdrawn.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 2990 **Modification No.** B011

Representation

WTSWW support this modification

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 2991 **Modification No.** C007

Representation

WTSWW support this modification

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 4 **Accession No.** 2993 **Modification No.** D023

Representation

WTSWW support this modification

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 35 **Accession No.** 3024 **Modification No.** L021

Representation

WTSWW support this modification on p.167.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 36 **Accession No.** 3025 **Modification No.** L022

Representation

WTSWW support this modification on p.167.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation T. Mobile (UK) Ltd. **Contact**

Representor No. 1645 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 3078 **Modification No.** L019

Representation

(i) We support the usage of existing structures and therefore the inclusion of this policy that is accordance with TAN 19 paragraph 57. (ii) We support the inclusion of this policy that is accordance with TAN 19 paragraph 67 in regard to the siting and design of telecommunication developments. (iii) We support the inclusion of this policy that is accordance with TAN 19 paragraph 67 in regard to the impact of telecommunication developments within designated areas.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation T. Mobile (UK) Ltd.

Contact

Representor No. 1645

Representation No. 2

Accession No. 3079

Modification No. LO18

Representation

We would support the inclusion of this policy that complies with TAN 19 paragraph 46 in regard to the consideration of technical constraints of telecommunication developments.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Community and Utilities

Organisation

Contact Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668

Representation No. 17

Accession No. 3096

Modification No. L009

Representation

1) Cofton Limited supports the allocation of land at The Waterfront, Barry for a new school. In other Representations submitted on the Proposed Modifications, Cofton Limited has advocated the development of a new primary school at Rhoose. Cofton Limited therefore recommends that an additional allocation be made under Policy COM3 for a new primary school at Rhoose. The provisional location of the primary school is set out on Plan MRP2.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support for MOD L009 is welcomed. Please refer to the Council's other response to your comments with specific regard to Rhoose (No.s 1668.3-1668.25).

COUNTRYSIDE

Issue: Countryside

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 87

Accession No. 2854

Modification No. D001

Representation

Paragraph 3.1.3 is inaccurate as currently worded.

Desired Change

Amend paragraph 3.1.3 to read. The Vale has 22 Sites of Special Scientific Interest totaling 850 Hectares, 2 Local Nature Reserves, 7 Wildlife Trust Reserves incorporating 12 miles of the Glamorgan Heritage Coast stretching from Ogmere by Sea to West Aberthaw. This stretch of coastline includes the Dunraven Bay candidate Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The Severn Estuary at Penarth is a Site of Special Scientific Interest, Wetland of International Importance (RAMSAR Site), Special Protection Area (SPA) and a possible Special Area of Conservation (space).

Recommendation

AGREED. The Council accepts your recommendation that Paragraph 3.1.3 (MOD D001) be amended to read:

Recent development in the Vale of Glamorgan has been located very close to the main built up areas leaving the countryside relatively unaffected. However, the rural environment has been subject to significant changes in recent decades. Increasing pressure is being placed on the countryside due to changes in the rural farming economy and increasing demand for recreation and development. In an area as attractive as the Vale of Glamorgan, there is a great need to protect the rural environment not only to sustain its agricultural base, but to preserve its rich heritage for future generations, as well as for local residents and others to enjoy today. A testimony to the richness and diversity of the natural environment of the Vale of Glamorgan is the presence of a number of protective designations. The Vale has twenty two Sites of Special Scientific Interest totalling some 850 hectares, two Local Nature Reserves and seven Wildlife Trust Reserves incorporating twelve miles of the Glamorgan Heritage Coast stretching from Ogmere-By-Sea to West Aberthaw. This stretch of coastline includes the Dunraven Bay candidate Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The Severn Estuary at Penarth is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Wetland of International Importance (RAMSAR site), Special Protection Areas (SPA) and a possible Special Area of Conservation (pSAC).

Issue: Countryside

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 94

Accession No. 2861

Modification No. D012

Representation

CCW would like to express concern at ENV 1 criterion iv) as it would appear to permit any development in the open countryside that is compliant with any other policies in the plan.

Desired Change

Recommendation

The proposed modification (MOD D012) to Policy ENV1 of the UDP accepts the Inspector's reasoning that the policy was too restrictive and not in accordance with national guidance. The Inspector felt that there was scope to accommodate some development in the countryside, which should be advised via Policy ENV1.

The Council has accepted the revised wording of Policy ENV1 as laid out by the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.5) and feels that the wording is clear. The Council is confident that the overall strategic policies of the plan, including protection of the countryside, cannot be mistaken. In addition the supporting text states "This policy seeks to protect the countryside from inappropriate development" and as such the meaning behind Policy ENV1 is clear.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Countryside

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 96

Accession No. 2863

Modification No. D015

Representation

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

To ensure clarity and avoid confusion CCW recommend the inclusion of an exhaustive list of the policies under which criterion iv) of policy ENV 1 is relevant.

Desired Change

CCW recommend the inclusion of an exhaustive list of the policies under which criterion iv) of policy ENV1 is relevant.

Recommendation

The Council does not accept your recommendation that an exhaustive list of relevant policies should be provided within the paragraph to follow 3.4.2. The Council is confident that the development plan is clear and concise and does not wish to add unnecessary text that may result in confusion rather than clarification of the Policy.

Policy ENV1 should be read in conjunction with the supporting text and the UDP as a whole. The Council is therefore confident that the meaning behind the Policy is clear and does not require amendments.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Countryside

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 17

Accession No. 3031

Modification No. B002

Representation

Object to increased number of dwellings as contrary to national policy on sustainable development and to objectives in the Plan.

Desired Change

Review number of dwellings in accord with transport provision and make the number conditional (and defer subsequent permission/construction) on the road proposals said to be essential.

Recommendation

The proposed modification ensures that a continuous supply of residential land is made available throughout the plan period to meet the residual housing requirement (1010 dwellings) and housing provision (6079 dwellings 1998-2011). Sites have been identified by the use of a search sequence as required by Planning Policy Wales (March 2002). This sequence starts with the reuse of previously used land or buildings within settlements, then settlement extensions and then new development around settlements with good public transport links.

Consequently, The amended housing figure and has been undertaken in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations and accords to Planning Policy Wales 2002 which ensures that housing is made available over the plan period.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Countryside

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 19

Accession No. 3033

Modification No. D005

Representation

We object as the changed quotation is quite different and does not contain ref. to Habitats Regulations nor to policies that "Development Plans must include". The reason given "update guidance" is false or inadequate.

Desired Change

Delete and substitute a proper equivalent or comparable quotation.

Recommendation

The proposed modification (MOD D005) to amend paragraph 3.2.3 has been carried out to update the UDP in line with current national planning guidance. The quotation from the obsolete Planning Guidance (Wales) "Planning Policy" (1996) has been

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

replaced with text from the latest national planning guidance contained within Planning Policy Wales (2002). It is acknowledged that the revised paragraph does not specifically refer to the Habitats Regulations or policies that development plans must include. However, these issues are covered by other policies in the Plan, which must be read as a whole.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Countryside

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 51

Accession No. 3065

Modification No. D012

Representation

It does not allow exceptions for renewable energy projects for which a countryside location is advantageous but not essential; and because the word PARTICULARLY provides a loophole and adds uncertainty.

Desired Change

Delete "particularly".

Recommendation

Although the policy does not make specific reference to proposals for new renewable energy projects in the countryside, criterion (iv) allows for "development which is approved under other policies of the Plan." Policy COMM 5 in the Plan relates to renewable energy schemes and the new supporting paragraph to be inserted after paragraph 3.4.2 (MOD D015) acknowledges that such development may be appropriate in the countryside. The amendments to Policy ENV 1 are considered to be in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation number 3.5 and the addition of the word 'particularly' to criterion (iii) is not regarded to create a loophole or add uncertainty. In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Countryside

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 52

Accession No. 3066

Modification No. D014

Representation

MOD D014 Para. 3.4.2 is given as being changed following Planning Policy Wales 2002 but all changes are not given in bold type. One sentence "It will form the basis of Supplementary Planning Guidance, and will feed into the Countryside Strategy" is omitted, but the reason given as update of references to national planning guidance is inapplicable. We believe these mistakes invalidate the proposal, which would sneak in changes to (unboldened) text over which the Inspector had no objection. In any case we object to omitting the SPG and not covering the sustainable communities concept of PPW.

Desired Change

Show actual changes and consult on them as legally required. Replace omitted statement.

Recommendation

The changes to Paragraph 3.4.2 (MOD D014) were in fact carried out to update the UDP in line with current national planning guidance.

It would appear that a typographical error in the preparation of the Proposed Modifications document is responsible for some anomalies between bold and non-bold text. The Council acknowledges this mistake and apologises for the inconvenience.

With regard to the omission of the sentence "It will form the basis of Supplementary Planning Guidance" from the deposit draft UDP, the proposed modification (MOD D014) merely re-words this statement with the same meaning behind it. The revised paragraph 3.4.2 states: "This study includes an assessment of all of the components listed above and has provided a basis for landscape policy, management and design guidance." It is still the Council's intention therefore, to produce Supplementary Planning Guidance on 'Design in the Landscape' and 'Special Landscape Areas'.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Countryside

Organisation Contact Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668 **Representation No.** 20 **Accession No.** 3099 **Modification No.** D012

Representation

1) Cofton Limited supports the changes made to the policy and supporting text for development in the countryside. In particular, it is noted that the supporting text states that "(inappropriate) development can unacceptably affect agriculture and diminish the quality of the rural landscape". 2) Although the policy goes on to confirm that development which is approved under other policies of the Plan will be allowed in the countryside, it is considered that the large scale allocation north of the railway line at Rhose (Policy HOUS1 (22)) fundamentally conflicts with this policy. 3) The allocation at Rhose is on a visually sensitive site, which contributes to the rural context of the settlement. The land is currently used for agricultural purposes and acts as a rural gateway entrance into the settlement from the Airport and Cardiff to the east. If development should occur on the site, this landscape feature will be lost forever to the detriment of the whole of the Vale of Glamorgan. 4) Other Representations submitted by Cofton Limited propose that this allocation be deleted and be reallocated elsewhere in Rhose to more sustainable and less visually intrusive locations.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support in relation to MOD D012 is welcomed.

Please refer to the Council's other responses to your comments with specific regard to proposed changes to the Rhose settlement boundary and the housing allocation at land to the north of the railway line, Rhose (No.s 1668.3-1668.25).

Issue: Countryside

Organisation Contact Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668 **Representation No.** 21 **Accession No.** 3100 **Modification No.** D013

Representation

1) Cofton Limited supports the changes made to the policy and supporting text for development in the countryside. In particular, it is noted that the supporting text states that "(inappropriate) development can unacceptably affect agriculture and diminish the quality of the rural landscape". 2) Although the policy goes on to confirm that development which is approved under other policies of the Plan will be allowed in the countryside, it is considered that the large scale allocation north of the railway line at Rhose (Policy HOUS1 (22)) fundamentally conflicts with this policy. 3) The allocation at Rhose is on a visually sensitive site, which contributes to the rural context of the settlement. The land is currently used for agricultural purposes and acts as a rural gateway entrance into the settlement from the Airport and Cardiff to the east. If development should occur on the site, this landscape feature will be lost forever to the detriment of the whole of the Vale of Glamorgan. 4) Other Representations submitted by Cofton Limited propose that this allocation be deleted and be reallocated elsewhere in Rhose to more sustainable and less visually intrusive locations.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support in relation to MOD D013 is welcomed.

Please refer to the Council's other responses to your representations with regard to the revised Rhose residential settlement boundary and the new housing allocation to the north of the railway line, Rhose (Rep. Nos. 1668.8, 1668.9, 1668.24 and 1668.25 refer).

COWBRIDGE CATTLE MARKET

Issue: Cowbridge Cattle Market

Organisation Contact R.D. Allin

Representor No. 40 **Representation No.** 11 **Accession No.** 1688 **Modification No.** F044

Representation

Page 94 Deposit Draft 1998 UDP Policy EMP 12 Cowbridge Cattle Market. I strongly support Modification F044 following Recommendation 5.21 (and the deletion of Policy EMP 12) and the Inspector's comments. Also, for all the reasons placed before the Public Inquiry by all the objectors.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Cowbridge Cattle Market

Organisation Contact Mrs. Jane Tennant

Representor No. 253 **Representation No.** 7 **Accession No.** 1652 **Modification No.** F044

Representation

Support for the deletion of Policy EMP 12

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Cowbridge Cattle Market

Organisation Keep Cowbridge Special **Contact** Mr. D.A. Pain

Representor No. 254 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 1653 **Modification No.** F044

Representation

I fully support the Council's proposed modification to delete Policy EMP 12 for all the reasons contained in the Inspector's Report.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Cowbridge Cattle Market

Organisation Keep Cowbridge Special **Contact** Mr. D.A. Pain

Representor No. 254 **Representation No.** 3 **Accession No.** 1654 **Modification No.** F044

Representation

Keep Cowbridge Special supports the Council's decision to delete Policy EMP 12 from the UDP because this was our objective in making our original representations and in attending the Public Inquiry in June 1999.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

CYCLING

Recommendation

The establishment of a cycle route linking Dinas Powys and Cardiff via Cwm George and Cwrt yr Ala Lane is a matter that was considered by the Inspector in his report into objections received to the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan of November 2000. The Inspector considered the Issue: of cycling development within the Vale of Glamorgan and specifically Further Proposed Changes FPCF003 and FPCF004 which relate to the investigation of additional cycling routes within the Vale.

The Inspector considered that the proposals in the Plan had their origin in the 1997 Vale of Glamorgan Cycling Strategy and that they reflect the priority aim of the Council to provide for both commuter and recreational cycle travel between the Borough and Cardiff and along the coast. While being mindful that any extension to the cycling network would be subject to the availability of resources as detailed by FPCF04, the Inspector was of the view that FPCF003 and FPCF005 should be accepted and the Plan modified accordingly (REC 6.13).

Notwithstanding this however, the Inspector felt that to depict such routes on the main UDP Proposals Map would be misleading and would portray the routes as firm proposals rather than being subject to further detailed investigation and the securing of funding.

As yet, no detailed investigative work has been undertaken. However, it is considered that the link identified between Cardiff and Dinas Powys via Cwm George provides an ideal opportunity to develop a facility for both commuter and recreational cycling within the Vale of Glamorgan. The route can assist in achieving the objectives outlined in the Council's Cycling Strategy to develop a network of cycle routes within the Vale of Glamorgan and to increase the overall level of cycle use. It should further be noted that all of the routes identified at paragraph 6.4.25 are subject to the provisions of paragraph 6.4.24.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Cycling

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 34

Accession No. 3048

Modification No. 1024

Representation

We object to this attempt of the Council to wash its hands of the Aberthaw to Cowbridge cycle route. We want it replaced by a definite statement of intent, without which no funds could be secured. Other Councils negotiate rights of way, only in the extreme (Ceredigion) having to go for a CPO. The Aberthaw to Cowbridge route is important if cycling tourists are to be attracted to the Barry area.

Desired Change

We object to this attempt of the Council to wash its hands of the Aberthaw to Cowbridge cycle route. We want it replaced by a definite statement of intent, without which no funds could be secured. Other Councils negotiate rights of way, only in the extreme (Ceredigion) having to go for a CPO. The Aberthaw to Cowbridge route is important if cycling tourists are to be attracted to the Barry area.

Recommendation

Policy REC 12 – PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY AND RECREATION ROUTES (v) clearly identifies the development of the disused railway line between Aberthaw/Cowbridge/Pontyclun as an objective of the Council during the Plan period. The insertion of the new paragraph at 8.4.47 of the Plan as proposed by modification MOD 1024 merely clarifies the situation on the ground in that ownership of the disused railway line is now vested in multiple owners. It is therefore the view of the Council that the definite statement of intent required by the representation already exists in the policy commitment given by the Council and that no further amendment is necessary.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

DARREN FARM

Issue: Darren Farm

Representor Details

For organisations and individuals that have made a representation in respect of housing allocations at Darren Farm include in the below table; please refer to list of representations, which is to be found at the rear of this document

Representation and Desired Changes

A large number of "identical representations" were received by the Council in respect of the Proposed Modifications for the non-allocation of land at Darren Farm. Therefore for reasons of practicality the Council has prepared a composite list of all representations and has amalgamated these together alongside representation numbers, identical representations and desired change text.

Representor No's.

40	394	418	436	454	524	559
173	398	419	437	455	531	580
380	399	420	438	459	532	581
381	401	422	439	461	533	592
382	402	423	440	466	534	593
383	403	426	443	467	537	613
384	404	427	444	468	538	614
385	405	428	445	470	539	615
386	406	429	446	471	542	650
387	407	430	447	510	543	651
388	409	431	448	511	546	651
389	410	432	449	513	547	652
390	412	433	450	514	554	653
392	413	434	451	515	555	654
393	417	435	452	516	556	1640
					558	1650

Representation

This representation is in support of Proposed Modification MOD E13 to meet the housing need in the Vale of Glamorgan for the present Unitary Development Plan period 1996-2011, for the planning reasons based on Planning Policy Wales (2002) as stated in the above Proposed Modifications (February 2003) (pages 78 to 84) and in the UDP Statement of Decisions (February 2003) (pages 87 to 95). MOD E13 takes account of the revised need for additional dwellings in the Plan period and how this requirement will be met in a way consistent with Planning Policy Wales 2002, including the policy that Councils should seek only to identify sufficient land to meet their housing requirement (para 9.2.7 refers). The sites identified for housing development in MOD E13 result from the "search sequence" as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002 and those sites should be developed prior to the release of a greenfield site located outside the strategy of the Plan. In particular, this representation is in support of the exclusion of the site at Darren Farm, Cowbridge, as in MOD E13 (pages 83 to 84), from the land allocated for development in the plan period, and in support of the retention of the Llysworney bypass in Policy TRAN 2 as in MOD E13 (page 84), for the planning reasons given in the Proposed Modifications and Statement of Decisions sections cited above. Given the above and the lack of need for the inappropriate additional housing site at Darren Farm, Cowbridge; the proposed access and link road between the A48 and B4270 Llantwit Major Road is not necessary. The Llysworney bypass is the preferred solution to the diversion of traffic from that village.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Darren Farm

Organisation Bellway Estates

Contact Sue Bridge

Representor No. 126

Representation No. 19

Accession No. 1848

Modification No. E13

Representation

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Our Client objects to the Proposed Modification MOD E13. The Proposed Modification does not allocate land at Darren Farm for residential development as was recommended by the UDP Inquiry Inspector (Recommendation 04.44 refers). The Statement of Decisions that accompanies the Proposed Modifications does not set out good reason as to why Recommendation 04.44 should not be accepted by the Council. Our objection has regard to the following considerations: The UDP, as proposed to be modified, does not accurately reflect advice in Planning Policy Wales that requires a sustainable settlement strategy to be prepared. In this context the development needs of the Rural Vale continue to be given insufficient weight by the Council. The UDP Inspector concluded that the Plan's strategy and policies for the Rural Vale were too restrictive, whilst more up to date guidance in the form of Planning Policy Wales requires the majority of new developments in rural areas to be located in settlements where a sustainable pattern of development can be achieved. The UDP Strategy is justified by the Council on its consistency with Planning Policy Wales, however, a major failing of the Strategy continues to be that the needs of the Rural Vale are not being met in a manner consistent with Planning Policy Wales. The simple operation of a "search sequence" centred on the Waterfront Strip ignores advice in Planning Policy Wales as regards to rural area. The UDP Inspector recognised Cowbridge as a settlement that should accommodate new housing development both to meet the needs of the Rural Vale and in response to the large-scale employment proposals at Llandow. The Council argue that such needs can be met by housing opportunities and commitments available at Cowbridge, Llantwit Major and Ystradowen. However, the UDP Inspector knew all such opportunities when he concluded that Cowbridge should accommodate approximately 250 additional houses by 2011.

There is only a limited supply of new housing opportunities in Cowbridge. There can be no certainty that the site's allocated in Policy H1 at River Walk and The Limes will be developed during the Plan period. Similarly the amendment proposed to the settlement boundary North of the Town Hall cannot be relied upon to bring forward residential development. This land is constrained due to the extent of the River Thaw floodplain and in terms of access. Moreover, in the context of the search sequence in Planning Policy Wales, such sites are not previously used and are no different to the land at Darren Farm. The development at Darren Farm would bring substantial benefits to Cowbridge including the provision of an alternative to the Llysworney Bypass, and affordable housing. Such benefits will not otherwise come forward in the town. There is an urgent need to provide traffic relief for Llysworney, yet there is no prospect of the Council being able to secure the funding necessary to construct the Llysworney Bypass. The provision of the Link Road in association with residential development at Darren Farm provides the only opportunity to address traffic problems at Llysworney, which will be exacerbated as employment growth at Llandow continues. There is no good planning reason why Darren Farm should not be allocated for residential development. The UDP Inspector found there to be no overriding Issue: s, which would present the site's the site's development. Investigations conducted in association with planning application reference 01/00826/OUT and 02/01617/OUT confirm that Issue: s of ecology, archaeology, infrastructure, agriculture and landscape do not preclude the site's development for residential purposes.

Desired Change

Our Client proposes the further Modification of the Plan so as to allocate land at Darren Farm for residential development in accord with Recommendation 04.44 of the UDP Inspector's Report.

Recommendation

The Council is satisfied that it can adequately provide for the housing needs of the Vale of Glamorgan through the sites identified in the proposed modifications.

The reason for the rejection of the Inspectors recommendations 4.4.4 is fully outlined in the Council's Statement of Decisions.

In the view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Darren Farm

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 98 **Accession No.** 2865 **Modification No.** E12

Representation

CCW supports the exclusion of the Darren Farm site from the Councils proposed housing site.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Darren Farm

Organisation Llandow Community Council **Contact** Mrs. Jean Fairclough

Representor No. 246 **Representation No.** 19 **Accession No.** 1886 **Modification No.** E13

Representation

Modification E13 does not include the 'Darren Farm' site that was recommended by the Inspector for residential development. We consider that benefits of developing this site for housing are such that the Darren Farm site should be included in policy HOUS 1. The reasons that we would like to see the 'Darren Farm' site developed are: - the Inspector concluded that additional growth should be provided in Cowbridge or Llantwit Major to help relieve the development pressure caused by the growth of employment at the Vale Business Park and the Llandow Trading Estate and that this would not harm the strategy of the Plan of concentrating major development along the waterfront strip. He concluded that Cowbridge was preferable to Llantwit Major for this growth because it already has a small country town character with good public transport links, it has a high demand for housing, such a development would be sustainable and development at Cowbridge would help it to retain its service function in the rural Vale. Furthermore, he recommended that the Darren Farm site could fulfil this need. The Darren Farm development would also bring substantial environmental and safety benefits to Cowbridge and Llysworney through the provision of a new link road between the A48 and the B4270. The Council agreed a statement at the UDP inquiry that this development would: bring environmental and safety benefits to Llysworney; remove 15% of traffic from Cowbridge town centre; improve road safety on the Cowbridge bypass. The link road would bring economic benefits to the Western Vale by improving access to the 2 employment sites adjacent to the B4270 (Bale Business Park and the Llandow Trading Estate). There is potential for economic growth but existing and future business is hindered by poor access to these sites. An alternative Llysworney by-pass is most unlikely to materialise as evidenced by the fact that one has been promised for the last 30 years but funding has never been found. Realistically, funding is most likely to become available for a road solution through a financial contribution linked with a private development such as Darren farm. The alternative of a large development at Llysworney would harm the village character of Llysworney and would be an unsustainable development because of the lack of facilities and services there. In conclusion we consider that the Darren Farm site should be included as a residential development site during the plan period because it would have huge benefits for the Western Vale.

Desired Change

The Darren Farm site should be included in policy HOUS 1 as a site allocated for residential development.

Recommendation

The decision by the Council to not identify the Link Road construction that would be undertaken in association with Darren Farm is based on the Council's rejection to the Inspectors recommendations 4.44, 4.45 and 6.07. The justification for this is being that the sites identified in the proposed modifications satisfy the Council's housing land requirement over the Plan period, and that these sites have been allocated in accordance with the 'search sequence' required by Planning Policy Wales (2002). This sequence starts with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements, then settlement extensions and then new development around settlements with good transport links.

The reason for the rejection of the Inspectors recommendations 4.4.4, 4.45 and 6.07, which relate to this matter is fully outlined in the Council's Statement of Decisions.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Darren Farm

Organisation Llandow Community Council **Contact** Mrs. Jean Fairclough

Representor No. 246 **Representation No.** 20 **Accession No.** 1887 **Modification No.** E12

Representation

Modification E12 does not include the 'Darren Farm' site, that was recommended by the Inspector for residential development. We consider that benefits of developing this site for housing are such that the Darren Farm site should be included in policy HOUS 1. The reasons that we would like to see the 'Darren Farm' site developed are: - the Inspector concluded that additional growth should be provided in Cowbridge or Llantwit Major to help relieve the development pressure caused by the growth of employment at the Vale Business Park and the Llandow Trading Estate and that this would not harm the strategy of the Plan of concentrating major development along the waterfront strip. He concluded that Cowbridge was preferable to Llantwit Major for this growth because it already has a small country town character with good public transport links, it has a high demand for housing, such a development would be sustainable and development at Cowbridge would help it to retain its service function in the rural Vale. Furthermore, he recommended that the Darren Farm site could fulfil this need. The Darren Farm development would also bring substantial environmental and safety benefits to Cowbridge and Llysworney through the provision of a new link road between the A48 and the B4270. The Council agreed a statement at the UDP inquiry that this development would: bring environmental and safety benefits to Llysworney; remove 15% of traffic from Cowbridge town centre; improve road safety on the Cowbridge bypass. The link road would bring economic benefits to the Western Vale by improving access to the 2 employment sites adjacent to the B4270 (Bale Business Park and the Llandow Trading Estate). There is potential for economic growth but existing and future business is hindered by poor access to these sites. An alternative Llysworney by-pass is most unlikely to materialise as evidenced by the fact that one has been promised for the last 30 years but funding has never been found. Realistically, funding is most likely to become available for a road solution through a financial contribution linked with a private development such as Darren farm. The alternative of a large development at Llysworney would harm the village

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

character of Llysworney and would be an unsustainable development because of the lack of facilities and services there. In conclusion we consider that the Darren Farm site should be included as a residential development site during the plan period because it would have huge benefits for the Western Vale.

Desired Change

Policy HOUS1 should also include Darren Farm.

Recommendation

The decision by the Council to not identify the Link Road construction that would be undertaken in association with Darren Farm is based on the Council's rejection to the Inspectors recommendations 4.44, 4.45 and 6.07. The justification for this is being that the sites identified in the proposed modifications satisfy the Council's housing land requirement over the Plan period, and that these sites have been allocated in accordance with the 'search sequence' required by Planning Policy Wales (2002). This sequence starts with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements, then settlement extensions and then new development around settlements with good transport links.

Consequently the Council is of the opinion that the inclusion of the Link road would inconsistent with the plan on the basis that the Council considers that it can meet its housing requirements without the need to allocate the Darren Farm site for housing.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Darren Farm

Organisation Llandow Community Council

Contact Mrs. Jean Fairclough

Representor No. 246

Representation No. 26

Accession No. 1893

Modification No. F033

Representation

We support the pollution based criteria to be applied in respect on B2 development as we consider that existing and future users of the site and neighbours are entitled to unpolluted air. We do not want future development to be prejudiced by a polluting industry.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Darren Farm

Organisation

Representor No. 379 380 **Representation No.** 1

Contact S.A. Thomas

Accession No. 1608 **Modification No.** E13

Representation

This representation is in support of Proposed Modification MOD E13 to meet the housing need in the Vale of Glamorgan for the present Unitary Development Plan period 1996-2011, for the planning reasons based on Planning Policy Wales (2002) as stated in the above Proposed Modifications (February 2003) (pages 71 to 84) and in the UDP Statement of Decisions (February 2003) (pages 87 to 95). In particular, this representation is in support of the exclusion of the site at Darren Farm, Cowbridge from the land allocated for development in the plan period, and in support of the retention of the Llysworney bypass in Policy TRAN 2 for the planning reasons given in the Proposed Modifications and Statement of Decisions sections cited above.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Darren Farm

Organisation Contact Mr. & Mrs. L. Evans

Representor No. 381 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 1609 **Modification No.** E13

Representation

This representation is in support of Proposed Modification MOD E13 to meet the housing need in the Vale of Glamorgan for the present Unitary Development Plan period 1996-2011, for the planning reasons based on Planning Policy Wales (2002) as stated in the above Proposed Modifications (February 2003) (pages 78 to 84) and in the UDP Statement of Decisions (February 2003) (pages 87 to 95). MOD E13 takes account of the revised need for additional dwellings in the Plan period and how this requirement will be met in a way consistent with Planning Policy Wales 2002, including the policy that Councils should seek only to identify sufficient land to meet their housing requirement (para 9.2.7 refers). The sites identified for housing development in MOD E13 result from the "search sequence" as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002 and those sites should be developed prior to the release of a greenfield site located outside the strategy of the Plan. In particular, this representation is in support of the exclusion of the site at Darren Farm, Cowbridge, as in MOD E13 (pages 83 to 84), from the land allocated for development in the plan period, and in support of the retention of the Llysworney bypass in Policy TRAN 2 as in MOD E13 (page 84), for the planning reasons given in the Proposed Modifications and Statement of Decisions sections cited above. Given the above and the lack of need for the inappropriate additional housing site at Darren Farm, Cowbridge; the proposed access and link road between the A48 and B4270 Llantwit Major Road is not necessary. The Llysworney bypass is the preferred solution to the diversion of traffic from that village.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Darren Farm

Organisation Contact Mr. Richard Griffiths

Representor No. 391 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 1619 **Modification No.** E13

Representation

We write to support the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan (as amended 2003) (including the associated Statement of Decisions and Proposed Modifications) especially as they relate to Darren Farm Cowbridge and the exclusion of the farm from land allocated for development. Equally we oppose the Bellway planning applications and appeals (1095305 and 1108352) to be heard at the Public Inquiry in Cowbridge on 8th to 11th April 2003. Our reasons include: 1) Application is contrary to the Vale UDP 2) Under capacity of local services (e.g. schools, sewerage, roads etc) 3) Increased flooding risk in Cowbridge and the consequent adverse effect downriver in Llanblethian 4) Biodiversity Issue: s. Item 30 is of particular importance to us and we would be very grateful for the Council's supportive representation at the Inquiry.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Darren Farm

Organisation Contact Rosalin Norris

Representor No. 400 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 1628 **Modification No.** E13

Representation

This representation is in support of Proposed Modification MOD E13 to meet the housing need in the Vale of Glamorgan for the present Unitary Development Plan period 1996-2011, for the planning reasons based on Planning Policy Wales (2002) as stated in the above Proposed Modifications (Feb. 2003) (pages 71 to 84) and in the UDP Statement of Decisions (February 2003) (pages 87 to 95). In particular, this representation is in support of the exclusion of the site at Darren Farm, Cowbridge, from the land allocated for development in the plan period, and in support of the retention of the Llysworney bypass in Policy

TRAN 2 for the planning reasons given in the Proposed Modifications and Statement of Decisions sections cited above.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Darren Farm

Organisation History Society

Contact Mrs. D. Thomas

Representor No. 458

Representation No. 1

Accession No. 1686

Modification No. E13

Representation

This representation is in support of Proposed Modification MOD E13 to meet the housing need in the Vale of Glamorgan for the present Unitary Development Plan period 1996-2011, for the planning reasons based on Planning Policy Wales (2002) as stated in the above Proposed Modifications (February 2003) (pages 78 to 84) and in the UDP Statement of Decisions (February 2003) (pages 87 to 95). MOD E13 takes account of the revised need for additional dwellings in the Plan period and how this requirement will be met in a way consistent with Planning Policy Wales 2002, including the policy that Councils should seek only to identify sufficient land to meet their housing requirement (para 9.2.7 refers). The sites identified for housing development in MOD E13 result from the "search sequence" as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002 and those sites should be developed prior to the release of a greenfield site located outside the strategy of the Plan. In particular, this representation is in support of the exclusion of the site at Darren Farm, Cowbridge, as in MOD E13 (pages 83 to 84), from the land allocated for development in the plan period, and in support of the retention of the Llysworney bypass in Policy TRAN 2 as in MOD E13 (page 84), for the planning reasons given in the Proposed Modifications and Statement of Decisions sections cited above. Given the above and the lack of need for the inappropriate additional housing site at Darren Farm, Cowbridge; the proposed access and link road between the A48 and B4270 Llantwit Major Road is not necessary. The Llysworney bypass is the preferred solution to the diversion of traffic from that village. There must be a new primary school before families move in!!

Desired Change

There must be a new primary school built before any new house, let alone new comprehensive school.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Darren Farm

Organisation

Contact Mrs. Mary Lycett

Representor No. 581

Representation No. 1

Accession No. 1831

Modification No. E13

Representation

This representation is in support of Proposed Modification MOD E13 to meet the housing need in the Vale of Glamorgan for the present Unitary Development Plan period 1996-2011, for the planning reasons based on Planning Policy Wales (2002) as stated in the above Proposed Modifications (February 2003) (pages 78 to 84) and in the UDP Statement of Decisions (February 2003) (pages 87 to 95). MOD E13 takes account of the revised need for additional dwellings in the Plan period and how this requirement will be met in a way consistent with Planning Policy Wales 2002, including the policy that Councils should seek only to identify sufficient land to meet their housing requirement (para 9.2.7 refers). The sites identified for housing development in MOD E13 result from the "search sequence" as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002 and those sites should be developed prior to the release of a greenfield site located outside the strategy of the Plan. In particular, this representation is in support of the exclusion of the site at Darren Farm, Cowbridge, as in MOD E13 (pages 83 to 84), from the land allocated for development in the plan period, and in support of the retention of the Llysworney bypass in Policy TRAN 2 as in MOD E13 (page 84), for the planning reasons given in the Proposed Modifications and Statement of Decisions sections cited above. Given the above and the lack of need for the inappropriate additional housing site at Darren Farm, Cowbridge; the proposed access and link road between the A48 and B4270 Llantwit Major Road is not necessary. The Llysworney bypass is the preferred solution to the diversion of traffic from that village.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Darren Farm

Organisation

Contact Mr. Neil McLean

Representor No. 591

Representation No. 1

Accession No. 1849

Modification No. E13

Representation

Representations in support of the decision to reject proposed modification MOD E32 and to exclude the Darren Farm site from the housing allocations under Policy HOUS 1 of the Unitary Development Plan. 1) The allocation of this land for residential development would have conflicted with national planning guidance and with Part 1 and Part 2 policies within the Vale of Glamorgan UDP, which encourage new development to locate where it would minimise the need to travel, particularly by car. Residential development here would not be within easy walking distance of commercial, retail and community facilities within Cowbridge and the new residents would have a greater propensity to use a motor car to gain access to these facilities. 2) This area of open countryside lying beyond the settlement boundary for Cowbridge. Accordingly, the allocation of the land for residential development would have conflicted with government policies for the protection of the countryside and with Part 1 and Part 2 policies within the UDP. 3) The Inspector who considered the UDP concluded that there was a need for the provision of 250 dwellings in the Cowbridge area during the remainder of the plan period. However, there has not been a sufficiently rigorous urban capacity study undertaken within the proposed modified settlement boundary for Cowbridge, or within the Vale of Glamorgan as a whole, to determine whether there are other more suitable sites to accommodate these new dwellings, before it becomes necessary to identify a green-field site in the open countryside. In his report into the objections to the UDP, the inspector at paragraph 9 of page (ii) recommended the inclusion of the Darren Farm site within Policy HOUS 1. However, he also made the point that it was for the Council to determine whether there were other more suitable sites that had not been put before him for consideration. A more rigorous urban capacity study within the modified settlement boundary for Cowbridge and in the Vale of Glamorgan as a whole would identify more suitable sites for housing than the Darren Farm site. 4) New residential development here could have increased the population of Cowbridge by as much as 10%.

Cowbridge is already experiencing a chronic shortage of off-street parking facilities, especially at peak times. The parking problem manifests itself in a number of ways, some of which have been described in Chapter 4 of the Cowbridge Walled Town Study (commissioned by your Council in 1996). No specific provision has been made in the UDP to address the parking problem and an influx of new population, relying on the car to gain access to Cowbridge, would have only exacerbated the situation. 5) The UDP has already identified a deficit of playing fields in the Cowbridge area of 2.33 hectares and some of the existing facilities that have been identified recently have been occupied by new development at Cowbridge Comprehensive School. Accordingly, there is now a deficit of at least 3.60 hectares in playing field provision for Cowbridge. In an area with a population of more than 6000 people, there is only one full sized soccer pitch. An influx of new population would only have exacerbated the problem of lack of playing fields. There were no specific provisions within the UDP to address these problems and no policies to ensure that housing development at Darren Farm would make any additional provision by way of planning gain. 6) The increase in the population of Cowbridge would have lead to an unmanageable demand on medical, educational and other community services within the town. There were no specific provisions within the UDP to address these problems and no policies to ensure that housing development at Darren farm would make any additional provision by way of planning gain. 8) Paragraph 9.2.5 of Planning Policy Wales - March 2002 states that proposed housing sites must be free, or readily freed from planning physical and ownership constraints and capable of being developed economically. However, this is not the case at the Darren Farm site. The existing tenant farmer has a lifetime tenancy agreement with the landowners and, therefore, controls a significant part of the proposed housing site and land over which the proposed link road would run. The tenant farmer has objected in principle to the planning applications, which have been submitted on the site. Accordingly, the site cannot be described as being free from ownership constraints. 8) With reference to Paragraph 9.2.5 of Planning Policy Wales, it must also be questionable whether the site would be capable of being developed economically of the following reasons: (i) The development of housing here would require the installation of large scale surface water storage and run-off attenuation facilities to prevent flooding in the western part of Cowbridge. (ii) The EA has advised that the site is located on a sensitive aquifer and measures would be required to prevent contamination during and after construction of the houses. (iii) To implement a housing and road scheme of this scale, the developer must be requires to provide substantial off-site highway and other infrastructure improvements, which the Traffic Assessments Report that has been prepared by the developers does not mention. For example, there would need to be a road widening and improvement scheme along much of the B4270 to Llandow to compensate for the additional traffic that would be diverted away from Llysworney village. Whether it would be feasible or economic to provide these off-site improvements as part of the scheme are matters that the report did not address. There were no specific provisions within the UDP to address these problems and no policies in the UDP or in the LTP to ensure that housing development at Darren Farm would provide these highway improvements by way of planning gain. (iv) This is highly visible site that would require a comprehensive soft landscaping to reduce its impact in the landscape. Not only would there be a need for substantial woodland and hedgerow planting, there would also be a need for a fund to ensure the preservation and maintenance of these trees and hedgerows in perpetuity. (v) Cowbridge already needs a wider range of housing choice, because it has insufficient 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings to cater for smaller households. The substantial costs of developing this site for housing would encourage the developers to construct the most profitable housing types and not to cater for the needs of smaller households. 9) This is an area, which is important as a local wildlife habitat. There are alternative sites in the Vale of Glamorgan that could accommodate housing development that are less sensitive in terms of nature conservation. Accordingly, the allocation of the land for residential development would have conflicted with government policies and with Part 2 policies in the UDP. 10) This is an area, which is important for historical and archaeological reasons. There are alternative sites in the Vale of Glamorgan that could accommodate housing development that are not as significant in historical and archaeological terms. Accordingly, the allocation of the land for residential development would have conflicted with government policies and with Part 2 policies in the UDP.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Darren Farm

Organisation Glamorgan Bird Club

Contact Mr. R Nottage

Representor No. 604

Representation No. 1

Accession No. 1868

Modification No. M005

Representation

MOD M005 states that the Council intends to prepare further supplementary planning guidance (SPG) in respect of nature conservation. I support this modification in principle but request that more detail is included.

Desired Change

I request that the following documents are specifically included in brackets following "nature conservation", listed as a topic the Council intends to prepare further SPG in respect of, under M005, Appendix 8: A Nature Conservation Strategy for the Vale of Glamorgan The Vale of Glamorgan Local Biodiversity Action Plan i.e. to appear as: Nature Conservation (A Nature Conservation Strategy for the Vale of Glamorgan; The Vale of Glamorgan Biodiversity Action Plan).

Recommendation

The documents that you refer to above are not specifically related to land use issues, which is the intention of supplementary planning guidance. However, in preparing supplementary guidance such documents would be used to inform this guidance. On this basis the Council considers it inappropriate to refer to non-planning documents within this section of the UDP. In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Darren Farm

Organisation

Contact Rebecca Exley

Representor No. 1652

Representation No. 1

Accession No. 2807

Modification No. E13

Representation

I am pleased to see the housing development allocation on the land at Darren Farm, Cowbridge removed. Any building on this land would result in a worsening of the flooding in Westgate, Cowbridge and subsequently flooding in Llanblethian by the River Thaw. The Middlegate Court development has been acknowledged to be a contributing factor to the River Thaw floods in recent years. Fears of further flooding mean we cannot accept further development of the River Thaw catchment.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

DESIGN OF NEW DEVELOPMENTS

Issue: Design of New Developments

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 33 **Accession No.** 2956 **Modification No.** DO57

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Design of New Developments

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 141 **Accession No.** 2908 **Modification No.** D057

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Issue: Design of New Developments

Organisation Environment Agency **Contact** Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247 **Representation No.** 94 **Accession No.** 3123 **Modification No.** D056

Representation

The inclusion of adequate waste management within new development is supported.

Desired Change

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Design of New Developments

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 14 **Accession No.** 3003 **Modification No.** D057

Representation

WTSWW support this modification.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

DEVELOPMENT INVOLVING HORSES

Issue: Developments involving horses

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 26 **Accession No.** 2949 **Modification No.** D033

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Developments involving horses

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 116 **Accession No.** 2883 **Modification No.** D033

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Developments involving horses

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry **Contact** Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376 **Representation No.** 42 **Accession No.** 3056 **Modification No.** D033

Representation

We object to the words "unacceptably affect" as weaker and more subjective than the existing "detract from".

Desired Change

Delete the change.

Recommendation

The Vale of Glamorgan Council, during the Deposit stage of the Unitary Development Plan, accepted to amend Policy ENV08, as a result of an objection made by the Country Landowners Association. The objection stated "If the word 'detract' is not qualified, any 'detraction' could be the basis of a refusal of planning permission". The wording 'unacceptably affect' therefore replaces 'detract from' - is maintained by the Council. It is refuted that 'unacceptably affect' constitutes a weaker and more subjective meaning than 'detract from'. The Inspector considered this Issue: and recommended no modification be made to this Policy (Rec. 3.32 refers).

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

GENERAL HOUSING

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Cowbridge Local History Society **Contact** Mr. A.J.L Alden

Representor No. 13 **Representation No.** 4 **Accession No.** 1851 **Modification No.** E13

Representation

This representation is in support of Proposed Modification MOD E13 to meet the housing need in the Vale of Glamorgan for the present Unitary Development Plan period 1996-2011, for the planning reasons based on Planning Policy Wales (2002) as stated in the above Proposed Modifications (February 2003) (pages 78 to 84) and in the UDP Statement of Decisions (February 2003) (pages 87 to 95). MOD E13 takes account of the revised need for additional dwellings in the Plan period and how this requirement will be met in a way consistent with Planning Policy Wales 2002, including the policy that Councils should seek only to identify sufficient land to meet their housing requirement (para 9.2.7 refers). The sites identified for housing development in MOD E13 result from the "search sequence" as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002 and those sites should be developed prior to the release of a greenfield site located outside the strategy of the Plan. In particular, this representation is in support of the exclusion of the site at Darren Farm, Cowbridge, as in MOD E13 (pages 83 to 84), from the land allocated for development in the plan period, and in support of the retention of the Llysworney bypass in Policy TRAN 2 as in MOD E13 (page 84), for the planning reasons given in the Proposed Modifications and Statement of Decisions sections cited above. Given the above and the lack of need for the inappropriate additional housing site at Darren Farm, Cowbridge; the proposed access and link road between the A48 and B4270 Llantwit Major Road is not necessary. The Llysworney bypass is the preferred solution to the diversion of traffic from that village.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 35 **Accession No.** 2958 **Modification No.** E27

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 36 **Accession No.** 2959 **Modification No.** E33

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 38 **Accession No.** 2961 **Modification No.** F005

Representation

The Town Council supports Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation **Contact** Mr. C.W. Kipling

Representor No. 60 **Representation No.** 6 **Accession No.** 2796 **Modification No.** E13

Representation

Ystradowen has experienced significant growth and I support the UDP so that no further significant housing development takes place.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Penllyn Community Council **Contact** Mr. C. Kipling

Representor No. 159 **Representation No.** 8 **Accession No.** 2793 **Modification No.** E13

Representation

Penllyn Community Council has had the opportunity to review the proposed modifications to the UDP Draft of 1998 - February 2003. We would wish to confirm our previous comments and ask that they be considered as part of the consultation process. We especially support MOD E13 page 78 as applied to site (12) at Ystradowen where no further large-scale development is proposed for the village. We are particularly concerned to see the development boundary is maintained around the village.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Grenville Estates **Contact** John G Taylor

Representor No. 223 **Representation No.** 3 **Accession No.** 1897 **Modification No.** E12

Representation

My clients support the proposed modification to include land at Palmerstone Lane Business Centre as a housing allocation under the terms of revised policy HOUS1. The Council's proposed modification is entirely consistent with the Inspector's

recommendations pursuant to the UDP public inquiry.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 90

Accession No. 2857

Modification No. E07

Representation

CCW object to the modification as currently worded and suggests the addition of: "...previously developed land where there is no significant nature conservation interest, is used in preference..."

Desired Change

The addition of... "...previously developed land where there is no significant nature conservation interest, is used in preference..."

Recommendation

The Council considers that the addition of "previously developed land, where there is no significant nature conservation interest" is unnecessary as such issues are addressed elsewhere in the plan.

For instance paragraph point 6 of 4.2.4, indicates that consideration shall be given to " The physical and environmental constraints on the development of land"

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 138

Accession No. 2905

Modification No. E45

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Llandow Community Council

Contact Mrs. Jean Fairclough

Representor No. 246

Representation No. 18

Accession No. 1885

Modification No. MOD N047

Representation

The inspector advised (para. 3.3.6 of Vol1 of Report of the Objections) that the inclusion of the settlements in policy HOUS 2 should be based on settlement capacity studies to identify factors of form and capacity, including such features as drainage, public transport, services etc. In this regard we consider that the settlement of Llandow is not acceptable for infilling and rounding off and should not be included in Policy HOUS 2 for the following reasons: the village is already at full main drains capacity; alternative methods of drainage such a cesspits and septic tanks would be environmentally unacceptable due to the stream running through the village. The village is prone to flooding. Recently installed flood defences have proved to have

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

limited success and include an unauthorised section of bund on railway land which when removed will cause a breach in the defence works; community facilities are very limited - no shop, no school, no post office, no play area, no public house, an extremely limited bus service, a village hall and a church; Because of the lack of facilities, no-car families that have been moved to social housing in Llandow have suffered from rural deprivation to the extent that the council has had to provide taxis to facilities for them and eventually they have left and/or turned to crime; there is no apparent capacity within the village for development; the inspector did not include the village of Llandow in rec.3.7.

Desired Change

Delete Llandow from settlements listed in HOUS 2.

Recommendation

The modification to include Llandow within the list of rural settlements identified under Policy HOUS2 has been undertaken following the Inspectors recommendation that the land west of the railway line would be suitable for "rounding off" and therefore should be included for housing. Following this recommendation, it was necessary to include Llandow within the list of settlements identified in Policy HOUS2, as this list includes those villages where small-scale development can be accommodated. However, development within the settlements listed under HOUS2 would also be subject to the criteria attached to Policy HOUS9.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: General Housing

Organisation	Llandow Community Council	Contact	Mrs. Jean Fairclough				
Representor No.	246	Representation No.	22	Accession No.	1889	Modification No.	E34

Representation

The inspector advised (para. 3.3.6 of Vol1 of Report of the Objections) that the inclusion of the settlements in policy HOUS 2 should be based on settlement capacity studies to identify factors of form and capacity, including such features as drainage, public transport, services etc. In this regard we consider that the settlement of Llandow is not acceptable for in filling and rounding off and should not be included in Policy HOUS 2 for the following reasons: the village is already at full main drains capacity; alternative methods of drainage such as cesspits and septic tanks would be environmentally unacceptable due to the stream running through the village.

The village is prone to flooding. Recently installed flood defences have proved to have limited success and include an unauthorised section of bound on railway land which when removed will cause a breach in the defence works; community facilities are very limited - no shop, no school, no post office, no play area, no public house, an extremely limited bus service, a village hall and a church; Because of the lack of facilities, no-car families that have been moved to social housing in Llandow have suffered from rural deprivation to the extent that the council has had to provide taxis to facilities for them and eventually they have left and/or turned to crime; there is no apparent capacity within the village for development; the inspector did not include the village of Llandow in rec.3.7.

Desired Change

DELETE LANDOW FROM LIST OF RURAL SETTLEMENTS IN POLICY HOUS 2.

Recommendation

The modification to include Llandow within the list of rural settlements identified under Policy HOUS2 has been undertaken following the Inspectors recommendation that the land west of the railway line would be suitable for "rounding off" and therefore should be included for housing. Following this recommendation, it was necessary to include Llandow within the list of settlements identified in Policy HOUS2, as this list includes those villages where small-scale development can be accommodated. However, development within the settlements listed under HOUS2 would also be subject to the criteria attached to Policy HOUS9.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: General Housing

Organisation	Llandow Community Council	Contact	Mrs. Jean Fairclough				
Representor No.	246	Representation No.	23	Accession No.	1890	Modification No.	E44

Representation

We support the wording that "all" the residential criteria should be met in policy HOUS9 because the development in rural settlements could have an adverse impact on the village environment, the amenities of existing residents or the amenities of future occupiers of the development if any one of the criteria are not met.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru

Contact Ryan Bowen

Representor No. 293

Representation No. 22

Accession No. 2778

Modification No. E33

Representation

As a statutory Water and Sewerage undertaker, we always try to ensure that sufficient infrastructure exists for domestic developments. Where such facilities are stretched, Capital Investment under our 5 year Investment Plans usually remedy the problem. However, our planned investment is dictated by our Regulators, the Environment Agency and Ofwat, and therefore there may be instances where our planned investment may not coincide with development needs for which "lead in" times are required. The optimum use of existing infrastructure will ensure that developments proceed without detriment to existing customers. Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) reinforces this, in particular the contents of Chapter 12. We would support the use of Planning Conditions and related Section 106 Agreements of Town & Country Planning Act which may enhance the quality of development and enable proposals to go ahead which might otherwise be refused. Where development will create a need for extra facilities, in advance of an Undertakers Regulatory investment, it may be reasonable for developers to meet or contribute towards the cost of providing such facilities.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Cowbridge and Llanblethian Residents Group

Contact Dr. C.A. Pearce

Representor No. 378

Representation No. 2

Accession No. 1605

Modification No. E04

Representation

This representation is in support of proposed modification E04 because this modification clarifies and ensures how a continuous supply of residential land is made available throughout the plan period to meet the residual housing requirement (1010 dwellings) and housing target (1998-2011) (6079 dwellings). This is achieved by the use of a search sequence as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002 and by the Joint Housing Land Availability Study (1st April 2001) (WDA, 2002). This identifies sites for housing development prior to the release of greenfield sites located outside the strategy area of the Plan.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Cowbridge and Llanblethian Residents Group

Contact Dr. C.A. Pearce

Representor No. 378

Representation No. 3

Accession No. 1606

Modification No. C004

Representation

The methods used in MODC004 for dwelling projections are more up to date, realistic and logical in terms of population migration patterns, economic trends and self-sustaining strategic aims for the Vale and its environmental aims. The housing pressure needs to be balanced with environmental concerns so that we do not destroy the intrinsic attractiveness of the Vale, both residents and tourists.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 17 **Accession No.** 3006 **Modification No.** E07

Representation

WTSWW object to the modification as currently worded on p.61 and suggests the addition of "previously developed land, where there is no significant nature conservation interest, is used in preference..."

Desired Change

WTSWW object to the modification as currently worded on p.61 and suggests the addition of "previously developed land, where there is no significant nature conservation interest, is used in preference..."

Recommendation

The Council considers that the addition of "previously developed land, where there is no significant nature conservation interest" is unnecessary as such issues are addressed elsewhere in the plan. For instance paragraph point 6 of 4.2.4, indicates that consideration shall be given to "The physical and environmental constraints on the development of land"

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: General Housing

Organisation **Contact** V. J. Thomas & Sons

Representor No. 1644 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 3076 **Modification No.** E34

Representation

Further to your letter dated 22/1/02, I wish to support your modification E34 and E44. It is hoped that the inspector's comments of village boundaries being "subjective and multipitive" will enable me to process an application for small scale development as detailed on enclosed ordnance survey map. Please advise at this stage if you feel an application would be looked upon favourably.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation **Contact** V. J. Thomas & Sons

Representor No. 1644 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 3077 **Modification No.** E44

Representation

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Further to your letter dated 22/1/02, I wish to support your modification E34 and E44. It is hoped that the inspector's comments of village boundaries being "subjective and multipitive" will enable me to process an application for small scale development as detailed on enclosed ordnance survey map. Please advise at this stage if you feel an application would be looked upon favourably.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Contact Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 3081 **Modification No.** B002

Representation

1) Cofton Limited expresses broad support for the strategy adopted by the Vale of Glamorgan. In particular, the overall provision of an additional 6,079 dwellings in the remainder of the Plan period allows the Vale to provide a range and choice of development opportunities.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Contact Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668 **Representation No.** 4 **Accession No.** 3083 **Modification No.** C004

Representation

1) Cofton Limited expresses broad support for the strategy adopted by the Vale of Glamorgan. In particular, the 10% contingency allowance and overall provision of an additional 6,079 dwellings in the remainder of the Plan period allows the Vale to provide a range and choice of development opportunities.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Contact Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668 **Representation No.** 7 **Accession No.** 3086 **Modification No.** E04

Representation

1) Whilst Cofton Limited expresses broad support for the housing target figure for the period 1998 - 2001 (6,079 dwellings), objection is made to the calculations to ascertain the residual housing requirement. 2) The Vale of Glamorgan has made no allowances for potential double counting between housing completions and those sites over 10 units with planning consent. The LPA has failed to impose a discounted rate based on the double counting that can occur when those larger sites with planning consent may already have been partly completed. 3) Furthermore, in respect of those units already with planning consent, no non-implementation rate has been applied by the Vale of Glamorgan. Although the Plan period is long, there is no guarantee that all the 2,946 dwellings will come forward in the Plan period. Non-implementation rates are normally applied in realisation of the effect that not all planning permissions come forward. Sites may fail to come forward for a number of reasons, for example problems incurred with the negotiation of Section 106 Agreements, failure to organise the land assembly of the site, and financial difficulties can prevent consents being realised. It is therefore considered that a 10% non-implementation

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

rate should be applied to site over 10 units with planning consent. 4) Cofton Limited note in Table 1 of the Policy HOUS 1 that the HOUS 1 (3) site at Pencoedre, Barry be the subject of a Development Brief before the number of units can be established. Elsewhere in the Proposed Modifications, reference is made to the need for a Development Brief for land north of the railway line at Rhose. This is not reflected in Table 1. Notwithstanding the fact that Cofton Limited object to the principle of development north of the railway, its feasibility must be fully assessed by a Development Brief before any judgements over its capacity can be realised. It is considered that the potential for the development of 600 dwellings north of the railway is incapable of being realised at this location if the existing character and community infrastructure requirements at Rhose are to be maintained and enhanced. 5) Cofton Limited makes a full objection to the allocation of the proposed allocation site HOUS1 (22) Land North of the Railway, Rhose elsewhere in these representations.

Desired Change

Recommendation

The Inspector's Report recognised that double counting between housing completions and those sites over 10 units with planning permission had occurred within the Draft Deposit. Consequently, the Inspector recommended that the Council should amend its housing requirements by 1104 dwellings, which the Council accepted and this is represented in the final housing target (1998-2001) of 6079 dwellings. Therefore the Council considers that it has satisfied the requirement to take account of double counting through the proposed modification, in line with the Inspectors recommendation.

With regard to the possibility of the non-implementation of sites, the Inspector also recommended that the Council should provide a contingency of 10% to take into account the uncertainty of both allocated sites and sites under 10 units. This recommendation was accepted by the Council and is included in the proposed modification to the Strategy Section of the Introduction to the plan (MOD C004). Therefore the Council considers that it has satisfied the requirement to take account of the non-implementation of planning permission in line with the Inspectors recommendation.

The requirement to undertake a development brief for Land North of the Railway Rhose so as to determine the capacity of the site is considered by the Council to be unnecessary. The justification being that the figure of 600 (400 in this plan period) dwellings cited in the proposed modification is based on the capacity of Rhose Point, which has a capacity of 510 dwellings but occupies a site smaller than the site North of the Railway. Therefore the Council considers 600 dwellings a realistic capacity for this site, and as such the undertaking of a development brief to determine the sites capacity is considered by the Council to be unnecessary. Nevertheless, the Council will request a development brief to be undertaken for this site, ensuring that the character and community infrastructure is addressed as part of the development.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: General Housing

Organisation		Contact	Cofton Limited
Representor No.	1668	Representation No.	13
		Accession No.	3092
		Modification No.	E44

Representation

1)Cofton Limited expresses broad support for the additions and modifications made to Policy HOUS9.2) Cofton Limited have consistently objected to the residential allocation of land north of the railway line in Rhose though these representations (Policy HOUS1(22)). It is considered that this allocation conflicts with the criteria set out in Policy HOUS9. In particular, the scale of development proposed is unsympathetic to the environs of the site and further impacts upon good quality agricultural land and other areas of attractive landscape.3) Cofton Limited therefore recommends the deletion of this allocation in favour of more sustainable levels of development at Rhose. These alternatives are set out in the Representations on Modifications E12, E13 and E32.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support in relation to MOD E44 is welcomed.

Please refer to the Council's other responses to your comments with specific regard to proposed changes including the housing allocation of land to the north of the railway line, Rhose (No.s 1668.3-1668.25)

Issue: General Housing

Organisation		Contact	Cofton Limited
Representor No.	1668	Representation No.	18
		Accession No.	3097
		Modification No.	E07

Representation

1) Cofton Limited supports the UDP's approach to the sequential release of housing sites. In particular, support is given to the need to prioritise the redevelopment of previously developed sites particularly where they are located in sustainable settlements.2) Cofton Limited contends that the new allocations in the HOUS1 Policy do not reflect this strategy. In particular, objection is made to the allocation on land north of the railway at Rhoose (Policy HOUS1(22)). Although located on the urban edge of Rhoose, and thus located in a relatively sustainable location, this is a greenfield development site with limited capability of providing essential community based infrastructure.3) In other Representations submitted by Cofton Limited, consideration is given to more sustainable development options in Rhoose. This includes the redevelopment of previously developed sites, which are capable of supporting up to 400 dwellings. Cofton Limited proposes that the Authority reassess the options for development in Rhoose and delete the allocation north of the railway in favour of more sustainable options.4) Cofton Limited support the recommendations of Modification E08 and note in particular that the search sequence has had regard to the ability to build communities to support new physical and social infrastructure and the need to provide sufficient demand to sustain appropriate local services and facilities. By allocating land north of the railway line, this objective will not be achieved. In other Representations submitted by Cofton Limited, consideration is given to the fact that an allocation of 400 houses increasing to 600 in future Local Plan periods is unsustainable for the settlement of Rhoose to support without major infrastructure improvements. Given the nature of the allocation north of the railway line, there is insufficient scope on site to provide any community facilities that will meet existing and future levels of demand in Rhoose.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Your support in relation to proposed modifications E07 and E08 is welcomed.

Please refer to the Council's other responses to your representations that relate specifically to the allocation of land to the north of the railway, Rhoose for housing (No.s 1668.3-1668.25).

Issue: General Housing

Organisation Contact Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668 **Representation No.** 19 **Accession No.** 3098 **Modification No.** E08

Representation

1) Cofton Limited supports the UDP's approach to the sequential release of housing sites. In particular, support is given to the need to prioritise the redevelopment of previously developed sites particularly where they are located in sustainable settlements.2) Cofton Limited contends that the new allocations in the HOUS1 Policy do not reflect this strategy. In particular, objection is made to the allocation on land north of the railway at Rhoose (Policy HOUS1(22)). Although located on the urban edge of Rhoose, and thus located in a relatively sustainable location, this is a greenfield development site with limited capability of providing essential community based infrastructure.3) In other Representations submitted by Cofton Limited, consideration is given to more sustainable development options in Rhoose. This includes the redevelopment of previously developed sites that are capable of supporting up to 400 dwellings. Cofton Limited proposes that the Authority reassess the options for development in Rhoose and delete the allocation north of the railway in favour of more sustainable options.4) Cofton Limited support the recommendations of Modification E08 and note in particular that the search sequence has had regard to the ability to build communities to support new physical and social infrastructure and the need to provide sufficient demand to sustain appropriate local services and facilities. By allocating land north of the railway line, this objective will not be achieved. In other Representations submitted by Cofton Limited, consideration is given to the fact that an allocation of 400 houses increasing to 600 in future Local Plan periods is unsustainable for the settlement of Rhoose to support without major infrastructure improvements. Given the nature of the allocation north of the railway line, there is insufficient scope on site to provide any community facilities that will meet existing and future levels of demand in Rhoose.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Your support in relation to proposed modifications E07 and E08 is welcomed

Please refer to the Council's other responses to your representations that relate specifically to the allocation of land to the north of the railway, Rhoose for housing (No.s 1668.3-1668.25).

**GENERAL INDUSTRY
&
EMPLOYMENT**

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation Cowbridge Local History Society **Contact** Mr. A.J.L Alden

Representor No. 13 **Representation No.** 5 **Accession No.** 1852 **Modification No.** F025

Representation

I support MOD F025 re: Vale Business Park, Llandow - that full planning permission for an extension should not be granted until a link road between the A48 and B4270 has been constructed (assuming that the link in question is the Llysworney Bypass). Currently traffic and HGV traffic in particular through the village of Llysworney is at dangerous levels.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 39 **Accession No.** 2962 **Modification No.** F038

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 40 **Accession No.** 2963 **Modification No.** F044

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation ABP Associated British Ports (South Wales) **Contact** Kevin Francis

Representor No. 218 **Representation No.** 14 **Accession No.** 1869 **Modification No.** F020

Representation

5.4.20 includes the phrase "The site lies within 250 metres of a former landfill site". I am not aware of a landfill site in this area and should appreciate clarification as its whereabouts.

Desired Change

The line should be deleted or the location of the landfill be identified so that the accuracy of the statement can be established.

Recommendation

The site that lies within 250 meters of a former landfill referred to in the text is employment site EMP 1(3), adjacent to No.2 Dock Bypass. As this is site specific it would not imply that vast tracts of land at Barry Docks lay within 250 meters of a landfill site. Consequently, as this a site specific reference, provided by the Environment Agency the Council considers it unnecessary to identify neither the location of this former landfill site, nor the 250 meter zone as this would be considered in detail as part of the redevelopment of the site.

With regard to your objection to specification that the flood defence levels are raised to 8.6 AOD, this reference was included in the original text of the Deposit Draft plan, and objections to this should have been considered at the deposit stage of the consultation process.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation ABP Associated British Ports (South Wales) **Contact** Kevin Francis

Representor No. 218 **Representation No.** 15 **Accession No.** 1870 **Modification No.** F009

Representation

MOD F009 5.4.8 - Barry Docks the proposal is to include "...given that part of the site lies within 250 metres of a former landfill site...". 5.4.9 - Chemical Complex the proposal is to include "the site lies within 250 metres of a former landfill site". This is far too sweeping a statement. The implication that vast tracts of available land at the Port of Barry is within 250 metres of a former landfill site is misleading and inaccurate. Either the land fill site referred to needs to be identified by reference to a plan or the area within the 250 metre zone needs to be identified. There is reference to the site adjacent to No.2 Dock Bypass coupled with a recommendation "that flood defence levels are raised to a minimum of 8.6m AOD". This is a plateau area with an ambient level of 12m - 14m AOD, the implication that it requires work to bring it above 8.6m AOD is misleading and inaccurate.

Desired Change

- 1) The landfill site be identified
- 2) The 250m sphere of influence of the landfill site be identified.
- 3) Where not appropriate the reference to a requirement that flood defence levels are raised to a minimum of 8.6 AOD be omitted.

Recommendation

The site that lies within 250 meters of a former landfill referred to in the text is employment site EMP 1(3), adjacent to No.2 Dock Bypass. As this is site specific it would not imply that vast tracts of land at Barry Docks lay within 250 meters of a landfill site. Consequently, as this a site specific reference, provided by the Environment Agency the Council considers it unnecessary to identify neither the location of this former landfill site, nor the 250 meter zone as this would be considered in detail as part of the redevelopment of the site.

With regard to your objection to specification that the flood defence levels are raised to 8.6 AOD, this reference was included in the original text of the Deposit Draft plan, and objections to this should have been considered at the deposit stage of the consultation process.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation Land Division, Welsh Development Agency **Contact** Mike Cuddy

Representor No. 232 **Representation No.** 19 **Accession No.** 2829 **Modification No.** F031

Representation

The Council proposes to modify Policy EMP 3 in a number of ways, including the introduction of a new criterion (viii), which states: "(viii) does not present additional risk to the health and safety of users of the site and does not unacceptably pollute air, water, or land; and..." All development generates some degree of risk (e.g. crossing a road in a housing estate or operating machinery in a factory). This should be recognised by a reasonable amendment to the policy, as suggested below. This would allow scope, in appropriate circumstances, for planning application to be accompanied by a risk assessment, which would be taken into account as a material planning consideration. If the criterion is retained in its present form, it would inhibit development in the area and would be unworkable. The amendment suggested reflects the use of the term "unacceptably pollute" in the same criterion.

Desired Change

Amend criterion (viii) to read: "does not present unacceptable additional risk to the health and safety of the site and does not unacceptably pollute air, water, or land; and.."

Recommendation

The Council considers that the inclusion of the word "unacceptable" as it relates to criteria (iv) of policy EMP3 is unnecessary as this criteria relates to the risk to health and safety as a result of the development and not those caused through the daily operation of the development, which are matters for the Health and Safety Executive.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation Land Division, Welsh Development Agency **Contact** Mike Cuddy

Representor No. 232 **Representation No.** 20 **Accession No.** 2830 **Modification No.** F033

Representation

The Council proposes to modify Policy EMP 4 in a number of ways, including the introduction of a new criterion (iv), which states: "(iv) it does not present additional risk to the health or safety of the site and does not unacceptably pollute air, water, or land; and..." All development generates some degree of risk (e.g. crossing a road in a housing estate or operating machinery in a factory). This should be recognised by a reasonable amendment to the policy, as suggested below. This would allow scope, in appropriate circumstances, for a planning application to be accompanied by a risk assessment, which would be taken into account as a material planning consideration. If the criterion is retained in its present form, it would inhibit development in the area and would be unworkable. The amendment suggested reflects the use of the term "unacceptably pollute" in the same criterion.

Desired Change

Amend criterion (iv) to read: "(iv) it does not present unacceptable additional risk to the health or safety of users of the site and does not unacceptably pollute, air, water, or land: and.."

Recommendation

The Council considers that the inclusion of the word "unacceptable" as it relates to criteria (iv) of policy EMP3 is unnecessary as this criteria relates to the risk to health and safety as a result of the development and not those caused through the daily operation of the development, which are a matters for the Health and Safety Executive.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation Llandow Community Council **Contact** Mrs. Jean Fairclough

Representor No. 246 **Representation No.** 25 **Accession No.** 1892 **Modification No.** F025

Representation

We strongly support modification 25 as the current road system and junctions cannot cope satisfactorily with the existing traffic generated by the Vale Business Park. Any future development will require improvements to be put in place.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation Environment Agency

Contact Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247

Representation No. 96

Accession No. 3125

Modification No. F031

Representation

Protection of water, land and air from pollution is supported.

Desired Change

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation Environment Agency

Contact Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247

Representation No. 97

Accession No. 3126

Modification No. F033

Representation

Protection of water, land and air from pollution is supported.

Desired Change

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation Environment Agency

Contact Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247

Representation No. 98

Accession No. 3127

Modification No. F046

Representation

This type of development should not be located in areas of unacceptable flood risk

Desired Change

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru

Contact Ryan Bowen

Representor No. 293

Representation No. 24

Accession No. 2780

Modification No. F009

Representation

The sewerage comments area self explanatory

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru

Contact Ryan Bowen

Representor No. 293

Representation No. 25

Accession No. 2781

Modification No. F020

Representation

The comments relating to DCWW are self-explanatory. Under the water Industry Act 1991 there is no obligation for a water & sewerage undertaker to make provision for non-domestic demands but would wish to work with potential site developers to understand their needs to enable solutions to be found.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru

Contact Ryan Bowen

Representor No. 293

Representation No. 28

Accession No. 2784

Modification No. F029

Representation

The comments relating to DCWW are self-explanatory. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 there is no obligation for a water & sewerage undertaker to make provision for non-domestic demands but would wish to work with potential site developers to understand their needs to enable solutions to be found.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation Glamorgan Bird Club

Contact Mr. R Nottage

Representor No. 604

Representation No. 3

Accession No. 1883

Modification No. MOD

Representation

MOD F007 lists Pencoedtre, Barry as a site allocated for housing development, subject to a development brief. I object to this allocation as this site is classified as Ancient Woodland (classified in the Glamorgan Inventory of Ancient Woodlands, E.Southern, 1986, Nature Conservancy Council). This site is also a candidate Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Development at this site would contravene Planning Policy Wales 2002, which states that: "ancient and semi-natural woodlands are irreplaceable habitats of high biodiversity value that should be protected from development that would result in significant damage". Development at this site would also contravene the following policies in the Vale of Glamorgan Council UDP: Policy ENV10 - Protection of landscape features, Policy Env14 - Local sites of nature conservation significance, Policy EMP 3 - New business and industrial development: sub-item (ii).

Desired Change

I request that the Pencoedtre, Barry site is deleted from the list of sites allocated for housing development under MOD F007, and all subsequent references to it removed.

Recommendation

The proposed modification recognises the importance of the ancient woodland that occupies part of the allocated Pencoedtre site and states that a development brief for the site will be required to "ensure that the development of this site protects and enhances the quality ancient woodland". The proposed modification also states that any development of the site would require to retain the existing ancient woodland and that prior to the granting of planning permission the developer will be required to undertake a woodland survey and submit an appropriate management plan for the woodland.

On this basis the Council considers that these requirements will protect the quality ancient woodland from development in accordance with Planning Policy Wales (2002), and also addresses your objection towards the allocation due to the impact it would have on the ancient woodland.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation

Contact Mr. Richard Smith

Representor No. 1648

Representation No. 2

Accession No. 2800

Modification No. F007

Representation

MOD F007 lists Pencoedtre, Barry as a site allocated for employment development, subject to a development brief. I object to this allocation as this site is classified as Ancient Woodland (classified in the Glamorgan Inventory of Ancient Woodlands, E.Southern, 1986, Nature Conservation Council). This site is also a candidate Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Development at this site would contravene Planning Policy Wales 2002, which states that: "ancient and semi-natural woodlands are irreplaceable habitats of high biodiversity value that should be protected from development that would result in significant damage". Development at this site would also contravene the following policies in the Vale of Glamorgan Council UDP: Policy ENV10 - Protection of landscape features, Policy ENV14 - Local sites of nature conservation significance, Policy EMP3 - New business and industrial development: sub-item (ii).

Desired Change

I request that Pencoedtre is deleted from the list of sites allocated for employment under MOD F007, and all subsequent references to it removed.

Recommendation

The proposed modification recognises the importance of the ancient woodland that occupies part of the allocated Pencoedtre site and that a development brief for the site will be required to "ensure that the development of this site protects and enhances

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

the quality ancient woodland". The proposed modification also states that any development of the site would be required to retain the existing ancient woodland and that prior to the granting of planning permission the developer will be required to undertake a woodland survey and submit an appropriate management plan for the woodland. These measures will ensure that any development of the site would also accord to Policies ENV10, ENV and HOUS9, which you also refer to in your objection.

On this basis the Council considers that these requirements will protect the ancient woodland from development in accordance with Planning Policy Wales (2002) and also compliments Policies ENV10, ENV and HOUS9.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: General Industry & Employment

Organisation

Contact Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668

Representation No. 14

Accession No. 3093

Modification No. F007

Representation

1)Support is given to the deletion of Sites 12 and 18 from the employment list. Their deletion and subsequent re-allocation for housing purposes confirms that the Vale of Glamorgan is acting upon the advice of Planning Policy Wales in so far as making reassessments of existing employment sites that have capabilities for a change of use.2) Cofton Limited considers that such a process should be consistently monitored and where appropriate, other sites should come forward for residential conversion either through reallocation in subsequent releases of UDP's or through windfall development on the smaller sites. In particular, other Representations have been submitted by Cofton Limited, which consider that the employment site at Rhoose Point (Site 12) is suitable for a change of use to residential. The conversion of the use for residential purposes is considered more sustainable in meeting the overall objectives for development at Rhoose. The employment land would be replaced by alternative facilities at the proposed "Western Expansion" of Rhoose Point.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support in relation to MOD F0007 is welcomed.

Please refer to the Council's other responses to your comments with specific regard to the employment allocation at Rhoose Point (No.s 1668.3-1668.25).

**GOLF COURSES
&
RELATED DEVELOPMENT**

Issue: Golf Courses & Related Development

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 133

Accession No. 2900

Modification No. 1017

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Golf Courses & Related Development

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 144

Accession No. 2911

Modification No. 1018

Representation

CCW object to the policy as currently worded as the criteria are confusing and misleading. We suggest the deletion of criteria 1 and 2 and replacement with: 1) Areas of ecological, geological, archaeological and landscape interest.

Desired Change

The deletion of criteria 1 and 2 and replacement with: 1) Areas of ecological, geological, archaeological and landscape interest.

Recommendation

The Inspector, in his Report, states that "...Policy REC09 as changed by PCI015 relates to the appropriate degree of conservation interest to be formally safeguarded".

The Council would also draw attention to Policy REC08 (MOD 1016) which already states that "proposals for golf courses...will be permitted if ...the proposal does not unacceptably affect the archaeological, ecological, geological and geomorphological value of the area" (criterion (iii) refers).

In the light of the points above, the Council believes that the criteria of Policy REC08 and REC09 are sufficient to deal with potential golf related development in the Vale of Glamorgan.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Golf Courses & Related Development

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales

Contact Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643

Representation No. 28

Accession No. 3017

Modification No. 1018

Representation

WTSWW object to the policy as currently worded as the criteria on p.132 are confusing and misleading. We suggest the deletion of criterion 1 and 2, and their replacement with: i.) Areas of ecological, geological, archaeological and landscape interest.

Desired Change

WTSWW object to the policy as currently worded as the criteria on p.132 are confusing and misleading. We suggest the deletion of criterion 1 and 2, and their replacement with: i.) Areas of ecological, geological, archaeological and landscape interest.

Recommendation

The Inspector, in his Report, states that "...Policy REC09 as changed by PCI015 relates to the appropriate degree of conservation interest to be formally safeguarded".

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

The Council would also draw attention to Policy REC08 (MOD I016) which already states that "proposals for golf courses...will be permitted if ...the proposal does not unacceptably affect the archaeological, ecological, geological and geomorphological value of the area" (criterion (iii) refers).

In the light of points made above, the Council believes that the criteria of Policy REC08 and REC09 are sufficient to deal with potential golf related development in the Vale of Glamorgan.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

GREEN BELT

Issue: Green Belt

Organisation Campaign for Protection of Rural Wales **Contact** Mr. A L J Raum

Representor No. 173 **Representation No.** 33 **Accession No.** 1839 **Modification No.** D020

Representation

We consider that the Council has had adequate support to proceed with the designation of one or more Green Belts in the present Plan. Reference is made to: 1) Planning Policy Wales 2.61 & 2.62. 2) South East Wales Unitary Development Plans Liaison Group, Draft Strategic Planning Guidance, South Wales, Vol.1, January 1999, p33, Recommendation GB1. It is demonstrated that a sub-regional study has already been carried out by experts who have concluded that Green Belt designations are necessary. 3) Cardiff Unitary Development Plan: Outline Proposals for Consultation May, 2001, p27. It is important that the Vale should propose matching plans to provide contiguous Green Belt areas across the borders. (This has been proposed to Cardiff County Council). 4) Proposals made by the Inspector of the Vale UDP Public Inquiry. It is proposed that at least the Inspector's recommendations should be implemented in this Plan. Further extension of the area to include the Thaw Valley should be made in the 1st Review of the Plan. It is recognised that Green Wedges and Special Landscape Areas are proposed, but the Inspector has made it quiet clear that this is inadequate protection in the long term.

Desired Change

Amend 3.4.10. It is recognised that the only safe way adequately to protect the Vale of Glamorgan countryside is by designating Green Belt areas as these will give much greater protection than Green Wedges or SLA's. A limited area of Green Belt is, therefore, proposed, as recommended by the Inspector, extending from the border with Cardiff to the Five Mile Lane, Barry. Further extensions will be considered as part of the 1st review of the UDP

Recommendation

The Council has considered in detail the Inspector's recommendation 3.20 to designate a green belt in the Vale of Glamorgan. Having given the matter due consideration, the council believes that, in reaching his recommendation, the Inspector did not give sufficient consideration to the potential impact of the designation on the growth dynamics of the region and did not afford necessary weight to the Draft Strategic Planning Guidance for South East Wales or the requirements of Planning Policy Wales 2002.

The designation of a green belt in isolation from other local authorities in the region, and in the absence of an assessment of the longer term needs for development land in the region is, in the opinion of the Council, contrary to the guidance contained within paragraphs 2.6.6, 2.6.7 and 2.6.8 of Planning Policy Wales 2002, and is contrary to the Strategic Planning Guidance for South East Wales 2000.

The Council considers that the guidance contained within Planning Policy Wales 2002 clearly requires local authorities to act in consultation with adjoining local authorities in considering the long term need for development land prior to the designation of a green belt. The green belt designation recommended by the Inspector clearly fails to consider the need for long term development land in the region or the Vale of Glamorgan.

The Issue: of Green Belt designation and the process of assessing longer term need for development land in the South East Wales region are addressed in the adopted Strategic Planning Guidance for South East Wales. The Guidance, produced jointly by 11 local authorities in South East Wales, provides a clear policy context for the approach to be taken to green belt designation in the region.

In assessing the strategic guidance, the Inspector notes that, at the time of writing his report, the final version of the guidance had not been Issue: d but comments that "at the time of the Inquiry, however, this study had not been re-visited in the light of consultation and has no statutory status" (paragraph 3.5.4 of his report refers). Whilst the Council accepts that the emerging guidance may have had no statutory status at the time of the Inquiry it was nevertheless an important material consideration and provided a clear explanation of the regional approach to be taken to green belt designation and has since been Issue: d in final adopted form.

The Council considers that the acceptance of the Inspector's recommendation to designate a Green Belt would be contrary to Planning Policy Wales 2002 and Strategic Planning Guidance for South East Wales. The Designation of a Green Belt in the Vale of Glamorgan could have a serious detrimental effect upon both the growth dynamics of the region and regional sustainability.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Green Belt

Organisation House Builders Federation **Contact** Mr. Gareth Williams

Representor No. 249 **Representation No.** 24 **Accession No.** 3032 **Modification No.** D020

Representation

The HBF supports the council's decision not to designate a Green Belt.

Desired Change

No change required.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Green Belt

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 47

Accession No. 3061

Modification No. D020

Representation

We object to the new wording against a Green Belt. We propose the Green Belt is included as agreed by the Inspector. It should in any case be given protection as "interim Green Belt"

Desired Change

Delete wording. Agree and insert protection of areas as interim Green Belt.

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a public local inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The Council has considered in detail the Inspector's recommendation 3.20 to designate a green belt in the Vale of Glamorgan. Having given the matter due consideration, the council believes that, in reaching his recommendation, the Inspector did not give sufficient consideration to the potential impact of the designation on the growth dynamics of the region and did not afford necessary weight to the Draft Strategic Planning Guidance for South East Wales or the requirements of Planning Policy Wales 2002.

The designation of a green belt in isolation from other local authorities in the region, and in the absence of an assessment of the longer term needs for development land in the region is, in the opinion of the Council, contrary to the guidance contained within paragraphs 2.6.6, 2.6.7 and 2.6.8 of Planning Policy Wales 2002, and is contrary to the Strategic Planning Guidance for South East Wales 2000.

The Council considers that the guidance contained within Planning Policy Wales 2002 clearly requires local authorities to act in consultation with adjoining local authorities in considering the long term need for development land prior to the designation of a green belt. The green belt designation recommended by the Inspector clearly fails to consider the need for long-term development land in the region or the Vale of Glamorgan.

The Issue: of Green Belt designation and the process of assessing longer term need for development land in the South East Wales region are addressed in the adopted Strategic Planning Guidance for South East Wales. The Guidance, produced jointly by 11 local authorities in South East Wales, provides a clear policy context for the approach to be taken to green belt designation in the region.

In assessing the strategic guidance, the Inspector notes that, at the time of writing his report, the final version of the guidance had not been issued but comments that "at the time of the Inquiry, however, this study had not been re-visited in the light of consultation and has no statutory status" (paragraph 3.5.4 of his report refers). Whilst the Council accepts that the emerging guidance may have had no statutory status at the time of the Inquiry it was nevertheless an important material consideration and provided a clear explanation of the regional approach to be taken to green belt designation and has since been issued in final adopted form.

The Council considers that the acceptance of the Inspector's recommendation to designate a Green Belt would be contrary to Planning Policy Wales 2002 and Strategic Planning Guidance for South East Wales. The Designation of a Green Belt in the Vale of Glamorgan could have a serious detrimental effect upon both the growth dynamics of the region and regional sustainability.

The new green wedge designation between Barry, Rhose and St. Athan is in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation number 3.24. In his report, the Inspector acknowledged that settlements in the Waterfront Strip are under considerable development pressure given its identification as a growth strip. Consequently, he considered that a green wedge designation should be designated between Barry, Rhose and St. Athan to protect the open nature of the land and avoid coalescence. In accepting the Inspector's recommendation, the Council carried out a further assessment of the area, prior to designating the new green wedge. The green wedge between Barry, Rhose and St. Athan is considered to be accurately and logically drawn, abutting man made boundaries (e.g. roads and railway lines), major land uses (e.g. Aberthaw Power Station and Cardiff International Airport) and UDP designations (e.g. residential settlement boundaries and employment allocations).

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

GREEN WEDGES

Issue: Green Wedges

Organisation Barry Town Council

Contact Mr. Ian Harris

Representor No. 33

Representation No. 17

Accession No. 1753

Modification No. MOD

Representation

The inclusion in the plan of the additional green wedge (V) Barry, Rhoose and St.Athan is welcomed.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Green Wedges

Organisation Campaign for Protection of Rural Wales

Contact Mr. A L J Raum

Representor No. 173

Representation No. 36

Accession No. 1842

Modification No. D018

Representation

In the absence of Green Belt designations we support this Policy and especially the inclusion of (v) Barry, Rhoose and St. Athan.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Green Wedges

Organisation Dinas Powys Community Council

Contact

Representor No. 262

Representation No. 6

Accession No. 2811

Modification No. D018

Representation

Support

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Green Wedges

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 48

Accession No. 3062

Modification No. D018

Representation

We object to retaining the green wedges between Barry and Penarth and the North and East of Wenvoe, instead of the Green Belt we proposed and was recommended by the Inspector. We object to a new proposed Green Wedge between Barry, Rhoose and St Athan, and would instead protect west of Barry by a Cardiff and Barry Green Belt (as e.g. Cheltenham and

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Gloucester). We consider protection (whether wedge of green belt should cover the WDA-owned land to the east of Rhoose and north of the railway).

Desired Change

Restore Green Belt as recommended by Inspector. Establish Green Belt to cover west of Barry and Rhoose.

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this Issue: . A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The Council has considered in detail the Inspector's recommendation 3.20 to designate a green belt in the Vale of Glamorgan. Having given the matter due consideration, the council believes that, in reaching his recommendation, the Inspector did not give sufficient consideration to the potential impact of the designation on the growth dynamics of the region and did not afford necessary weight to the Draft Strategic Planning Guidance for South East Wales or the requirements of Planning Policy Wales 2002.

The designation of a green belt in isolation from other local authorities in the region, and in the absence of an assessment of the longer term needs for development land in the region is, in the opinion of the Council, contrary to the guidance contained within paragraphs 2.6.6, 2.6.7 and 2.6.8 of Planning Policy Wales 2002, and is contrary to the Strategic Planning Guidance for South East Wales 2000.

The Council considers that the guidance contained within Planning Policy Wales 2002 clearly requires local authorities to act in consultation with adjoining local authorities in considering the long term need for development land prior to the designation of a green belt. The green belt designation recommended by the Inspector clearly fails to consider the need for long term development land in the region or the Vale of Glamorgan.

The Issue: of Green Belt designation and the process of assessing longer term need for development land in the South East Wales region are addressed in the adopted Strategic Planning Guidance for South East Wales. The Guidance, produced jointly by 11 local authorities in South East Wales, provides a clear policy context for the approach to be taken to green belt designation in the region.

In assessing the strategic guidance, the Inspector notes that, at the time of writing his report, the final version of the guidance had not been Issue: d but comments that "at the time of the Inquiry, however, this study had not been re-visited in the light of consultation and has no statutory status" (paragraph 3.5.4 of his report refers). Whilst the Council accepts that the emerging guidance may have had no statutory status at the time of the Inquiry it was nevertheless an important material consideration and provided a clear explanation of the regional approach to be taken to green belt designation and has since been Issue: d in final adopted form.

The Council considers that the acceptance of the Inspector's recommendation to designate a Green Belt would be contrary to Planning Policy Wales 2002 and Strategic Planning Guidance for South East Wales. The Designation of a Green Belt in the Vale of Glamorgan could have a serious detrimental effect upon both the growth dynamics of the region and regional sustainability.

The new green wedge designation between Barry, Rhoose and St. Athan is in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation number 3.24. In his report, the Inspector acknowledged that settlements in the Waterfront Strip are under considerable development pressure given its identification as a growth strip. Consequently, he considered that a green wedge designation should be designated between Barry, Rhoose and St. Athan to avoid coalescence between and within these settlements and to protect the open nature of the land.

In accepting the Inspector's recommendation, the Council carried out a further assessment of the area, prior to designating the green wedge. The green wedge between Barry, Rhoose and St. Athan is considered to be accurately and logically drawn abutting man made boundaries (e.g. roads and railway lines), major land uses (e.g. Aberthaw Power Station and Cardiff International Airport) and UDP designations (e.g. residential settlement boundaries and employment allocations). The land to the north of the railway line, Rhoose has already been considered by the Inspector as suitable for housing (REC 4.79 refers) and accepted by the Council for the reasons set out on pages 110 and 111 in the Statement of Decisions document (February 2003). Therefore, it would be nonsensical to include this new housing allocation (Policy HOUS 1 [22] refers) within the new green wedge.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Green Wedges

Organisation

Contact Mr. Andrew Bailey

Representor No. 1550

Representation No. 6

Accession No. 2654

Modification No. N025

Representation

Green belt has not included land on eastern edge of Rhoose. I.e. land behind Ceri Avenue and between airport perimeter - also

land north of railway line, Rhoose.

Desired Change

Extend the green wedge to include land between the airport perimeter and Rhoose village. Extend the green wedge to include land north of the railway line, Rhoose.

Recommendation

The new green wedge designation between Barry, Rhoose and St. Athan is in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation number 3.24. In his report, the Inspector acknowledged that settlements in the Waterfront Strip are under considerable development pressure given its identification as a growth strip. Consequently, he considered that a green wedge designation should be designated between Barry, Rhoose and St. Athan to avoid coalescence between and within these settlements and to protect the open nature of the land.

In accepting the Inspector's recommendation, the Council carried out a further assessment of the area, prior to designating the green wedge. The green wedge between Barry, Rhoose and St. Athan is considered to be accurately and logically drawn abutting man made boundaries, major land uses and UDP designations. The land between Ceri Avenue and Cardiff International Airport is enclosed by existing residential development to the south west, Porthkerry Road to the south and the airport to the north. Therefore, to include it within the new green wedge would not be in line with the fundamental aims and objectives of Policy ENV 3. In addition, the land to the north of the railway line has already been considered by the Inspector as suitable for housing (REC 4.79 refers) and accepted by the Council for the reasons set out on pages 110 and 111 in the Statement of Decisions document (February 2003). Therefore, it would be nonsensical to include this new housing allocation (Policy HOUS 1 [22] refers) within the new green wedge. Finally, it should be noted that the land between Ceri Avenue and the airport is currently designated as "countryside" (Policy ENV1 refers) where there is a general presumption against new development.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Green Wedges

Organisation

Contact L McDonald

Representor No. 1642

Representation No. 1

Accession No. 2988

Modification No. D018

Representation

1. We act on behalf of Mr. L. McDonald and are instructed to submit representations to The Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996 - 2011: Proposed Changes to the Proposed Modifications to the Deposit Draft 1998. 2. The representations concern specific policy designation affecting land accessed from Sully Road opposite St Cyres County Comprehensive School that should have been included as part of Penarth's urban area. An appropriate small-scale development would help to satisfy part of the council's housing needs for an additional 6,079 dwellings between 1998 - 2011. 3. The land is identified on the attached plan. 4. The land is proposed to accommodate the Barry Waterfront to Cardiff Link Road passing directly through its centre - Policy In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification. Tran 1. When this link road is constructed, access will be denied to our client's land to the West of the link road. 5. Playing fields are proposed by Policy REC 5 (i). These adjoin the land to the West of the link road. In order to maintain the Green Wedge, our client will undertake a limited agricultural use of this land accessed where possible through the adjoining housing estate, or by other route if at all possible; and may agree to extend the playing fields on to his land. 6. Our client will also gift to the council the land required for the route of the Link Road in his ownership. 7. In return for the gifted link road land, the possible extension of the playing fields, and the land that will have been made inaccessible, a designation of the land to the East of the Link Road is sought for residential development, in line with a design brief to the satisfaction of the council, and to include for affordable housing. 8. The site is of adequate size to accommodate all the development without causing detrimental impact to the privacy and amenity of dwellings and occupiers nearby; and will be designed to minimise any impact upon the landscape and will have the highest regard to the characteristics and features of the landscape. The design will have full regards to site aspects, noise minimisation, ergonomics, energy conservation and extendibility. This proposal will:- (i) Respect and enhance the local environment. (ii) Be of a suitable design appropriate to its location, and will utilise materials appropriate to the character of the area. (iii) Avoid the loss of important features, which contribute to the quality of the local environment. (iv) Incorporate hard and soft landscaping including trees, hedges, walls and ponds as an integral part of the design. (v) Have no unacceptable impact on local amenity in terms of visual impact, privacy, disturbance and loss of light. (vi) Retain, enhance and/or create open spaces, public views, skyline, and other landscape features. (vii) Be designed so as to ensure maximum use is made of natural daylight and solar energy, within buildings, in gardens and amenity space subject to the parameters set by other policies in this plan. This is achieved by:- a) Strategically planning the development. b) Minimising its visual impact. c) Using a suitable design for its location and environment utilising traditional materials already used in the area. d) Utilising the physical character and topography of the site, including all natural features. e) Creating visual, amenity and recreational areas, with the landscaped areas being designed to cater for the safe and efficient movement of less able people. f) Providing access including provision of visibility spays, turning areas and parking space standards. g) Landscaping the development and constructing a large shallow pond to act as a feature and surface water attenuation to assist in surface water drainage. h) Encouraging waterfowl, amphibians and other aquatic life. i) Mature trees, hedgerows and existing landscape features will be retained to create a high amenity and mature trees.

Desired Change

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this Issue: . A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

MOD D018 refers to the inclusion of an additional Green Wedge designation in the areas between Barry, Rhoose and St. Athan (Inspector's Recommendation 3.24 refers) and the amendment of Policy ENV 3 to include the words "which prejudices the open nature of the land will not be permitted." In his report, the Inspector acknowledged that settlements in the Waterfront Strip are under considerable development pressure given its identification as a growth strip. Consequently, he considered that a Green Wedge designation should be designated between Barry, Rhoose and St. Athan to protect the open nature of the land and avoid coalescence. The representation does not relate to MOD D018 and is therefore regarded as not duly made. The correct time to have made this representation was at Deposit Draft stage in 1998.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Green Wedges

Organisation Legal & General/Hines

Contact

Representor No. 1646

Representation No. 1

Accession No. 3075

Modification No. D018

Representation

We formally object to reference MOD D018 with specific reference to the inclusion of point (v), namely "(v) BARRY, RHOOSE AND ST ATHAN". This proposal allocates part of our client's land (as indicated on the attached plan) as Green Wedge. By way of justification to this objection, we comment that the emerging local planning policy framework including this area as Green Wedge would serve to unnecessarily constrain development. We understand that most of the land to the east of the runway and airport terminal is proposed as a green wedge despite not having been allocated for any specific use by the planning authority in the first deposit plan. Whilst we accept that other land remains available for development, we are of the opinion that such an allocation would sterilise the land for the life of the emerging plan and, with the allocation having been proposed without taking into account the full implications of the facilitating growth scenario, would prejudice the implementation of any future air strategy. It is therefore critical that local planning policies are formulated to take full account of this consultation exercise in order to ensure a coherent and deliverable strategy is prepared. As has been highlighted in the recent Welsh Assembly Government and Department for Transport paper entitled 'The Future Development of Air Transport in the United Kingdom: Wales', promotion of national airports' strategy in order to secure the co-ordinate delivery of services on a national basis is welcomed. Such a strategic approach is essential in order to ensure that predicted future growth in demand for air travel can be accommodated effectively taking full account of economic, environmental and other policy related objectives. That Consultation paper (on which we have submitted our representations) confirms the importance of aviation to Wales (both in terms of direct and indirect jobs) whilst also improving productivity and efficiency. Key business growth sectors (such as high tech industries) require effective links to air services, thereby demonstrating the importance of air travel to promoting inward investment. The Consultation Document identifies six policy scenarios used to forecast demand at regional airports. We have submitted in our representations on the Consultation document that we consider the "Facilitating Growth Scenario" is the most appropriate given that this will secure the ongoing development of major international airports in the South East of England whilst also maximising the potential benefits of Cardiff International Airport to the local economy. It has been confirmed in the Consultation Document that under most scenarios air traffic using Cardiff International Airport will grow significantly from current levels of around 1.5 million passengers per annum. Indeed, under the facilitating growth option, around 4.4 million passengers per annum will use the airport - a threefold increase over current levels. We maintain that Cardiff International Airport should be the focus for future growth in Wales in order to claw back passengers from other destinations and to maximise the potential benefits associated with air travel. However, such growth raises issues in respect of: terminal capacity; runway and apron capacity; supporting infrastructure. Looking beyond direct operational impacts, the availability and quality of supporting infrastructure is of critical importance in maximising economic benefits. The likely rise in passenger numbers will place further strains on local and sub regional infrastructure servicing the airport. This situation is exacerbated by the current congestion experienced in the Culverhouse Cross area, which contributes to wider congestion in the area. We have submitted therefore that we would be supportive of any proposals that enhance existing road infrastructure provision to the airport and associated with this the provision of high quality public transport linkages to Cardiff and the wider sub-region (including the provision of a dedicated rail link to Cardiff airport). We consider that, in order to support the expansion of Cardiff International Airport to 2030, opportunities must be made available through the development of further supporting infrastructure including land for Airport related uses (e.g. such as terminal buildings, parking and freight related activities) and business infrastructure (including the potential development of a business campus related to the airport and other services such as hotels). The Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan currently under preparation provides planning policies for the period to 2011. The plan proposes the identification of a major green wedge adjoining the airport on land between Barry, Rhoose and St Athan in order to prevent coalescence of these settlements. The impact of this would be to sterilise much of the land adjoining the airport from any form of development during the life of the plan. In our opinion, such a proposal is inappropriate in that the planning strategy for this area should be shaped in response to this consultation exercise and specifically decisions in respect of the future growth in usage of Cardiff International Airport. Whilst recognising that a green wedge designation would not be permanent, it would in effect sterilise the land adjoining the airport for a considerable period thereby serving to constrain economic development benefits whilst also playing only a limited role in preventing coalescence of these settlements. We consider that the aviation sector is critical to the Welsh economy in a number of ways including: direct and indirect jobs associated with Cardiff International Airport; direct and indirect benefits associated with firms involved in the aviation sector throughout Wales; the importance to Wales of having an international airport in seeking to attract

inward investment to the area and to provide the necessary infrastructure to ensure that existing occupier requirements can be satisfied. In order to maximise these economic benefits the issues raised earlier (and, in particular, the creation of appropriate supporting infrastructure) must be addressed to secure the sustainable future growth of the area. This includes providing a portfolio of facilities including appropriate linkages to the airport (by a choice of means of transport), airport related facilities and the ongoing maintenance of a supply of high quality sites capable of supporting business development in close proximity to the airport. Again, we re-emphasise our concern that the emerging planning policy framework could serve to constrain such options. The development of the aviation sector in Wales can undoubtedly make an important contribution to addressing deprivation and social exclusion. Any expansion will create a range of opportunities both within the immediate locality and the wider supporting area which can be filled, subject to appropriate support from public sector bodies (such as training/skills organisations) and employers to create new employment opportunities. Given the close proximity of Cardiff International Airport to the West Wales and the Valleys Objective One area, opportunities to promote regeneration and social inclusion should be fully embraced. We actively support initiatives that involve such public sector organisations and local employers in order to promote social inclusion. The planning system must play a central role in balancing economic, community and environmental needs and priorities. Therefore, we consider that the development of a cohesive long-term strategy for future growth at Cardiff International Airport should be supported. We are of the opinion that it is inappropriate to progress the emerging Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan to adoption with the inclusion of our clients' land within a proposed Green Wedge without the Authority first taking full account of the implications of the above mentioned Consultation Document and associated development strategy. As presently emerging, the development plan strategy is likely to significantly constrain opportunities for growth at Cardiff International Airport despite evidence not having been provided of any major environmental constraints on land adjoining the airport. In addition to this, development plan allocations have been based on past take up levels, which we consider are not relevant when compared with future projected levels.

Desired Change

We would wish to see the land indicated on the attached plan removed from the Green Wedge.

Recommendation

The new green wedge designation between Barry, Rhose and St. Athan is in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation number 3.24. In his report, the Inspector acknowledged that settlements in the Waterfront Strip are under considerable development pressure given its identification as a growth strip. Consequently, he considered that a green wedge should be designated between Barry, Rhose and St. Athan to avoid coalescence between and within these settlements and to protect the open nature of the land.

In accepting the Inspector's recommendation, the Council carried out a further assessment of the area, prior to designating the new green wedge. The green wedge between Barry, Rhose and St. Athan is considered to be accurately and logically drawn, abutting man made boundaries (e.g. roads and railway lines), major land uses (e.g. Aberthaw Power Station and Cardiff International Airport) and UDP designations (e.g. residential settlement boundaries and employment allocations).

Your comments with regard to the WAG / DfT consultation paper 'The Future Development of Air Transport in the UK: Wales' are noted. There is currently a large supply of employment land available for specific uses adjacent to the airport (Policy EMP 1 [4] refers), which was supported by the Inspector (Paragraph 5.2.8 of his report refers). The Council seeks to encourage the continued use and development of Cardiff International Airport (Policy TRAN 7 refers) and acknowledges that the green wedge designation will need to be re-assessed in the next Plan period. It is considered that the development of the objection site would clearly prejudice the open nature of the land and contribute towards the coalescence of Cardiff International Airport and Barry. Furthermore, Port Road West is considered to provide a logical and defensible boundary for the new green wedge. Finally, it should be noted that even if this green wedge designation were amended to exclude the objection site, no development would be permitted (except that permitted by UDP Policy ENV 1 and ENV 5).

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Green Wedges

Organisation Legal & General/Hines

Contact

Representor No. 1646 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 3074 **Modification No.** N025

Representation

We formally OBJECT to reference MOD N025 (REC 3.24) with specific reference to the inclusion of our client's land within an area proposed for Green Wedge. We justify this objection based on our objection to Reference MOD D018 which we produced below.

"We formally OBJECT to reference MOD D018 with specific reference to the inclusion of point (v), namely "(v) BARRY, RHOSE AND ST ATHAN". This proposal allocates part of our client's land (as indicated on the attached plan) as Green Wedge.

By way of justification to this objection, we comment that the emerging local planning policy framework including this area as Green Wedge would serve to unnecessarily constrain development. We understand that most of the land to the east of the runway and airport terminal is proposed as a green wedge despite not having been allocated for any specific use by the planning authority in the first deposit plan.

Whilst we accept that other land remains available for development, we are of the opinion that such an allocation would sterilise the land for the life of the emerging plan and, with the allocation having been proposed without taking into account the full

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

implications of the facilitating growth scenario, would prejudice the implementation of any future air strategy. It is therefore critical that local planning policies are formulated to take full account of this consultation exercise in order to ensure a coherent and deliverable strategy is prepared.

As has been highlighted in the recent Welsh Assembly Government and Department for Transport paper entitled 'The Future Development of Air Transport in the United Kingdom: Wales', promotion of a national airports' strategy in order to secure the co-ordinate delivery of services on a national basis is welcomed. Such a strategic approach is essential in order to ensure that predicted future growth in demand for air travel can be accommodated effectively taking full account of economic, environmental and other policy related objectives.

That Consultation Paper (on which we have submitted our representations) confirms the importance of aviation to Wales (both in terms of direct and indirect jobs) whilst also improving productivity and efficiency. Key business growth sectors (such as high tech industries) require effective links to air services, thereby demonstrating the importance of air travel to promoting inward investment.

The Consultation Document identifies six policy scenarios used to forecast demand at regional airports. We have submitted in our representations on the Consultation Document that we consider the "Facilitating Growth Scenario" is the most appropriate given that this will secure the ongoing development of major international airports in the South East of England whilst also maximising the potential benefits of Cardiff International Airport to the local economy.

It has been confirmed in the Consultation Document that under most scenarios air traffic using Cardiff International Airport will grow significantly from current levels of around 1.5 million passengers per annum. Indeed, under the facilitating growth option, around 4.4 million passengers per annum will use the airport - a threefold increase over current levels.

We maintain that Cardiff International Airport should be the focus for future growth in Wales in order to clawback passengers from other destinations and to maximise the potential benefits associated with air travel. However, such growth raises issues in respect of:

- terminal capacity;
- runway and apron capacity;
- supporting infrastructure.

Looking beyond direct operational impacts, the availability and quality of supporting infrastructure is of critical importance in maximising economic benefits. The likely rise in passenger numbers will place further strains on local and sub regional infrastructure servicing the airport. This situation is exacerbated by the current congestion experienced in the Culverhouse Cross area, which contributes to wider congestion in the area. We have submitted therefore that we would be supportive of any proposals that enhance existing road infrastructure provision to the airport and associated with this the provision of high quality public transport linkages to Cardiff and the wider sub-region (including the provision of a dedicated rail link to Cardiff airport).

We consider that, in order to support the expansion of Cardiff International Airport to 2030, opportunities must be made available through the development of further supporting infrastructure including land for airport related uses (e.g. such as terminal buildings, parking and freight related activities) and business infrastructure (including the potential development of a business campus related to the airport and other services such as hotels).

The Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan currently under preparation provides planning policies for the period to 2011. The plan proposes the identification of a major green wedge adjoining the airport on land between Barry, Rhoose and St Athan in order to prevent coalescence of these settlements. The impact of this would be to sterilise much of the land adjoining the airport from any form of development during the life of the plan. In our opinion, such a proposal is inappropriate in that the planning strategy for this area should be shaped in response to this consultation exercise and specifically decisions in respect of the future growth in usage of Cardiff International Airport. Whilst recognising that a green wedge designation would not be permanent, it would in effect sterilise the land adjoining the airport for a considerable period thereby serving to constrain economic development benefits whilst also playing only a limited role in preventing coalescence of these settlements.

We consider that the aviation sector is critical to the Welsh economy in a number of ways including:

- direct and indirect jobs associated with Cardiff International Airport;
- direct and indirect benefits associated with firms involved in the aviation sector throughout Wales;
- the importance to Wales of having an international airport in seeking to attract inward investment to the area and to provide the necessary infrastructure to ensure that existing occupier requirements can be satisfied.

In order to maximise these economic benefits the issues raised earlier (and, in particular, the creation of appropriate supporting infrastructure) must be addressed to secure the sustainable future growth of the area.

This includes providing a portfolio of facilities including appropriate linkages to the airport (by a choice of means of transport), airport related facilities and the ongoing maintenance of a supply of high quality sites capable of supporting business development in close proximity to the airport. Again, we re-emphasise our concern that the emerging planning policy framework could serve to constrain such options.

The development of the aviation sector in Wales can undoubtedly make an important contribution to addressing deprivation and social exclusion. Any expansion will create a range of opportunities both within the immediate locality and the wider supporting area which can be filled, subject to appropriate support from public sector bodies (such as training / skills organisations) and employers to create new employment opportunities. Given the close proximity of Cardiff International Airport to the West Wales and the Valleys Objective One area, opportunities to promote regeneration and social inclusion should be fully embraced.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

We actively support initiatives that involve such public sector organisations and local employers in order to promote social inclusion.

The planning system must play a central role in balancing economic, community and environmental needs and priorities. Therefore, we consider that the development of a cohesive long-term strategy for future growth at Cardiff International Airport should be supported.

We are of the opinion that it is inappropriate to progress the emerging Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan to adoption with the inclusion of our clients' land within a proposed Green Wedge without the Authority first taking full account of the implications of the above mentioned Consultation Document and associated development strategy. As presently emerging, the development plan strategy is likely to significantly constrain opportunities for growth at Cardiff International Airport despite evidence not having been provided of any major environmental constraints on land adjoining the airport. In addition to this, development plan allocations have been based on past take up levels which we consider are not relevant when compared with future projected levels."

Desired Change

We would wish to see the land indicated on the attached plan removed from the Green Wedge allocation. We would wish to see point (v) removed from the opposed Policy ENV3.

Recommendation

The new green wedge designation between Barry, Rhoose and St. Athan is in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation number 3.24. In his report, the Inspector acknowledged that settlements in the Waterfront Strip are under considerable development pressure given its identification as a growth strip. Consequently, he considered that a green wedge designation should be designated between Barry, Rhoose and St. Athan to avoid coalescence between and within these settlements and to protect the open nature of the land.

In accepting the Inspector's recommendation, the Council carried out a further assessment of the area, prior to designating the new green wedge. The green wedge between Barry, Rhoose and St. Athan is considered to be accurately and logically drawn, abutting man made boundaries (e.g. roads and railway lines), major land uses (e.g. Aberthaw Power Station and Cardiff International Airport) and UDP designations (e.g. residential settlement boundaries and employment allocations).

Your comments with regard to the WAG / DfT consultation paper 'The Future Development of Air Transport in the UK: Wales' are noted. However, as it has yet to be decided how the Issue: s in the consultation paper will be taken forward, it would be premature to allocate additional land for development in the vicinity of the airport. There is currently a large supply of employment land available for specific uses adjacent to the airport (Policy EMP 1[4] refers) which was supported by the Inspector (Paragraph 5.2.8 of his report refers). The Council seeks to encourage the continued use and development of Cardiff International Airport (Policy TRAN 7 refers) and acknowledges that the green wedge designation will need to be re-assessed in the next plan period. It is considered that the development of the objection site would clearly prejudice the open nature of the land and contribute towards the coalescence of Cardiff International Airport and Barry. Furthermore, Port Road West is considered to provide a logical and defensible boundary for the new green wedge. Finally, it should be noted that even if this green wedge designation was amended to exclude the objection site, no development would be permitted (except that permitted by UDP Policy ENV 1 and ENV 5).

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Green Wedges

Organisation		Contact	Cofton Limited
Representor No.	1668	Representation No.	6
		Accession No.	3085
		Modification No.	D018

Representation

1) Cofton Limited support the additional green wedge allocations at Barry, Rhoose and St Athan. Cofton Limited note the overall strategy for the Vale of Glamorgan is to focus development on the Waterfront Strip., and concur with the Authority that this must not be at the expense of insensitive encroachment into the countryside. Accordingly, the green wedges proposed ensure that the existing character of the settlements of Barry, Rhoose and St.Athan are protected and will endure in the long term.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Green Wedges

Organisation		Contact	Cofton Limited
---------------------	--	----------------	----------------

Representor No. 1668 **Representation No.** 23 **Accession No.** 3102 **Modification No.** N025

Representation

2) Cofon Limited supports the changes to the Proposals Map in respect of the allocation of green wedges around the north-west and eastern areas of Rhoose.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Green Wedges

Organisation c/o Agent

Contact Mr. Roy Alison

Representor No. 1669 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 2940 **Modification No.** D018

Representation

We object to the inclusion of the land outlined in red on the attached plan in the green wedge under Policy ENV 3(v) - Barry, Rhoose and St Athan. The justification for the designation of green wedges is "to prevent coalescence between and within settlements". The land edged red, if developed would not lead to the coalescence of Rhoose and St Athan as there is already development in Rhoose to the west of the subject land. Neither would it lead to coalescence within the settlement. My clients consider that if their objection is not accepted that this matter should be the subject of a further Public Inquiry as this was not included in the Deposit Draft Plan and they therefore will not have had the opportunity to put their case to an independent Planning Inspector.

Desired Change

The land identified on the attached plan in red should be deleted from the green wedge proposed for Barry, Rhoose and St Athan under Policy ENV 3.

Recommendation

The new green wedge designation between Barry, Rhoose and St. Athan is in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation number 3.24. In his report, the Inspector acknowledged that settlements in the Waterfront Strip are under considerable development pressure given its identification as a growth strip. Consequently, he considered that a green wedge designation should be designated between Barry, Rhoose and St. Athan to avoid coalescence between and within these settlements and to protect the open nature of the land. Moreover, the Inspector has previously considered the suitability of the objection site for housing and concluded that, "...any development on the site would constitute an intrusive element into what is an open rural landscape of pleasant visual quality" (paragraph C19.4 of the Inspector's Report refers).

In accepting the Inspector's recommendation, the Council carried out a further assessment of the area, prior to designating the new green wedge. The green wedge between Barry, Rhoose and St. Athan is considered to be accurately and logically drawn, abutting man made boundaries (e.g. roads and railway lines), major land uses (e.g. Aberthaw Power Station and Cardiff International Airport) and UDP designations (e.g. residential settlement boundaries and employment allocations). Nevertheless, it is accepted that such a designation is not permanent and would need to be re-assessed at the next review of the Plan.

In addition, it should be noted that even if this green wedge designation was amended to exclude the objection site, no development would be permitted (except that permitted by UDP Policy ENV 1). In view of the above, the inclusion of the objection site within Policy ENV 3 (V) is considered to be fully justified.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

HERITAGE COAST

Issue: Heritage Coast

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 120

Accession No. 2887

Modification No. D022

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

HOUSING ALLOCATION LLANDOUGH FIELDS

Issue: Housing Allocation Llandough

Organisation Land Division, Welsh Development Agency **Contact** Mike Cuddy

Representor No. 232 **Representation No.** 23 **Accession No.** 2798 **Modification No.** E30

Representation

The Welsh Development Agency believes that the allocation of the land, formerly earmarked for industrial development at Llandough Fields for housing represents the most cost effective way to secure regeneration of this important waterside site. The Agency recognises that there are significant regeneration works required, and is concerned that the redevelopment proposed should be of sufficient scale to generate funds for the improvements required to existing accesses and for the reclamation/development of the site. The site requires the provision of substantial new infrastructure, which in addition to improved access, includes a revetment to the River Ely, regarding of the land to provide a suitable platform, and suitable treatment of the land prior to development. Current Planning Policy Guidance advocates making the best use of appropriate vacant land. The site has a gross area of 3.4 hectares (8.4 acres), as identified on the attached plan, which was submitted, in evidence at the Public Local Inquiry. No detailed development proposals for housing were prepared but sketch design proposals suggested that 25 town houses in 3 story blocks and 40 flats could be built giving a total estimate of 65 dwelling units. On the gross site area, 65 units represents a gross residential density of only 19 units per hectare (7.7 units per acre). Whilst it is accepted that the configuration of the site, and its location adjacent to the River Ely, limit the potential capacity of the site, current government policy guidance, and evidence of similar developments elsewhere suggest that much higher densities should be achieved on the site, particularly in view of its waterside location. The Agency therefore requests that Modification E30 of the Modifications Report be amended as set out below. The first sentence of the second paragraph which reads "The development of the site for residential purposes is expected to result in the creation of approximately 65 units" should be deleted. This text should be replaced by the following sentence: "It is considered that the site should be developed at a net minimum density of 35 dwellings per hectare." It is also suggested that the first sentence of the third paragraph should be deleted as this concern is no longer relevant. Water levels in the vicinity of the site are now controlled by the Barrage. It is suggested that the second sentence of the third paragraph be amended to read: "The Environment Agency have indicated that prior to any development proceeding, an Otter Survey will be required to establish whether this area is used "for lying up".

Desired Change

The first sentence of the second paragraph which reads "The development of the site for residential purposes is expected to result in the creation of approximately 65 units" should be deleted. This text should be replaced by the following sentence: "It is considered that the site should be developed at a net minimum density of 35 dwellings per hectare." It is also suggested that the first sentence of the third paragraph should be deleted as this concern is no longer relevant. Water levels in the vicinity of the site are now controlled by the Barrage. It is suggested that the second sentence of the third paragraph be amended to read: "The Environment Agency have indicated that prior to any development proceeding, an Otter Survey will be required to establish whether this area

Recommendation

The Council considers that the capacity of 65 dwellings on the allocated Llandough Fields is realistic due to the site constraints created by virtue of the sites location and elongated shape. However, given that the proposed modification indicates that a development brief will be required for the site, the Council accepts that it may be possible to achieve higher densities, for example through innovative design. However this would be dependent on the development providing that an acceptable standard of amenity.

In respect to the deletion of the reference to run-off restriction, the Council considers that it would be inappropriate for this to be removed considering the location of the site in relation to the River Taff. Also the Cardiff Barrage was activated at the time the Environment Agency indicated that run off restrictions may apply to the site.

Finally, reference to the undertaken of an Otter survey has been included within the proposed modification (MOD E40, paragraph 3) and therefore the Council has addressed this Issue: .

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing Allocation Llandough Fields

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 99 **Accession No.** 2866 **Modification No.** E30

Representation

CCW supports the requirement for an Otter Survey to be undertaken at Llandough Fields, Penarth

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Housing Allocation Llandough Fields

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 21 **Accession No.** 3010 **Modification No.** E30

Representation

WTSWW support the EA's requirement for an otter survey at Llandough Fields Penarth.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

HOUSING ALLOCATION PENCOEDTRE

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

delaying the contribution of this site to the later part of the plan period. The allocation of this site should be considered the same way as the other sites listed in Table 1 - none of which footnote 2 refers. Whilst it is accepted that the contribution of the site to housing is dependent on the outcome of a development brief, this does not justify delaying the development of the site.

Desired Change

Footnote 2 should be deleted from the proposed modifications.

Recommendation

The Council is of the opinion that in order to ensure that residential land is available throughout the plan period it is necessary to indicate phasing of new greenfield allocations. The Council also considers this to be a realistic time scale as it takes account for the time required for undertaking a development brief that would successfully address the on site issues associated with this site.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation Forest Enterprise

Contact

Representor No. 21

Representation No. 3

Accession No. 2928

Modification No. E04

Representation

Forest Enterprise support the proposed modifications in relation to the 14 hectares of land that is allocated for mixed use development of residential, employment and woodland at Pencoedtre. We understand that the Countryside Council for Wales have indicated that the woodland on the site is of nature conservation value and as a result, the Council have not taken on board the Inspector's recommendation that the site should be allocated for 7 has of employment and 7 has of residential for approximately 135 units. Instead the amount and location of the elements of residential, employment and woodland will be determined through the preparation of a development brief. Forest Enterprise are fully aware of the conservation issues relating to the site and have undertaken studies of the site to identify those areas of the site worthy of retention. Forest Enterprise's position is more fully explained in the attached letter and it is their intention to fully engage with the community and Countryside Council for Wales in identifying the areas of woodland to be retained and which will be progressively restored and managed by Forest Enterprise.

Dear Sir,

PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN, DEPOSIT DRAFT 1998

We are writing to you to support the continued allocation of the land at Pencoedtre for a mixture of housing, employment and woodland uses, the proportions of which to be confirmed by further research to be undertaken for the preparation of a woodland/conservation management plan. These comments support the representations submitted by our Agent, Harmers.

Following the Inspector's recommendation arising from the Public Inquiry in 1999 that the site should be reallocated for a mixture of housing and employment, Forest Enterprise (FE) has undertaken detailed studies of the site to provide the necessary information for the preparation of a Development Brief to be submitted to the Council for approval. A significant part of these studies has involved detailed surveys to assess the ancient woodland characteristics of this site.

Pencoedtre Wood (West) and others in the vicinity were included in the draft Inventory of Ancient Woodlands produced by the former Nature Conservation Council in the 1970s. This wood is Plantation on an Ancient Woodland Site (PAWS). This is where plantations, predominantly conifers have been established in place of previous broadleaf trees on woodland identified as being an Ancient Woodland site.

The ecological surveys were also undertaken as part of an exercise to advise the Forestry Commissioners of the potential impact of development within the wood. Woodlands for Wales, the Welsh Assembly Government's Strategy for woodlands, encourages measures to prevent further loss of Ancient Woodland with a presumption in favour of protecting Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW). Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) seeks to protect Ancient and Ancient semi-natural woodlands from development that would result in significant damage.

In order to ensure compatibility with the policies aimed at protecting Ancient Woodland, FE has identified areas within the wood that it would exclude from any development. When development of the remainder of the land at Pencoedtre takes place these areas of retained woodland would be progressively restored and managed by Forest Enterprise as a Community woodland feature. In drawing up its detailed proposal FE will fully engage with the Community and with the Countryside Council for Wales.

In brief, the ecological survey and the evaluation that followed shows the woodland to comprise predominantly Japanese Larch/Beech plantation, with a small area in the southern extremity, where the native trees have asserted themselves and is regarded by Forest Enterprise to be equivalent in quality to (ASNW). There are other parts of the wood with a high ecological potential for restoration to Ancient Woodland, which are also predominantly in the southern part of the wood. It is intended that these areas will be retained, managed and restored. Finally, there are significant areas of the wood of far lower ecological

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

significance predominantly in the northern areas that do not justify retention.

The Forestry Commissioners have considered these proposals and have confirmed their support for partial development within the woodland that would allow for the restoration of the higher quality Ancient Woodland site and benefit the community whilst allowing the development of the lower quality areas.

Forest Enterprise only holds a long leasehold interest in the woodland and covenants within the lease prevent any form of public access. Shooting rights over the wood are reserved to the Landlord. The joint approach by FE and the Landlord of the development of the land at Pencoedtre will ensure that FE not only would be able to manage and restore the retained woodlands but it will also be provided as a community feature with the public able to enjoy access to these retained areas. Without the development proceeding, not only would the public access over the retained woodland area be denied but there would be no funding available to allow the restoration of the important ecological areas.

In addition to the FE Woodland Areas there is an adjacent area of Ancient Semi Natural Woodland owned by Messrs. Thomas and Brown that has been heavily grazed and unmanaged. Provisional agreement has been reached with these owners for FE to take ownership of this wood and for it to be fully integrated into the managed Woodland Area for progressive restoration and public benefit.

It is intended that these measures will be incorporated within a Woodland Management Plan/Development Brief to be discussed and agreed with the Council as required by the Modifications to the Deposit UDP.

Yours sincerely, Ian Shaw

Desired Change

Not applicable

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation Forest Enterprise

Contact

Representor No. 21

Representation No. 4

Accession No. 2929

Modification No. E18

Representation

Forest Enterprise support the proposed modifications in relation to the 14 hectares of land that is allocated for mixed use development of residential, employment and woodland at Pencoedtre. We understand that the Countryside Council for Wales have indicated that the woodland on the site is of nature conservation value and as a result, the Council have not taken on board the Inspector's recommendation that the site should be allocated for 7 has of employment and 7 has of residential for approximately 135 units. Instead the amount and location of the elements of residential, employment and woodland will be determined through the preparation of a development brief. Forest Enterprise are fully aware of the conservation Issue: s relating to the site and have undertaken studies of the site to identify those areas of the site worthy of retention. Forrest Enterprise's position is more fully explained in the attached letter and it is their intention to fully engage with the community and Countryside Council for Wales in identifying the areas of woodland to be retained and which will be progressively restored and managed by Forest Enterprise.

Dear Sir,

PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN, DEPOSIT DRAFT 1998

We are writing to you to support the continued allocation of the land at Pencoedtre for a mixture of housing, employment and woodland uses, the proportions of which to be confirmed by further research to be undertaken for the preparation of a woodland/conservation management plan. These comments support the representations submitted by our Agent, Harmers.

Following the Inspector's recommendation arising from the Public Inquiry in 1999 that the site should be reallocated for a mixture of housing and employment, Forest Enterprise (FE) has undertaken detailed studies of the site to provide the necessary information for the preparation of a Development Brief to be submitted to the Council for approval. A significant part of these studies has involved detailed surveys to assess the ancient woodland characteristics of this site.

Pencoedtre Wood (West) and others in the vicinity were included in the draft Inventory of Ancient Woodlands produced by the former Nature Conservation Council in the 1970s. This wood is Plantation on an Ancient Woodland Site (PAWS). This is where plantations, predominantly conifers have been established in place of previous broadleaf trees on woodland identified as being an Ancient Woodland site.

The ecological surveys were also undertaken as part of an exercise to advise the Forestry Commissioners of the potential impact of development within the wood. Woodlands for Wales, the Welsh Assembly Government's Strategy for woodlands, encourages measures to prevent further loss of Ancient Woodland with a presumption in favour of protecting Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW). Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) seeks to protect Ancient and Ancient semi-natural woodlands from development that would result in significant damage.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

In order to ensure compatibility with the policies aimed at protecting Ancient Woodland, FE has identified areas within the wood that it would exclude from any development. When development of the remainder of the land at Pencoedtre takes place these areas of retained woodland would be progressively restored and managed by Forest Enterprise as a Community woodland feature. In drawing up its detailed proposal FE will fully engage with the Community and with the Countryside Council for Wales.

In brief, the ecological survey and the evaluation that followed shows the woodland to comprise predominantly Japanese Larch/Beech plantation, with a small area in the southern extremity, where the native trees have asserted themselves and is regarded by Forest Enterprise to be equivalent in quality to (ASNW). There are other parts of the wood with a high ecological potential for restoration to Ancient Woodland, which are also predominantly in the southern part of the wood. It is intended that these areas will be retained, managed and restored. Finally, there are significant areas of the wood of far lower ecological significance predominantly in the northern areas that do not justify retention.

The Forestry Commissioners have considered these proposals and have confirmed their support for partial development within the woodland that would allow for the restoration of the higher quality Ancient Woodland site and benefit the community whilst allowing the development of the lower quality areas.

Forest Enterprise only holds a long leasehold interest in the woodland and covenants within the lease prevent any form of public access. Shooting rights over the wood are reserved to the Landlord. The joint approach by FE and the Landlord of the development of the land at Pencoedtre will ensure that FE not only would be able to manage and restore the retained woodlands but it will also be provided as a community feature with the public able to enjoy access to these retained areas. Without the development proceeding, not only would the public access over the retained woodland area be denied but there would be no funding available to allow the restoration of the important ecological areas.

In addition to the FE Woodland Areas there is an adjacent area of Ancient Semi Natural Woodland owned by Messrs. Thomas and Brown that has been heavily grazed and unmanaged. Provisional agreement has been reached with these owners for FE to take ownership of this wood and for it to be fully integrated into the managed Woodland Area for progressive restoration and public benefit.

It is intended that these measures will be incorporated within a Woodland Management Plan/Development Brief to be discussed and agreed with the Council as required by the Modifications to the Deposit UDP.

Yours sincerely, Ian Shaw

Desired Change

Not applicable

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation Forest Enterprise

Contact

Representor No. 21

Representation No. 5

Accession No. 2930

Modification No. N011

Representation

Forest Enterprise support the proposed modifications in relation to the 14 hectares of land that is allocated for mixed use development of residential, employment and woodland at Pencoedtre. We understand that the Countryside Council for Wales have indicated that the woodland on the site is of nature conservation value and as a result, the Council have not taken on board the Inspector's recommendation that the site should be allocated for 7 has of employment and 7 has of residential for approximately 135 units. Instead the amount and location of the elements of residential, employment and woodland will be determined through the preparation of a development brief. Forest Enterprise are fully aware of the conservation Issue: s relating to the site and have undertaken studies of the site to identify those areas of the site worthy of retention. Forrest Enterprise's position is more fully explained in the attached letter and it is their intention to fully engage with the community and Countryside Council for Wales in identifying the areas of woodland to be retained and which will be progressively restored and managed by Forest Enterprise.

Dear Sir,

PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN, DEPOSIT DRAFT 1998

We are writing to you to support the continued allocation of the land at Pencoedtre for a mixture of housing, employment and woodland uses, the proportions of which to be confirmed by further research to be undertaken for the preparation of a woodland/conservation management plan. These comments support the representations submitted by our Agent, Harmers.

Following the Inspector's recommendation arising from the Public Inquiry in 1999 that the site should be reallocated for a mixture of housing and employment, Forest Enterprise (FE) has undertaken detailed studies of the site to provide the necessary information for the preparation of a Development Brief to be submitted to the Council for approval. A significant part

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

of these studies has involved detailed surveys to assess the ancient woodland characteristics of this site.

Pencoedre Wood (West) and others in the vicinity were included in the draft Inventory of Ancient Woodlands produced by the former Nature Conservation Council in the 1970s. This wood is Plantation on an Ancient Woodland Site (PAWS). This is where plantations, predominantly conifers have been established in place of previous broadleaf trees on woodland identified as being an Ancient Woodland site.

The ecological surveys were also undertaken as part of an exercise to advise the Forestry Commissioners of the potential impact of development within the wood. Woodlands for Wales, the Welsh Assembly Government's Strategy for woodlands, encourages measures to prevent further loss of Ancient Woodland with a presumption in favour of protecting Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW). Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) seeks to protect Ancient and Ancient semi-natural woodlands from development that would result in significant damage.

In order to ensure compatibility with the policies aimed at protecting Ancient Woodland, FE has identified areas within the wood that it would exclude from any development. When development of the remainder of the land at Pencoedre takes place these areas of retained woodland would be progressively restored and managed by Forest Enterprise as a Community woodland feature. In drawing up its detailed proposal FE will fully engage with the Community and with the Countryside Council for Wales.

In brief, the ecological survey and the evaluation that followed shows the woodland to comprise predominantly Japanese Larch/Beech plantation, with a small area in the southern extremity, where the native trees have asserted themselves and is regarded by Forest Enterprise to be equivalent in quality to (ASNW). There are other parts of the wood with a high ecological potential for restoration to Ancient Woodland, which are also predominantly in the southern part of the wood. It is intended that these areas will be retained, managed and restored. Finally, there are significant areas of the wood of far lower ecological significance predominantly in the northern areas that do not justify retention.

The Forestry Commissioners have considered these proposals and have confirmed their support for partial development within the woodland that would allow for the restoration of the higher quality Ancient Woodland site and benefit the community whilst allowing the development of the lower quality areas.

Forest Enterprise only holds a long leasehold interest in the woodland and covenants within the lease prevent any form of public access. Shooting rights over the wood are reserved to the Landlord. The joint approach by FE and the Landlord of the development of the land at Pencoedre will ensure that FE not only would be able to manage and restore the retained woodlands but it will also be provided as a community feature with the public able to enjoy access to these retained areas. Without the development proceeding, not only would the public access over the retained woodland area be denied but there would be no funding available to allow the restoration of the important ecological areas.

In addition to the FE Woodland Areas there is an adjacent area of Ancient Semi Natural Woodland owned by Messrs. Thomas and Brown that has been heavily grazed and unmanaged. Provisional agreement has been reached with these owners for FE to take ownership of this wood and for it to be fully integrated into the managed Woodland Area for progressive restoration and public benefit

It is intended that these measures will be incorporated within a Woodland Management Plan/Development Brief to be discussed and agreed with the Council as required by the Modifications to the Deposit UDP.
Yours sincerely, Ian Shaw

Desired Change

Not applicable

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedre

Organisation Barry Town Council

Contact Mr. Ian Harris

Representor No. 33

Representation No. 21

Accession No. 1757 **Modification No.** E18

Representation

The Town Council is totally opposed to any residential development within the area of North-East Barry shown hatched on the modified proposals map (ref.: MOD N011) for the following reasons:- 1) Undue pressure would be placed upon the local infrastructure, highway network, education facilities etc, which are already having to cope with the effects of the large scale residential development of Pencoedre Village. 2) Open space in this part of town is severely limited. 3) Alternative brownfield sites are available elsewhere in the town. Furthermore:- 4) Great concerns are expressed regarding the impact of any additional development on the irreplaceable ancient woodland found within this area. This ancient woodland should not only be fully protected for its biodiversity value but also for its significant amenity benefits. It forms a most attractive green backdrop to the on-going residential development at Pencoedre Village situated immediately to the south.

Desired Change

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

1) That the proposals for North-East Barry be amended to exclude any additional residential development. 2) The irreplaceable areas of ancient woodland at North-East Barry should be protected from all forms of development not only for its bio-diversity value but also for its significant amenity benefits as an attractive green backdrop to the ongoing and large scale residential development at Pencoedtre Village.

Recommendation

The proposed modification indicates that prior to the development of the site, a revised development brief shall be undertaken which shall examine the Issue: s that you have raised in your objection; namely local infrastructure, highway network, and educational facilities. In addition to this, the proposed modification also indicates that a Green Transport Plan must also be produced for the site as a whole, this would set out how the proposed development aims to minimise the effect of travel and transport.

The need to allocate Pencoedtre for residential development has been considered by the Inspector's as being necessary due to the under allocation of housing land within the Draft Deposit Plan. Additionally, the Inspector concluded that the inclusion of Pencoedtre as a mixed-use development would provide "an addition to the range an choice of sites consistent with the plan's overall strategy". Consequently, the inclusion of Pencoedtre and has been undertaken in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations and accords to Planning Policy Wales 2002 which ensures that housing is made available over the plan period.

Finally the proposed modification recognises the ancient woodland and indicates that a development brief for the site will be required to "ensure that the development of this site protects and enhances the quality ancient woodland". These requirements will also protect the ancient woodland from development. Additionally, the proposed modification also states that any development of the site would be required to retain the existing ancient woodland and that prior to the granting of planning permission the developer will be required to undertake a woodland survey and submit an appropriate management plan for the woodland. This would ensure that not only is the woodland safeguarded, but its management would also provide the opportunity to enhance its value as an area of open recreational space.

On this basis the Council is satisfied that the proposed modification address the concerns that you have expressed in your objection as they relate to the impact development would have on local infrastructure, highway network, educational facilities, the loss of open space and ancient woodland. Furthermore the Council considers that the allocation of Pencoedtre for housing is necessary to meet its housing requirements over the plan period and is consistent with the Plans strategy for development within the Waterfront Strip.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation Barry Town Council

Contact Mr. Ian Harris

Representor No. 33

Representation No. 22

Accession No. 1758

Modification No. N011

Representation

The Town Council is totally opposed to any residential development within the area of North-East Barry shown hatched on the modified proposals map (ref.: MOD N011) for the following reasons:- 1) Undue pressure would be placed upon the local infrastructure, highway network, education facilities etc, which are already having to cope with the effects of the large scale residential development of Pencoedtre Village. 2) Open space in this part of town is severely limited. 3) Alternative brownfield sites are available elsewhere in the town. Furthermore:- 4) Great concerns are expressed regarding the impact of any additional development on the irreplaceable ancient woodland found within this area. This ancient woodland should not only be fully protected for its biodiversity value but also for its significant amenity benefits. It forms a most attractive green backdrop to the on-going residential development at Pencoedtre Village situated immediately to the south.

Desired Change

1) That the proposals for North-East Barry be amended to exclude any additional residential development. 2) The irreplaceable areas of ancient woodland at North-East Barry should be protected from all forms of development not only for its bio-diversity value but also for its significant amenity benefits as an attractive green backdrop to the ongoing and large scale residential development at Pencoedtre Village.

Recommendation

The proposed modification indicates that prior to the development of the site, a revised development brief shall be undertaken which shall examine the Issue: s that you have raised in your objection; namely local infrastructure, highway network, and educational facilities. In addition to this, the proposed modification also indicates that a Green Transport Plan must also be produced for the site as a whole, this would set out how the proposed development aims to minimise the effect of travel and transport.

The need to allocate Pencoedtre for residential development has been considered by the Inspector's as being necessary due to the under allocation of housing land within the Draft Deposit Plan. Additionally, the Inspector concluded that the inclusion of Pencoedtre as a mixed-use development would provide "an addition to the range an choice of sites consistent with the plan's

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

overall strategy". Consequently, the inclusion of Pencoedtre and has been undertaken in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations and accords to Planning Policy Wales 2002 which ensures that housing is made available over the plan period.

Finally the proposed modification recognises the ancient woodland and indicates that a development brief for the site will be required to "ensure that the development of this site protects and enhances the quality ancient woodland". These requirements will also protect the ancient woodland from development. Additionally, the proposed modification also states that any development of the site would be required to retain the existing ancient woodland and that prior to the granting of planning permission the developer will be required to undertake a woodland survey and submit an appropriate management plan for the woodland. This would ensure that not only is the woodland safeguarded, but its management would also provide the opportunity to enhance its value as an area of open recreational space.

On this basis the Council is satisfied that the proposed modification address the concerns that you have expressed in your objection as they relate to the impact development would have on local infrastructure, highway network, educational facilities, the loss of open space and ancient woodland. Furthermore the Council considers that the allocation of Pencoedtre for housing is necessary to meet its housing requirements over the plan period and is consistent with the Plans strategy for development within the Waterfront Strip.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 77

Accession No. 2844

Modification No. F028

Representation

CCW object to the allocation of the site 18 at Pencoedtre into the general employment policy given the important area of ancient woodland which occupies the site. This is in line with current National Planning guidance which states that Ancient Semi natural woodlands are irreplaceable habitats of high biodiversity which should be protected from development that would result in significant damage (Para 5.2.8 PPW March 2002).

Desired Change

Remove Pencoedtre allocation from EMP 1

Recommendation

The proposed modification recognises the importance of the ancient woodland that occupies part of the allocated Pencoedtre site and states that a development brief for the site will be required to "ensure that the development of this site protects and enhances the quality ancient woodland". The proposed modification also states that any development of the site would require to retain the existing ancient woodland and that prior to the granting of planning permission the developer will be required to undertake a woodland survey and submit an appropriate management plan for the woodland.

On this basis the Council considers that these requirements will protect the quality ancient woodland from development in accordance with Planning Policy Wales (2002), and also addresses your objection towards the allocation due to the impact it would have on the ancient woodland.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 80

Accession No. 2847

Modification No. F007

Representation

CCW object to the allocation of Site 18 - Pencoedtre for employment uses.

Desired Change

Remove allocation.

Recommendation

The Pencoedtre site was included in an extensive study that now forms part of the comprehensive development strategy for North East Barry, comprising of virtually self contained development consisting of housing, shopping, educational facilities, recreation and employment uses. The Inspector concluded that the proposal to develop the site as a mixed use development would be appropriate as it lies on the periphery of the town and that the inclusion of Pencoedtre as a mixed-use development would provide "an addition to the range and choice of sites consistent with the plan's overall strategy".

The promotion of Pencoedtre as a mixed-use development also accords with Planning Policy Wales that states that:

"Mixed use development should be promoted in, and adjoining settlements, where appropriate. Policies and supplementary planning guidance should support mixed use developments..."

Consequently, the inclusion of Pencoedtre for mixed use development and has been undertaken in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations and accords to Planning Policy Wales 2002 which promotes mixed use developments.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 145 **Accession No.** 2912 **Modification No.** E18

Representation

CCW object to MOD E18

Desired Change

MOD E18 CCW object to the additional area of land allocated for housing at the site given that the site is occupied by ancient woodland. Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) requires local authorities to protect ancient and semi-natural woodlands from development that would result in significant damage. It makes no reference to the quality of the woodlands, but refers to their importance as irreplaceable habitats of high biodiversity value, which should be protected from development.

Recommendation

The proposed modification recognises the importance of the ancient woodland that occupies part of the allocated Pencoedtre site and states that a development brief for the site will be required to "ensure that the development of this site protects and enhances the quality ancient woodland". The proposed modification also states that any development of the site would require to retain the existing ancient woodland and that prior to the granting of planning permission the developer will be required to undertake a woodland survey and submit an appropriate management plan for the woodland.

On this basis the Council considers that these requirements will protect the quality ancient woodland from development in accordance with Planning Policy Wales (2002), and also addresses your objection towards the allocation due to the impact it would have on the ancient woodland.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru **Contact** Ryan Bowen
Representor No. 293 **Representation No.** 19 **Accession No.** 2775 **Modification No.** E16

Representation

Development must have regard to the presence and protection of strategic water mains in order to safeguard security of water supply to domestic and industrial customers.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru

Contact Ryan Bowen

Representor No. 293

Representation No. 27

Accession No. 2783

Modification No. F028

Representation

Developments must have regard to the presence and protection of strategic water mains in order to safeguard the security of water supply to domestic and industrial customers.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation Glamorgan Bird Club

Contact Mr. R Nottage

Representor No. 604

Representation No. 2

Accession No. 1884

Modification No. E04

Representation

MOD E04 lists Pencoedtre, Barry as a site allocated for housing development, subject to a development brief. I object to this allocation as this site is classified as Ancient Woodland (classified in the Glamorgan Inventory of Ancient Woodlands, E.Southern, 1986, Nature Conservancy Council). This site is also a candidate Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Development at this site would contravene Planning Policy Wales 2002 which states that: "ancient and semi-natural woodlands are irreplaceable habitats of high biodiversity value which should be protected from development that would result in significant damage". Development at this site would also contravene the following policies in the Vale of Glamorgan Council UDP: Policy ENV10 - Protection of landscape features, Policy Env14 - Local sites of nature conservation significance, Policy Hous9 - Residential development within settlement boundaries: sub-item (iii).

Desired Change

I request that the Pencoedtre, Barry site is deleted from the list of sites allocated for housing development under MOD E04, and all subsequent references to it removed.

Recommendation

The proposed modification recognises the importance of the ancient woodland that occupies part of the allocated Pencoedtre site and states that a development brief for the site will be required to "ensure that the development of this site protects and enhances the quality ancient woodland". The proposed modification also states that any development of the site would require to retain the existing ancient woodland and that prior to the granting of planning permission the developer will be required to undertake a woodland survey and submit an appropriate management plan for the woodland.

On this basis the Council considers that these requirements will protect the quality ancient woodland from development in accordance with Planning Policy Wales (2002), and also addresses your objection towards the allocation due to the impact it would have on the ancient woodland.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales

Contact Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643

Representation No. 18

Accession No. 3007

Modification No. E18

Representation

WTSWW object to allocation of land at Pencoedre wood for any development. We understand the need to revise the brief to exclude all ancient woodland, but are totally confused by the planning history of this site, and wish it to be excluded.

Desired Change

WTSWW object to allocation of land at Pencoedre wood for any development. We understand the need to revise the brief to exclude all ancient woodland, but are totally confused by the planning history of this site, and wish it to be excluded.

Recommendation

The area of Pencoedre, which includes the ancient woodland, was first allocated for Special Employment uses in the Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan 1995, and was subsequently carried forward in to the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft. In 1997 outline planning permission (application no. 95/01148/OUT) was granted for the development of the site for mixed-use development, which included a business park.

The Inspector recommended that the categorising of Pencoedre as a Special Employment Site should be removed on the basis that such a classification was not recognised in the Uses Class Order 1987. The Inspector also concluded that given the Pencoedre's proximity to local highway networks and local transport, it was more suited to a local employment it should be reallocated as a general employment site within the UDP.

The Inspector also recommended that a smaller proportion of the site should be developed for employment (5.24 ha) with the remaining 7ha being allocated for housing. This was also seen by the Inspector as being necessary due to the under allocation of housing land within the Draft Deposit Plan.

Additionally, the Pencoedre site was included in a extensive study that now forms part of the comprehensive development strategy for North East Barry consisting of housing, shopping, education, recreation and employment uses. Therefore the Inspector concluded that the proposal to develop the site as a mixed used development would be appropriate as it lies on the periphery of the town and that the inclusion of Pencoedre as a mixed-use development would provide "an addition to the range and choice of sites consistent with the plan's overall strategy".

The proposed modification E18 indicates that a development brief will be required for the site to "ensure that the development of this site protects and enhances the quality ancient woodland". These requirements will also protect the ancient woodland from development in accordance with Planning Policy Wales (2002). Additionally, the proposed modification also states that any development of the site would be required to retain the existing ancient woodland and that prior to the granting of planning permission the developer will be required to undertake a woodland survey and submit an appropriate management plan for the woodland. This would not only ensure that the woodland is safeguarded, but its management would also provide the opportunity to enhance its value as an area of informal open space.

Consequently, the inclusion of Pencoedre for mixed use development and has been undertaken in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation (REC5.10) and accords to Planning Policy Wales 2002 which promotes mixed use developments. Therefore the Council considers it unnecessary to delete Pencoedre wood from the proposed modifications.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedre

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 19 **Accession No.** 3008 **Modification No.** F007

Representation

WTSWW object to allocation of land at Pencoedre wood for any development. We understand the need to revise the brief to exclude all ancient woodland, but are totally confused by the planning history of this site, and wish it to be excluded.

Desired Change

WTSWW object to allocation of land at Pencoedre wood for any development. We understand the need to revise the brief to exclude all ancient woodland, but are totally confused by the planning history of this site, and wish it to be excluded.

Recommendation

The area of Pencoedre, which includes the ancient woodland, was first allocated for Special Employment uses in the Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan 1995, and was subsequently carried forward in to the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft. In 1997 outline planning permission (application no. 95/01148/OUT) was granted for the development of the site for mixed-use development, which included a business park.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

The Inspector recommended that the categorising of Pencoedtre as a Special Employment Site should be removed on the basis that such a classification was not recognised in the Uses Class Order 1987. The Inspector also concluded that given the Pencoedtre's proximity to local highway networks and local transport, it was more suited to a local employment it should be reallocated as a general employment site within the UDP.

The Inspector also recommended that a smaller proportion of the site should be developed for employment (5.24 ha) with the remaining 7ha being allocated for housing. This was also seen by the Inspector as being necessary due to the under allocation of housing land within the Draft Deposit Plan.

Additionally, the Pencoedtre site was included in a extensive study that now forms part of the comprehensive development strategy for North East Barry consisting of housing, shopping, education, recreation and employment uses. Therefore the Inspector concluded that the proposal to develop the site as a mixed used development would be appropriate as it lies on the periphery of the town and that the inclusion of Pencoedtre as a mixed-use development would provide "an addition to the range and choice of sites consistent with the plan's overall strategy".

The proposed modification E18 indicates that a development brief will be required for the site to "ensure that the development of this site protects and enhances the quality ancient woodland". These requirements will also protect the ancient woodland from development in accordance with Planning Policy Wales (2002). Additionally, the proposed modification also states that any development of the site would be required to retain the existing ancient woodland and that prior to the granting of planning permission the developer will be required to undertake a woodland survey and submit an appropriate management plan for the woodland. This would not only ensure that the woodland is safeguarded, but its management would also provide the opportunity to enhance its value as an area of informal open space.

Consequently, the inclusion of Pencoedtre for mixed use development and has been undertaken in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation (REC5.10) and accords to Planning Policy Wales 2002 which promotes mixed use developments. Therefore the Council considers it unnecessary to delete Pencoedtre wood from the proposed modifications.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 20 **Accession No.** 3009 **Modification No.** F028

Representation

WTSWW object to allocation of land at Pencoedtre wood for any development. We understand the need to revise the brief to exclude all ancient woodland, but are totally confused by the planning history of this site, and wish it to be excluded.

Desired Change

WTSWW object to allocation of land at Pencoedtre wood for any development. We understand the need to revise the brief to exclude all ancient woodland, but are totally confused by the planning history of this site, and wish it to be excluded.

Recommendation

The area of Pencoedtre, which includes the ancient woodland, was first allocated for Special Employment uses in the Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan 1995, and was subsequently carried forward in to the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft. In 1997 outline planning permission (application no. 95/01148/OUT) was granted for the development of the site for mixed-use development, which included a business park.

The Inspector recommended that the categorising of Pencoedtre as a Special Employment Site should be removed on the basis that such a classification was not recognised in the Uses Class Order 1987. The Inspector also concluded that given the Pencoedtre's proximity to local highway networks and local transport, it was more suited to a local employment it should be reallocated as a general employment site within the UDP.

The Inspector also recommended that a smaller proportion of the site should be developed for employment (5.24 ha) with the remaining 7ha being allocated for housing. This was also seen by the Inspector as being necessary due to the under allocation of housing land within the Draft Deposit Plan.

Additionally, the Pencoedtre site was included in a extensive study that now forms part of the comprehensive development strategy for North East Barry consisting of housing, shopping, education, recreation and employment uses. Therefore the Inspector concluded that the proposal to develop the site as a mixed used development would be appropriate as it lies on the periphery of the town and that the inclusion of Pencoedtre as a mixed-use development would provide "an addition to the range and choice of sites consistent with the plan's overall strategy".

The proposed modification F028 indicates that a development brief will be required for the site to "ensure that the development of this site protects and enhances the quality ancient woodland". These requirements will also protect the ancient woodland from development in accordance with Planning Policy Wales (2002). Additionally, the proposed modification also states that

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

any development of the site would be required to retain the existing ancient woodland and that prior to the granting of planning permission the developer will be required to undertake a woodland survey and submit an appropriate management plan for the woodland. This would not only ensure that the woodland is safeguarded, but its management would also provide the opportunity to enhance its value as an area of informal open space.

Consequently, the inclusion of Pencoedtre for mixed use development and has been undertaken in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation (REC5.10) and accords to Planning Policy Wales 2002 which promotes mixed use developments. Therefore the Council considers it unnecessary to delete Pencoedtre wood from the proposed modifications.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation		Contact	Mr. Richard Smith				
Representor No.	1648	Representation No.	1	Accession No.	2799	Modification No.	E04

Representation

MOD E04 lists Pencoedtre, Barry as a site allocated for housing development, subject to a development brief. I object to this allocation as this site is classified as Ancient Woodland (classified in the Glamorgan Inventory of Ancient Woodlands, E.Southern, 1986, Nature Conservation Council). This site is also a candidate Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Development at this site would contravene Planning Policy Wales 2002 which states that: "ancient and semi-natural woodlands are irreplaceable habitats of high biodiversity value which should be protected from development that would result in significant damage". Development at this site would also contravene the following policies in the Vale of Glamorgan Council UDP: Policy ENV10 - Protection of landscape features, Policy ENV14 - Local sites of nature conservation significance, Policy HOUS9 - Residential Development within settlement boundaries: sub-item (iii).

Desired Change

I request that the Pencoedtre, Barry site is deleted from the list of sites allocated for housing development under MODE04, and all subsequent references to it removed.

Recommendation

The proposed modification recognises the importance of the ancient woodland that occupies part of the allocated Pencoedtre site and that a development brief for the site will be required to "ensure that the development of this site protects and enhances the quality ancient woodland". The proposed modification also states that any development of the site would be required to retain the existing ancient woodland and that prior to the granting of planning permission the developer will be required to undertake a woodland survey and submit an appropriate management plan for the woodland. These measures will ensure that any development of the site would also accord to Policies ENV10, ENV and HOUS9, which you also refer to in your objection.

On this basis the Council considers that these requirements will protect the ancient woodland from development in accordance with Planning Policy Wales (2002) and also compliments Policies ENV10, ENV and HOUS9.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation Contact		Mrs. & Mrs. Thomas & Brown					
Representor No.	1672	Representation No.	1	Accession No.	2925	Modification No.	E04

Representation

Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Brown support the modifications to the plan which allocate 14 hectares of land at Pencoedtre for mixed use development of residential, employment and woodland. Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Brown own part of the 14 hectares, including an area of ancient semi-natural woodland and a provisional agreement is in place with Forest Enterprise for them to take ownership of this wood and for it to be fully integrated into the managed woodland area. They also own an area of land (2.29 has) which is immediately adjacent to the 15 has of land which is currently allocated as part of the Pencoedtre Business Park (EMP1(13) Deposit Draft). The development of the 14 has of land for mixed use development will allow the necessary infrastructures to be provided enabling the employment site to be developed. Without the mixed use development it is unlikely that this will occur as the employment land alone would not generate sufficient value to fund the necessary infrastructure.

Desired Change

Not applicable.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation Contact Mrs. & Mrs. Thomas & Brown

Representor No. 1672 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 2926 **Modification No.** E18

Representation

Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Brown support the modifications to the plan which allocate 14 hectares of land at Pencoedtre for mixed use development of residential, employment and woodland. Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Brown own part of the 14 hectares, including an area of ancient semi-natural woodland and a provisional agreement is in place with Forest Enterprise for them to take ownership of this wood and for it to be fully integrated into the managed woodland area. They also own an area of land (2.29 has) which is immediately adjacent to the 15 has of land which is currently allocated as part of the Pencoedtre Business Park (EMP1(13) Deposit Draft). The development of the 14 has of land for mixed use development will allow the necessary infrastructures to be provided enabling the employment site to be developed. Without the mixed use development it is unlikely that this will occur as the employment land alone would not generate sufficient value to fund the necessary infrastructure.

Desired Change

Not applicable

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Housing allocation Pencoedtre

Organisation Contact Mrs. & Mrs. Thomas & Brown

Representor No. 1672 **Representation No.** 3 **Accession No.** 2927 **Modification No.** N011

Representation

Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Brown support the modifications to the plan which allocate 14 hectares of land at Pencoedtre for mixed use development of residential, employment and woodland. Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Brown own part of the 14 hectares, including an area of ancient semi-natural woodland and a provisional agreement is in place with Forest Enterprise for them to take ownership of this wood and for it to be fully integrated into the managed woodland area. They also own an area of land (2.29 has) which is immediately adjacent to the 15 has of land which is currently allocated as part of the Pencoedtre Business Park (EMP1(13) Deposit Draft). The development of the 14 has of land for mixed use development will allow the necessary infrastructures to be provided enabling the employment site to be developed. Without the mixed use development it is unlikely that this will occur as the employment land alone would not generate sufficient value to fund the necessary infrastructure.

Desired Change

Not applicable

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

HOUSING ALLOCATION RHOOSE

Issue: Housing allocation Rhoose

Representor Details

For organisations and individuals that have made a representation in respect of housing allocations at Rhoose, please refer to list of representations which is to be found at the rear of this document.

Representation

A large number of "identical representations" were received by the Council in respect of the Proposed Modifications for additional housing land at Rhoose. Therefore for reasons of practicality the Council has prepared a composite list of all representations and has amalgamated these together alongside representation numbers and identical representational text.

Desired Change

A large number of "identical desired changes" were received by the Council in respect of the Proposed Modifications for additional housing land at Rhoose. Therefore for reasons of practicality the Council has prepared a composite table of all desired changes that amalgamates both representation numbers and identical desired change text. These are shown in pages 112-116.

Recommendation

A composite response from the Council has been prepared in a manner that addresses all desired changes and representational text. This is given at page 116-118.

Issue: Housing allocation Rhoose (Representations)

Representor No. 377.1

Representation

The area under investigation for housing development to which I am objecting is at present a farmer's green field site, which sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including rare and threatened species. There is for example a resident covey of partridges which partly by our efforts to discourage people from shooting them, would become extinct. (We live in Murlande Way overlooking the fields). These fields more so now because of the loss of the fields to housing development on the other side of the railway, are used by migrating and resident birds throughout the year. Flocks of fieldfares, redwings, pied and yellow wagtails, swifts and swallows, goldfinches and large flocks of starlings rest and feed in these fields when migrating north/south or along the channel. Some species namely fieldfares, redwings and lapwings return to these fields in winter during very cold weather to feed, when areas away from the coast are covered in snow or frost. Recently in the last couple of years we have had skylarks return to the fields in the summer to nest. I am therefore, objecting to this proposal because the fields in question are an important area for bird migration and breeding. Building on them removes an important staging and feeding area along the coastal strip of the Vale of Glamorgan and puts further risks on some of the declining species of bird. My second objection to the proposed additional 600 houses, would be the high density housing this would create at the east end of Rhoose. Good planning practice is to leave open spaces in areas of housing development.

Representor No's.

408.1	540.1	763.1	1108.1	1219.1	1345.1	1546.1
414.1	549.1	764.1	1160.1	1248.1	1380.1	1604.1
415.1	562.1	766.1	1165.1	1272.1	1393.1	1614.1
416.1	563.1	767.1	1201.1	1310.1	1414.1	1615.1
425.1	572.1	768.1	1203.1	1316.1	1436.1	
441.1	599.1	986.1	1204.1	1326.1	1465.1	
442.1	601.1	987.1	1205.1	1327.1	1468.1	
469.1	638.1	991.1	1206.1	1328.1	1469.1	
519.1	658.1	993.1	1209.1	1335.1	1532.1	
520.1	674.2	995.1	1212.1	1336.1	1533.1	
528.1	675.1	1070.1	1213.1	1339.1	1543.1	
535.1	681.1	1107.1	1218.1	1340.1	1545.1	

Representation

The original draft of the Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development of the rural settlement of Rhoose is unnecessary. (ref. Housing Policy 3 Ref. 4.1.17). Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhoose fall outside these boundaries. (Housing policy 3 ref: 4.1.5.). Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural village of Rhoose, St Athan etc. The proposed developments are extensions not infills. (Housing Policy 8 Page 72).

Representor No. 411.1

Representation

I am writing with regard to the proposed plan for 600 houses to be built directly to the north of Rhoose Point. (Proposed Modification 32 referring to UDP Deposit Draft page no. 94). I am amazed that the Council would consider building a further 600 residences in an area where the infrastructure can barely cope with the size of the population we already have in Rhoose. My family and I moved three years ago specifically for the reason that the village was indeed a village and not another urban sprawl. I understand the need for new housing, but surely the Council could look in other directions for expansion. If further work has to be commenced in our village, at least consider the alternative plan of 200 houses plus school, golf course and other services put forward by the consortium looking at western end of the village. Has any consideration been made to the ecological issues?- We have a wide variety of flora and fauna in the area proposed, and surely we have little enough greenbelt land already without squandering it to concrete and steel. I understand that many residences are still for sale on Rhoose Point. It seems ridiculous that consideration of such a massive new build should be on the table whilst Rhoose Point has not yet been fully completed. Further to this point, at the original meetings concerning this first development were led to believe that many facilities (including a golf course, restaurants, pub etc) would also be included- Where are they?? On a personal note, living as we do to the north of the proposed site, I would dread the disruption to our lives that will ensue if the plan goes ahead. We have had to put up with the constant jack-hammers and heavy machinery during the Rhoose Point build, and that development is at least a mile away. To have 600 new houses built in our backyard, so to speak, would be totally unacceptable.

Representor No's 453.1 548.1 1484.1 1555.1

Representation

Access to and from the site is inadequate. Social infrastructure would be unable to cope. Increase in traffic would create many dangers either by pollution or crowded road junctions. In the event of an emergency, access would be very restricted for emergency vehicles. The original draft of the Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development of the rural settlement of Rhoose is unnecessary. (ref. Housing Policy 3 Ref.: 4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhoose fall outside these boundaries. (Housing policy 3 ref.: 4.1.5.) Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural village of Rhoose, St Athan etc, The proposed developments are extensions not infills. (Housing Policy 8 Page 72)

Representor No. 456.1

Representation

It is an unnecessary intrusion into the countryside when there are sufficient brown field sites within the Vale to satisfy any new housing requirement.

Representor No's

457.1	483.1	498.1	530.1	573.1	597.1	636.1
460.1	484.1	499.1	536.1	574.1	600.1	637.1
463.1	485.1	500.1	541.1	576.1	623.1	639.1
464.1	486.1	501.1	544.1	578.1	624.1	641.1
465.1	487.1	502.1	545.1	579.1	625.1	642.1
472.1	488.1	503.1	550.1	582.1	626.1	643.1
473.1	489.1	504.1	551.1	583.1	627.1	644.1
474.1	490.1	505.1	552.1	584.1	628.1	645.1
475.1	491.1	506.1	553.1	585.1	629.1	646.1
476.1	492.1	507.1	557.1	586.1	630.1	647.1
478.1	493.1	508.1	560.1	587.1	631.1	648.1
479.1	494.1	512.1	565.1	588.1	632.1	649.1
480.1	495.1	525.1	566.1	590.1	633.1	659.1
481.1	496.1	526.1	567.1	594.1	634.1	660.1
482.1	497.1	527.1	568.1	596.1	635.1	661.1

Representor No's

662.1	682.1	697.1	717.1	732.1	747.1	765.1
663.1	683.1	699.1	718.1	733.1	748.1	769.1
664.1	684.1	700.1	719.1	734.1	749.1	970.1
665.1	685.1	701.1	720.1	735.1	750.1	971.1
666.1	686.1	702.1	721.1	736.1	752.1	972.1
667.1	687.1	703.1	722.1	737.1	753.1	973.1
668.1	688.1	704.1	723.1	738.1	754.1	974.1

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

669.1	689.1	705.1	724.1	739.1	755.1	975.1
670.1	690.1	706.1	725.1	740.1	756.1	976.1
671.1	691.1	710.1	726.1	741.1	757.1	977.1
672.1	692.1	711.1	727.1	742.1	758.1	978.1
673.1	693.1	712.1	728.1	743.1	759.1	979.1
678.1	694.1	713.1	729.1	744.1	760.1	980.1
679.1	695.1	715.1	730.1	745.1	761.1	981.1
680.1	696.1	716.1	731.1	746.1	762.1	982.1
Representor No's						
983.1	1009.1	1025.1	1040.1	1055.1	1072.1	1086.1
984.1	1010.1	1026.1	1041.1	1056.1	1073.1	1087.1
985.1	1011.1	1027.1	1042.1	1057.1	1074.1	1088.1
988.1	1012.1	1028.1	1043.1	1058.1	1075.1	1089.1
989.1	1013.1	1029.1	1044.1	1059.1	1076.1	1090.1
992.1	1014.1	1030.1	1045.1	1060.1	1077.1	1091.1
994.1	1015.1	1031.1	1046.1	1061.1	1078.1	1092.1
996.1	1016.1	1032.1	1047.1	1062.1	1079.1	1093.1
998.1	1017.1	1033.1	1048.1	1063.1	1080.1	1094.1
999.1	1018.1	1034.1	1049.1	1064.1	1080.2	1095.1
1003.1	1019.1	1035.1	1050.1	1065.1	1081.1	1096.1
1004.1	1020.1	1036.1	1051.1	1066.1	1082.1	1097.1
1006.1	1021.1	1037.1	1052.1	1067.1	1083.1	1098.1
1007.1	1022.1	1038.1	1053.1	1068.1	1084.1	1099.1
1008.1	1023.1	1039.1	1054.1	1071.1	1085.1	1100.1
Representor No's						
1101.1	1118.1	1133.1	1149.1	1166.1	1181.1	1196.1
1102.1	1119.1	1135.1	1150.1	1167.1	1182.1	1197.1
1103.1	1120.1	1136.1	1151.1	1168.1	1183.1	1198.1
1104.1	1121.1	1137.1	1152.1	1169.1	1184.1	1199.1
1105.1	1122.1	1138.1	1153.1	1170.1	1185.1	1200.1
1106.1	1123.1	1139.1	1154.1	1171.1	1186.1	1202.1
1109.1	1124.1	1140.1	1155.1	1172.1	1187.1	1207.1
1110.1	1125.1	1141.1	1156.1	1173.1	1188.1	1208.1
Representor No's						
1111.1	1126.1	1142.1	1157.1	1174.1	1189.1	1210.1
1112.1	1127.1	1143.1	1158.1	1175.1	1190.1	1211.1
1113.1	1128.1	1144.1	1159.1	1176.1	1191.1	1214.1
1114.1	1129.1	1145.1	1161.1	1177.1	1192.1	1215.1
1115.1	1130.1	1146.1	1162.1	1178.1	1193.1	1216.1
1116.1	1131.1	1147.1	1163.1	1179.1	1194.1	1217.1
1117.1	1132.1	1148.1	1164.1	1180.1	1195.1	1220.1
Representor No's						
1221.1	1236.1	1254.1	1269.1	1285.1	1300.1	1317.1
1222.1	1237.1	1255.1	1270.1	1286.1	1301.1	1318.1
1223.1	1238.1	1256.1	1271.1	1287.1	1302.1	1319.1
1224.1	1239.1	1257.1	1273.1	1288.1	1303.1	1320.1
1225.1	1240.1	1258.1	1274.1	1289.1	1304.1	1321.1
1226.1	1241.1	1259.1	1275.1	1290.1	1305.1	1322.1
1227.1	1243.1	1260.1	1276.1	1291.2	1306.1	1323.1
1228.1	1244.1	1261.1	1277.1	1292.1	1307.1	1324.1
1229.1	1245.1	1262.1	1278.1	1293.1	1308.1	1325.1
1230.1	1246.1	1263.1	1279.1	1294.1	1309.1	1329.1
1231.1	1247.1	1264.1	1280.1	1295.1	1311.1	1330.1
1232.1	1250.1	1265.1	1281.1	1296.1	1312.1	1331.1
1233.1	1251.1	1266.1	1282.1	1297.1	1313.1	1332.1
1234.1	1252.1	1267.1	1283.1	1298.1	1314.1	1333.1
1235.1	1253.1	1268.1	1284.1	1299.1	1315.1	1334.1

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Representor No's

1337.1	1355.1	1370.1	1386.1	1402.1	1418.1	1452.1
1338.1	1356.1	1371.1	1387.1	1403.1	1421.1	1453.1
1341.1	1357.1	1372.1	1388.1	1404.1	1424.1	1454.1
1342.1	1358.1	1373.1	1389.1	1405.1	1428.1	1455.1
1343.1	1359.1	1374.1	1390.1	1406.1	1429.1	1458.1
1344.1	1360.1	1375.1	1391.1	1407.1	1430.1	1459.1
1346.1	1361.1	1376.1	1392.1	1408.1	1432.1	1462.1
1347.1	1362.1	1377.1	1394.1	1409.1	1433.1	1463.1
1348.1	1363.1	1378.1	1395.1	1410.1	1434.1	1464.1
1349.1	1364.1	1379.1	1396.1	1411.1	1435.1	1466.1
1350.1	1365.1	1381.1	1397.1	1412.1	1437.1	1467.1
1351.1	1366.1	1382.1	1398.1	1413.1	1438.1	1470.1
1352.1	1367.1	1383.1	1399.1	1415.1	1440.1	1471.1
1353.1	1368.1	1384.1	1400.1	1416.1	1445.1	1472.1
1354.1	1369.1	1385.1	1401.1	1417.1	1451.1	1473.1

Representor No's

1474.1	1498.1	1514.1	1530.1	1560.1	1578.1	1600.1
1475.1	1499.1	1515.1	1531.1	1561.1	1579.1	1603.1
1476.1	1500.1	1516.1	1534.1	1562.1	1580.1	1605.1
1477.1	1501.1	1517.1	1535.1	1563.1	1581.1	1606.1
1478.1	1502.1	1518.1	1536.1	1564.1	1582.1	1607.1
1479.1	1503.1	1519.1	1537.1	1565.1	1583.1	1608.1
1480.1	1504.1	1520.1	1538.1	1566.1	1586.1	1613.1
1481.1	1505.1	1521.1	1539.1	1567.1	1587.1	1616.1
1482.1	1506.1	1522.1	1541.1	1568.1	1588.1	1617.1
1483.1	1507.1	1523.1	1542.1	1570.1	1589.1	1625.1
1487.1	1508.1	1524.1	1544.1	1572.1	1590.1	1639.1
1487.2	1509.1	1525.1	1547.1	1573.1	1593.1	1673.1
1488.1	1510.1	1526.1	1548.4	1574.1	1594.1	1674.1
1491.1	1511.1	1527.1	1550.3	1575.1	1595.1	2239.1
1496.1	1512.1	1528.1	1556.1	1576.1	1596.1	
1497.1	1513.1	1529.1	1557.1	1577.1	1599.1	

Representation

The original Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development is not required (Housing Policy 3 4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhosee fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 4.1.5) Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhosee and St. Athan. The proposed developments are extensions not infills (Housing Policy 8 page 72) There are sufficient brownfield sites within the Vale to satisfy any projected need for new housing (Planning Guidance (Wales), Joint Land Availability Study, October 2002). Development of the site would not aid in urban regeneration, even though this is a key step in the "search sequence" as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002. Access to jobs, shops and services from the site will be severely limited except by car. Even after the rail station opens, they not be able to use it to visit the Primary School. Surgeries, Post Office, Library, local shops or nearest supermarkets. Air pollution in Rhosee from car exhausts, aircraft fumes and fallout from the nearby cement and power stations is already unacceptable. Local air pollution will increase with airport expansion and the start of shuttle buses running from the rail station. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality even further, with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population. The current transport infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. Due to the space restrictions placed on Rhosee by the airport and the sea, it is unlikely there would be any improvement to the infrastructure of the village to accommodate any further housing developments. The social infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. The site is an important area for bird migration and feeding. It sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including threatened species.

Representor No. 509.1

Representation

The original draft of the Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development of the rural settlement of Rhosee is unnecessary. (ref. Housing Policy 3 Ref:4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhosee fall outside these boundaries. Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhosee, St. Athan etc. The proposed developments are extensions not infills (Housing Policy 8 page 72) If further development was to

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

take place, the A4050 (top road in Barry) would become congested. This is an important point in my mind considering that is further development at DARA St Athan and also two battalions arriving at St Athan shortly.

Representor No. 523.1

Representation

The original Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development is not required (Housing Policy 3 4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhoose fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 4.1.5) Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhoose and St. Athan. The proposed developments are extensions not infills (Housing Policy 8 page 72) There are sufficient brownfield sites within the Vale to satisfy any projected need for new housing (Planning Guidance (Wales), Joint Land Availability Study, October 2002). Development of the site would not aid in urban regeneration, even though this is a key step in the "search sequence" as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002. Access to jobs, shops and services from the site will be severely limited except by car. Even after the rail station opens, they not be able to use it to visit the Primary School, Surgeries, Post Office, Library, local shops or nearest supermarkets. Air pollution in Rhoose from car exhausts, aircraft fumes and fallout from the nearby cement and power stations is already unacceptable. Local air pollution will increase with airport expansion and the start of shuttle buses running from the rail station. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality even further, with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population. The current transport infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. Due to the space restrictions placed on Rhoose by the airport and the sea, it is unlikely there would be any improvement to the infrastructure of the village to accommodate any further housing developments. The social infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. The site is an important area for bird migration and feeding. It sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including threatened species.

Representor No 529.1

Representation

The original Unitary Development Plan indicated a surplus of housing in the Vale of Glamorgan. Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. The development options fall outside these boundaries. Housing Policy 3 4.1.5. There are sufficient brownfield sites to satisfy any projected need for new housing. Access to jobs, shops and services from the site will be limited to cars. Air pollution is already bad in Rhoose, more cars will only make this worse. The social infrastructure of the village will not cope with more residents. The site provides a habitat for wildlife at present.

Representor No. 569.1

Representation

All the development options identified at Rhoose fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 ref. 4.1.5) Rhoose is a village and should remain as a village. Would not be able to cope with any more Housing development.

Representor No's. 640.1 1621.5

Representation

Development of the site would not aid urban regeneration even though this is a key step in 'the search sequence' as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002.

Representor No. 674.1

Representation

I strongly object to this proposed over development, as the road infrastructure cannot cope with the extra traffic it would create. Also the village amenities are over stretched already.

Representor No. 707.1

Representation

The original Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development is not required (Housing Policy 3 4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhoose fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 4.1.5) Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhoose and St. Athan. The proposed developments are extensions not infills (Housing Policy 8 page 72) There are sufficient brownfield sites within the Vale to satisfy any projected need for new housing (Planning Guidance (Wales), Joint Land Availability Study, October 2002). Development of the site would not aid in urban regeneration, even though this is a key step in the "search sequence" as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002. Access to jobs, shops and services from the site will be severely limited except by car.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Even after the rail station opens, they not be able to use it to visit the Primary School, Surgeries, Post Office, Library, local shops or nearest supermarkets. Air pollution in Rhosee from car exhausts, aircraft fumes and fallout from the nearby cement and power stations is already unacceptable. Local air pollution will increase with airport expansion and the start of shuttle buses running from the rail station. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality even further, with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population. The current transport infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. Due to the space restrictions placed on Rhosee by the airport and the sea, it is unlikely there would be any improvement to the infrastructure of the village to accommodate any further housing developments. The social infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. The site is an important area for bird migration and feeding. It sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including threatened species. I own a caravan at Font-y-Gary caravan park, Rhosee. I am deeply concerned with the proposals of building houses in the fields north of the railway line. We bought our caravan and came to this beautiful rural, seaside environment to escape the overcrowded, polluted, noisy city where we live. At the moment, Rhosee enjoys an unpolluted atmosphere and unrivalled views across the Bristol Channel. This is why we have chosen such a place to come and spend our free time. The Rhosee coastline, once built on, will be lost for future generations to enjoy. Please do not allow developers to build on it and destroy our rural heritage in the village.

Representor No's. 708.1 709.1

Representation.

I own a caravan at Font-y-Gary Caravan Park, Rhosee. I am deeply concerned with the proposals of building houses in the fields north of the railway line. We bought our caravan and came to this beautiful rural, seaside environment to escape the overcrowded, polluted city where we live. At the moment, Rhosee enjoys an unpolluted atmosphere and unrivalled views across the Bristol Channel. This is why we have chosen such a place to come and spend our free time. The Rhosee coastline, once built on, will be lost for future generations to enjoy. Please do not allow developers to build on it and destroy our rural heritage in the village.

Representor No's. 997.1 1620.1 1621.3

Representation

The residential settlement boundary of Rhosee should not be extended. The objection site should remain outside the settlement boundary for Rhosee. The settlement boundary for Rhosee should be as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.

Representor No. 1001.1

Since I moved to Rhosee in 1971 the size of the "village" has more than doubled yet the village school has seen no improvements. The only increase in leisure facilities has been the privately funded Fontygary Parks Leisure Centre. Another 1200 houses would severely overload the existing meager facilities. When the existing Rhosee Point development was proposed I recall a golf course was proposed for the quarry behind Fontygary Road and a new public house in the area of the development. Have these been shelved? What impact will further development have on the roads. The road between Wecock X and Culverhouse X is a convoy every morning and evening. If further development is proposed for Nurston what improvements will be made to Fonmon lane? It is amazing there are not more accidents on this section of road as things stand. Surely the Council should commit to improving facilities, road and rail links to Cardiff and the M4 before allowing further disproportionate development.

Representor No. 1002.1

Representation

There are far too many houses being built in Rhosee its becoming gridlocked for travelling by car. There are no improved amenities as promised. There are so many houses being built that when we have rain we are having drains overflowing all through the village. The original plan has been exceeded to the detriment of the village. Rhosee is as big as a town now not the village it once was No shops as once were promised. No improved school facilities as promised.

Representor No. 1134.1

Representation

The original Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development is not required (Housing Policy 3 4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhosee fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 4.1.5) Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhosee and St. Athan. The proposed developments are extensions not infills (Housing Policy 8 Page 72) There are sufficient brownfield sites within the Vale to satisfy any projected need for new housing (Planning Guidance [Wales], Joint Housing Land Availability Study, October 2002) Development of the site would not aid in urban regeneration, even though this is a key step in the "search sequence" as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002. Access to jobs, shops and services from the site will be severely limited except by car. Even after the rail station opens, they not be able to use it to visit the Primary School, Surgeries, Post Office, Library, local

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

shops or nearest supermarkets. Air pollution in Rhoose from car exhausts, aircraft fumes and fallout from the nearby cement and power stations is already unacceptable. Local air pollution will increase with airport expansion and the start of shuttle busses running from the rail station. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality even further, with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population. The current transport infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. Due to the space restrictions placed on Rhoose by the airport and the sea, it is unlikely there would be any improvement to the infrastructure of the village to accommodate any further housing developments. The social infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. The site is an important area for bird migration and feeding. It sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including threatened species.

Representor No.'s 1249.1 1444.1 1457.1 1548.1 1548.2 1549.2 1550.2 1591.1 1598.1 1609.1

Representation

Access to the proposed residential development is restricted to one road joining the new road from Porthkerry Rd to Rhoose Point. This new road will not be adequate when the twice-daily movement of approximately 600+ cars from the new development from this access are added to the 1000+ car journeys twice daily from a completed Rhoose Point. The other access to the proposed residential development will join Porthkerry Road. This access would need a roundabout or traffic lights to deal with approximately 600+ car movements twice daily onto an already busy road. This access already has a public footpath going through it. This footpath leads down to the coast, crossing the railway line. To remove or adjust the footpath would mean breaking local bylaws. There is no provision for safe pedestrian, disabled or cycle access across the railway line. The Draft Unitary Development Plan (MOD D028) states "underground water resources will be safeguarded". The proposed site is on an aquifer of high vulnerability (an underground water resource). The Draft Unitary Development Plan (MOD D029) states "development which would exacerbate flood risk elsewhere should NOT be permitted". Rhoose Point has already been subject to flooding, affecting houses and forcing the closure of the railway line. A residential development can only increase run off rates from buildings and hard surfaces increasing the risks of flooding in Rhoose Point.

Representor No.'s

1419.1	1431.1	1448.1	1492.1	1622.2	1633.1
1420.1	1439.1	1449.1	1493.1	1623.2	1634.3
1422.1	1441.1	1450.1	1495.1	1626.1	1635.1
1423.1	1442.1	1456.1	1597.1	1627.3	1636.2
1425.1	1443.1	1460.1	1601.1	1628.1	1637.3
1426.1	1446.1	1461.1	1610.1	1629.2	1622.3
1427.1	1447.1	1486.1	1618.1	1630.1	

Representation

The original Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development is not required (Housing Policy 3 4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhoose fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 4.1.5) Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhoose and St. Athan. The proposed developments are extensions not infills (Housing Policy 8 page 72) There are sufficient brownfield sites within the Vale to satisfy any projected need for new housing (Planning Guidance (Wales), Joint Land Availability Study, October 2002). Development of the site would not aid in urban regeneration, even though this is a key step in the "search sequence" as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002. Access to jobs, shops and services from the site will be severely limited except by car. Even after the rail station opens, they not be able to use it to visit the Primary School, Surgeries, Post Office, Library, local shops or nearest supermarkets. Air pollution in Rhoose from car exhausts, aircraft fumes and fallout from the nearby cement and power stations is already unacceptable. Local air pollution will increase with airport expansion and the start of shuttle buses running from the rail station. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality even further, with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population. The current transport infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. Due to the space restrictions placed on Rhoose by the airport and the sea, it is unlikely there would be any improvement to the infrastructure of the village to accommodate any further housing developments. The social infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. The site is an important area for bird migration and feeding. It sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including threatened species. Access to the proposed residential development is restricted to one road joining the new road from Porthkerry Rd to Rhoose Point. This new road will not be adequate when the twice daily movement of approximately 600+ cars from the new development from this access are added to the 1000+ car journeys twice daily from a completed Rhoose Point. The other access to the proposed residential development will join Porthkerry Road. This access would need a roundabout or traffic lights to deal with approximately 600+ car movements twice daily onto an already busy road. This access already has a public footpath going through it. This footpath leads down to the coast, crossing the railway line. To remove or adjust the footpath would mean breaking local bylaws. There is no provision for safe pedestrian, disabled or cycle access across the railway line. The draft Unitary Development Plan (MOD D028) states "underground water resources will be safeguarded". The proposed site is on an aquifer of high vulnerability (an underground water resources). The Draft Unitary Development Plan (MOD D029) states "development which would exacerbate flood risk elsewhere should NOT be permitted". Rhoose Point has already been subject to flooding, affecting houses and forcing the closure of the railway line. A residential development can only increase the run off rates from buildings and hard surfaces increasing the risk of flooding in Rhoose Point.

Representor No. 1485.1

Representation

I do not support building on greenfield sites. I thought that the WAG did not support building on greenfield sites. I am sure other brownfield sites within the Vale can be found to meet the target of new houses to be built. I am not confident that road improvements (congestion at Culverhouse Cross) and facilities such as school places will be provided. The state of the pavements etc are a disgrace on the present housing development.

Representor No's. 1489.2 1490.2

Representation

The original Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development is not required (Housing Policy 3 4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhoose fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 4.1.5) Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhoose and St. Athan. The proposed developments are extensions not infills (Housing Policy 8 page 72). There are sufficient brownfield sites within the Vale to satisfy any projected need for new housing (Planning Guidance {Wales}, Joint Housing Land Availability Study, October 2002). Development of the site would not aid urban regeneration, even though it is a key step in the "search sequence", as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002. Access to jobs, and services from the site will be severely limited except by car. Even after the rail station opens, they will not be able to use it to visit the primary school, surgeries, post office, library, local shops or nearest supermarkets. Air pollution in Rhoose from car exhausts, aircraft fumes and fallout from the nearby cement and power stations is already unacceptable. Local air pollution will increase with airport expansion and the start of the shuttle buses running from the train station. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality even further, with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population. The current transportation infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. Due to the space restrictions placed on Rhoose by the airport and the sea, it is unlikely there would be any improvement to the infrastructure of the village to accommodate any further housing developments. The social infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. The site is an important area for bird migration and feeding. It sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including threatened species. There is a potential threat of flooding due to water already coming across fields from Rhoose Village and Airport and the vulnerability of aquifer. As a retired Police Sergeant, I have firsthand experience of the effects of new housing projects, that do not have facilities developed at the same time as the housing. As a Community Liaison Officer I was dealing with damage, theft, burglary, theft of and from vehicles, public order offences, assaults, drunkenness, substance abuse from a whole spectrum of crimes being perpetuated by young people who had been abandoned to their own devices and complained of "being bored". The level of dog fouling pollution is already beyond belief, and the additional potential for filth on the footpaths does not fill me with hope for the future, bearing in mind the current lack of concern of dog owners, coupled with the apparent absence of Dog Fouling Enforcement Officers.

Representor No. 1551.1

Representation

Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries All the development options identified at Rhoose fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 4.1.5). The site is an important area for bird migration and feeding. It sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including threatened species.

Representor No's 1552.1 1621.4

Representation

Air pollution in Rhoose from car exhausts, aircraft fumes and fallout from nearby cement and power stations is already unacceptable. Local air pollution will increase with airport expansion and the start of shuttle buses running from the rail station. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality even further, with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population.

Representor No's 1554.1 1621.7

Representation

There are sufficient brownfield sites within the Vale to satisfy any projected need for new housing (Planning Guidance (Wales), Joint Housing Land Availability Study, October 2002). Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhoose and St Athan. The proposed developments are extension not infills (Housing Policy 8 Page 72).

Representor No's. 1584.1 1585.1

Representation

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

The original Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development is not required (Housing Policy 3 4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhoose fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 4.1.5) Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhoose and St. Athan. The proposed developments are extensions not infills (Housing Policy 8 page 72) There are sufficient brownfield sites within the Vale to satisfy any projected need for new housing (Planning Guidance (Wales), Joint Land Availability Study, October 2002). Development of the site would not aid in urban regeneration, even though this is a key step in the "search sequence" as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002. Access to jobs, shops and services from the site will be severely limited except by car. Even after the rail station opens, they not be able to use it to visit the Primary School. Surgeries, Post Office, Library, local shops or nearest supermarkets. Air pollution in Rhoose from car exhausts, aircraft fumes and fallout from the nearby cement and power stations is already unacceptable. Local air pollution will increase with airport expansion and the start of shuttle buses running from the rail station. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality even further, with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population. The current transport infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. Due to the space restrictions placed on Rhoose by the airport and the sea, it is unlikely there would be any improvement to the infrastructure of the village to accommodate any further housing developments. The social infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. The site is an important area for bird migration and feeding. It sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including threatened species.

Representor No. 1621.1

Representation

The original Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development is not required (Housing Policy 3 Ref.: 4.1.17).

Representor No. 1621.6

Representation

The social and transport infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with this new development on top of the huge expansion of housing in Rhoose that has taken place during the last 10-12 years.

Representor No. 1631.1

Representation

The social infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. The current transport infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. Due to the space restrictions placed on Rhoose by the airport and the sea, it is unlikely there would be any improvement to the infrastructure of the village to accommodate any further housing developments. Potential threat of flooding due to water already coming across fields from Rhoose village and airport and the vulnerable aquifer. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population. Access to jobs, shops and services from the site will be severely limited except by car. Even after rail station opens, they will not be able to use it to visit the Primary School, surgeries, Post Office, Library, local shops or nearest supermarkets.

The following representations were made in respect of Modification No. E32 as found in the Proposed Modifications document dated February 2003

Representor No. 1643.22

Representation

Land North of Railway Line, Rhoose. Should this development go ahead, it requires an effective Section 106 agreement to safeguard and manage the rest of the Rhoose Point area under the developer's control.

Representor No. 1638.1

Representation

I have written to you previously about concerns of residents at Rhoose about planning developments in the village. I would now like to formally lodge my objection to the extent of development proposed at Rhoose. I am concerned that the proposed development would lie outside of the identified settlement boundary, without apparent justification in terms of agricultural or forestry use. There are also concerns about the impact that this would have on this part of the coastal zone. I would argue that the proposed developments constitute extension rather than infill of the existing village and I would oppose the extension of the settlement boundary. Further, I understand that there are sufficient existing brownfield sites to satisfy the need of housing within the Vale. The present proposal would allow development at a rate far in excess of that which is necessary for the Vale of Glamorgan during the period covered by the UDP. I am very concerned that such a rate of development would pose problems for the development of adequate infrastructure. The present services, shops, schools, roads etc are certainly not adequate to sustain the proposed development. There are concerns that the extent of changes to the infrastructure required would not be

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

adequately met by the planning conditions and such changes would, in any event, radically alter the character of the village. This would not only have a negative impact on the social structure of the village, but would also include the destruction of natural habitat. I hope you will take my concerns and the concerns of many local residents, into account in this process.

Representor No. 1619.1

Representation

I wish to object to any development in the area because I believe the local Council does not represent the residents of the area. It appears to many of the residents that the Council is only interested in financial gain and does not consider the following problems: 1) The local school; exceeds the Government recommendations for the number of pupils per class. As the age of the people who will undoubtedly move into any new development will be young. This will cause an even greater burden on the schools. Should the development continue, I will be bringing this to the attention of the Welsh Assembly (Jane Dawson) bringing to her attention the Vale's Councils inability to take this into consideration when making its decision on planning regulations. 2) There is insufficient/inadequate provisions within Rhose to cope with the influx of a large development. This again will be brought to the attention of the Welsh Assembly should the Council authorise the development. 3) The Heath hospital is too far from Rhose to deal with emergencies and the larger the population the greater the need. Should any resident sustain injury as a result of this, the Council may be held liable as I will bring it to their attention.

Representor No. 237.85

Representation

CCW object to the wording of MOD E32

Representor No. 1602.1

Representation

All I can say as a member of Rhose community is the following: the public path to the beach has been ruined (by that I mean the path crossing the railway). It is too steep for older people and wheelchairs - It is dangerous - There should be more benches on the so-called walks - otherwise they are not walks but roads for cars. The roads where the new houses are built are already in a terrible state. Untidy, bumpy, tarmac and water everywhere. A Councilor should go and have a look. The cliff was blown to pieces and from an aesthetic point of view very ugly. That is just the present.

Representor No's. 1549.1 1550.1 1581.2

Representation

Planning Policy Wales (2002), Section 13.4.2 "In determining applications for development, local planning authorities should ...ensure that development does not :

- Increase the risk of flooding elsewhere by loss of flood storage or flood flow route or
- Increase the problem of surface water run-off".

In wet weather, a stream forms and flows past the last house on Porthkerry Road, across the road and drains down into the fields and towards Rhose Point. The fields behind the embankment came to resemble a lake. The serious nature of this stream was demonstrated on December 29th 2002 when the railway embankment, which had been holding back the water, was breached and water flooded into Rhose Point. Development of the objection site would increase the risk of flooding in Rhose Point, since it would increase sudden surface water run-off from all the hard surfaces, and remove flood storage capacity.

Planning Policy Wales (2002), Section 13.14.1 states "noise-sensitive developments such as...housing...should be located away from existing sources of significant noise, including air transport". The proposed site is very close to the road, the railway and the airport and therefore the site is not the best site for housing.

The village of Rhose already suffers from significant pollution. Noise pollution, light pollution and air pollution from car fumes, fallout from the power station and cement works and aircraft exhausts. This pollution will increase with the introduction of commuter trains onto the railway line and with any expansion of Cardiff International Airport. Should this site be used for residential development, the new dwellers would be close to the airport, road and railway line. Therefore the site is not the best site for housing because existing sites will pollute the homes of new dwellers.

Planning Policy Wales (2002), Section 11.1.1 states "Tourism is a major element in the Welsh economy, particularly in rural and coastal areas". Rhose has two caravan parks, one at either end of the village. Therefore tourism is important to the economy of Rhose. Loss of this greenfield site would make the area less attractive to tourists and adversely affect the economic development of Rhose.

Planning Policy Wales (2002), Section 11.1.10 states "informal open spaces...with significant amenity value should be protected from development...they fulfil multiple purposes, not only enhancing the quality of life, but contributing to biodiversity, the conservation of nature and landscape, air quality and the protection of groundwater." This site has significant amenity value to the residents of and the tourists to Rhose. With the loss of "Happy Valley" to the Rhose Point development, it is the only country walk available to the people east of the village.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Planning Policy Wales (2002), Section 9.2.16 states "Residential mobile homes can make a valuable contribution to overall housing provision and have a part to play in providing low cost accommodation for small households. Local planning authorities should consult the park homes industry about the provision of appropriate sites". These would certainly be in keeping with the character of the village, since Rhoose has caravan parks on both ends. Yet the proposed modification makes no mention of either low cost or small households.

Planning Policy Wales (2002), Section 8.5.5 "Developments at airports may provide improved facilities and bring economic benefits, but they may also give rise to environmental and other concerns that need to be taken into account".

Planning Policy Wales (2002), Section 9.3.2 states "residential development in the vicinity of existing industrial users should be restricted if the presence of houses is likely to lead residents to try to curtail the industrial use". If more houses are built close to Cardiff International Airport the new residents may well ask for restrictions to be placed on the airport to reduce noise and aircraft pollution. For example, limiting flights to after 8 in the morning and before 6 in the evening. This will have an adverse impact on growth potential, reducing the long term effectiveness and efficiency of the airport. If the airport is to be expanded to increase capacity, a buffer zone must be left otherwise the airport will be choked by housing. This will have an adverse impact on growth potential, reducing the long term effectiveness and efficiency of the airport.

Planning Policy Wales (2002), Section 9.3.3 states "insensitive in filling...should not be allowed to damage an areas character and amenity." The loss of a significant greenfield site eroding the setting of the community cannot be considered to be acceptable planning. The objection site enhances the quality of life for all the people of Rhoose. Residents and tourists can enjoy fresh air, birdsong, trees, flowers a country walk and spectacular views across the Bristol Channel.

Planning Policy Wales (2002), Section 8.2.1 "Walking should be promoted for shorter trips. The impact of policies and development on pedestrians should be considered. Planning authorities should promote specific measures to assist pedestrians including the provision of safe, convenient and well-signed routes."

Planning Policy Wales (2002), Section 8.2.2 "Cycling should also be encouraged...Local authorities should encourage the implementation of specific measures to develop safe cycling including new or improved routes." Walking and cycling are not encouraged by speculative housing developments that reduce visual amenity and damage the local environment. The proposed development is also very dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists attempting to cross the railway line to get to and from Rhoose Point. There is currently no safe access, and MOD E32 makes no mention of the Council considering improving the situation with a footbridge or underpass.

Planning Policy Wales (2002), Section 8.4.2 "Car parking provision is a major influence on the choice of means of transport and the pattern of development. Local authorities should ensure that new developments provide lower levels of parking than have generally been achieved in the past." The parking provision on Rhoose Point was generous. If the proposed development is intended to provide comparable on superior houses the parking provision will be comparable or superior as well. That means less space for houses, more for carports, garages and parking bays.

Representor No. 1612.1

Representation

I wish to object to the above application on the following grounds: 1) On the basis of need the Council has already identified that there is a surplus to the housing supply in the Vale of Glamorgan as stated in their Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011. 2) The area proposed for the development is a coastal zone, which is outside the current residential settlement boundaries as identified in the Vale of Glamorgan's Unitary Development Plan. 3) The proposed new primary school is unnecessary as there is adequate space for extending the existing primary school as stated in the Vale of Glamorgan's Unitary Development Plan. 4) Planning Guidance (Wales) Planning Policy (1996) states that the undeveloped coast will rarely be the most appropriate area for development and the Council will, through Policy ENV5, safeguard the East Vale Coast from inappropriate development. 5) Despite the significant increase in population over the past 20 years there has been no additional infrastructure provided to maintain the quality of life expected. For example: - rail travel, educational facilities, sport and leisure facilities (with a single additional part time doctor's surgery) - commercial development land and facilities. I note the current land allocated for commercial use is the subject of potential change from the land owners Cofton to residential use. I have written objecting to this proposal also. We do not wish to be a commuter ghetto serving the capital city! Why do you not support self development for local entrepreneurship? The original Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development is not required (Housing Policy 3 4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhoose fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 4.1.5) Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhoose and St. Athan. The proposed developments are extensions not infills (Housing Policy 8 page 72) There are sufficient brownfield sites within the Vale to satisfy any projected need for new housing (Planning Guidance (Wales), Joint Land Availability Study, October 2002). Development of the site would not aid in urban regeneration, even though this is a key step in the "search sequence" as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002. Access to jobs, shops and services from the site will be severely limited except by car. Even after the rail station opens, they not be able to use it to visit the Primary School, Surgeries, Post Office, Library, local shops or nearest supermarkets. Air pollution in Rhoose from car exhausts, aircraft fumes and fallout from the nearby cement and power stations is already unacceptable. Local air pollution will increase with airport expansion and the start of shuttle buses running from the rail station. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality even further, with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population. The current transport infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. Due to the space restrictions placed on Rhoose by the airport and the sea, it is unlikely there would be any improvement to the infrastructure of the village to accommodate any further housing developments. The social infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. The site is an important area for bird migration and feeding. It sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including threatened species. The land allocated for hotel/public house/parkland has been allowed to have a change of use to residential - destroying a superb section of the coastal path which may have been used by all residents of Rhoose. The allocated land for commercial use is being applied for to have a change of use to residential destroying any potential for WDA investment or private individual investment for commercial use, encouraging the area and village of Rhoose to become a greater commuter ghetto - The Cofton landscaping that has been provided is extremely

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

economical and is not maintained. The trees planted do not appear to have grown in the 3 plus years that they have been planted. Additional areas that have been developed have not been provided with any landscaping at all and the areas affected have been ignored - Rhoose Beach bridge area particularly. This developer simply does not care and is purely and absolutely profit motivated. The VOG appear to be a solid partner to this attitude - as my representative I am disappointed at the lack of VOG robust challenges to Cofton, they are walking all over you - to the bank!!!!

Representor No. 1668.8

Representation

1) Cofton Limited fundamentally object to the allocation of 400 dwellings (increasing to 600 dwellings in subsequent Plan periods) on land north of the railway line, Rhoose. This objection is based on a number of factors, which are set out below.

2) In its current use, the land lies as an area of attractive agricultural rural landscape. The site lies as a significant gateway feature for motorists and other vehicular users entering the settlement of Rhoose from Cardiff, Barry and Cardiff International Airport. This eastern entrance to Rhoose along the Porthkerry Road represents the more frequently used access into the settlement. In its present guise it affords attractive views across the landscape towards the Bristol Channel. If development was to occur on this site, that landscape would be lost forever to the detriment of the existing population and those entering the settlement from the principal point of access. At present, the new roundabout serving the Rhoose Point development from Porthkerry Road acts as a traffic calming measure. Accordingly, motorists are encouraged to slow down and thus gain more appreciation of the landscape in its current setting.

3) Though undoubtedly located in a sustainable position within the Vale of Glamorgan, and despite repeated pressures for development growth, the settlement has retained its rural sense of place. This will be lost forever should development proceed north of the railway line.

4) 600 further households in Rhoose will considerably change the characteristics of the settlement to its detriment. Cofton Limited has supported the UDP's proposals for green wedges protecting encroachment into the countryside around Rhoose elsewhere in these representations. The development of 600 additional houses is considered to be too great a scale of development for the settlement to support and retain its rural feel. A community based development of 400 dwellings with no capacity for further growth is more suitable and sustainable for Rhoose in the long term.

5) The allocation of this land conflicts with Policy ENV2, which considers the protection of agricultural land. The site is currently in full agricultural use and its loss would be of detriment to the retention of best and most versatile agricultural land in the Vale of Glamorgan. As set out below, there are other potential options around Rhoose that do not contravene the objectives of the protection of valuable agricultural land.

6) The development of this site would fundamentally conflict with the sustainable aims set out elsewhere in the UDP. Although the re-opening of the railway line and location in respect of proximity to Cardiff and the employment opportunities at the airport make Rhoose a highly sustainable location, the addition of 600 extra houses in this location seriously contravenes the sustainable objectives of the plan. In particular the capacity of the site is "limited" to accommodating 600 dwellings. It is limited in respect of the fact that there is no further opportunity once those 600 dwellings have been built for additional areas of employment, public open space, retail, community facilities and recreational needs. In itself, the development will not be able to support the needs of 600 further households in Rhoose. Fundamentally, the needs of the existing population will not be addressed through development north of the railway line. There is a clear and established need for greater community based infrastructure in Rhoose to serve the needs of this settlement at present.

7) Following a public consultation exercise with the residents of Rhoose, Cofton has established that the existing provisions in Rhoose are incapable of meeting existing and certainly future need. In particular, the Rhws Primary School is already at full capacity. Children from Rhoose already have to travel to Barry and Llantwit Major for their primary education, and this is prior to the existing Rhoose Point scheme being fully occupied. The proposals north of the railway line will only exacerbate the situation. Cofton Limited notes that modification E32 requires that the development makes an "effective and positive contribution to the social economic and environmental wellbeing of the local community". A mere financial contribution to education in Rhoose is not considered to go far enough. The Council has failed to consider the repercussions of the eventual occupation of 500 dwellings at Rhoose Point and a further 600 dwellings on new land. This results in approximately 250 new pupils to be accommodated in the existing school.

8) If Rhoose is to support development of this scale, a new school to serve the entire Rhoose population should be built. This facility should replace the existing school; that the maintenance of one primary school designed to cater for all the demands of Rhoose in turn helps to maintain a united community.

9) Notwithstanding the fact that there is no commitment to building a new school, given the size of the allocation in terms of land area and number of dwellings, there is insufficient capacity on the allocated site to build a new school with associated playing fields and at the same time provide 600 dwellings. Rhoose cannot support the development of 600 additional dwellings without developing a new school. If the allocation north of the railway proceeds, this development cannot occur.

10) There is limited scope on the existing school site to extend without having to encroach into valuable playing fields. Furthermore, carrying out building works at the existing school site would render it impossible to continue day-to-day school activity.

11) This is an unacceptable position which is being enforced upon existing and future residents of Rhoose. If key services such as the school are not built, the sustainability at the settlement will not be maintained and the Council will therefore be faced with the resultant social consequences thereof.

12) There is an established lack of recreational facilities in Rhoose. Again, given the size of the allocation and number of dwellings to be accommodated, there is very little opportunity to implement any recreational development on site. It is evident

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

from Cofton's own public consultation exercise that there is a need for a new stand alone facility such as a leisure centre and mere financial contributions to improve existing facilities are not enough.

13) Other essential community facilities such as surgeries and nurseries are already at full capacity in Rhose. There is limited scope to make any extensions to these facilities and thus financial contributions will not be adequate.

14) A development of this scale requires significant developer contributions to allow it to be integrated with the existing community through the provision of additional facilities. It is understood that two of the developers promoting this site have yet to acquire the land and only control it through option agreements. They will therefore be obliged to purchase the site at residential land values (maximising the same) that will significantly reduce, and be in direct conflict with the potential to provide any significant degree of community facilities. It is further understood that there is no landowners agreement in place. A potential for future disputes arises given that only a comprehensive development should be considered by the LPA in accordance with a Section 106 Agreement. As set out below, there are other options available to the Council to accommodate the level of housing need for this Plan period in Rhose and furthermore increase and enhance the level of community facilities available to them.

15) Cofton Limited recognise the sustainability potential of Rhose. They therefore support the level of housing apportioned to the settlement in respect of the Inspector's recommendation to increase the overall housing provision and approve the strategy for development along the Urban Waterfront. Accordingly, Cofton recognise that it is insufficient merely to object to an allocation of this scale without proposing an alternative and more sustainable option for development. Cofton Limited considers that there is a sustainable solution to development that can still deliver up to 400 dwellings within the Plan period. This scenario is set out below.

16) The proposed options for allocation comprise of three separate development sites. Cofton Limited recommend the deletion of site HOUS1(22) in favour of the following sites. The sites are identified on Plan MRP1 and are set out and addressed in turn below.

17) A planning application is being prepared to propose a comprehensive and co-ordinated development on the three sites set out below. Although not wishing to be premature to the UDP preparation, Cofton Limited are conscious that the proposals should be in the public domain where they can be subject to public consultation and further demonstrate that they are prepared to sign up to carrying out the proposed community works. Further, Cofton are committed to finding the right solution for Rhose and are committed to a continual involvement of the proposals through the consultation process. The application will be submitted with a traffic impact assessment to demonstrate that there are adverse traffic impacts on the settlement of Rhose.

1) The Western Expansion of Rhose Point (capacity 250 dwellings). As part of the Rhose Point approved scheme for 500 dwellings, Cofton Limited own this area of land, which has been secured at land values reflective of its current planning status. The land falls within the outline-approved scheme for Rhose Point and is shown on the Masterplan for use as a golf course. Since planning consent was granted in 1996, there has been no interest shown in the development of the site for that use. Given the costs associated with the redevelopment of a quarry site and general accepted principle that golf courses run at a loss until long established, it is not expected that there will be any interest in developing a golf course at this location within the Plan period. Following a recent public exhibition of the proposals that Cofton intend to pursue through these UDP Modifications, it has emerged that the local community were more inclined to suggest that they would welcome other recreational uses instead of a golf course in this location. Cofton are therefore fully aware that the Rhose residents both need and expect that additional recreational facilities will provided in this location. Cofton Limited are however equally aware that in accordance with PPG Wales and other Central Government guidance, more efficient use of this land can be made.

The land consists in part of previously developed quarry land. Cofton Limited proposes to develop 250 dwellings on this western expansion land. Because Cofton Limited have acquired this land at values significantly less than current residential values, there is sufficient scope to make a number of community based enhancements for the entire community to prosper from. Furthermore, the sheer scale of land ownership at the western expansion is such that there is scope (in direct contrast to land north of the railway line) to provide these facilities on the proposed new allocation site. Because the land has been acquired at minimal land values, Cofton are in a position where they are prepared to sign a unilateral undertaking to not only provide the land for these essential services, but to also facilitate the construction of the buildings. The proposed development at the western quarry is set out on Plan MRP2. The masterplan is submitted for illustrative purposes and will be the subject of ongoing consultation with the local community and the LPA. In respect of the community facilities, Cofton propose to build the following:

i) A New Primary School. The school is designed to replace the existing Rhws Primary School and therefore be a focus for the entire community. The provision of only one primary school is essential for sustainable community growth. The larger modern facility will enable latest technologies to be incorporated into the classroom, and will be relocated to a site less than 250 metres away from the existing facility, thereby causing minimal disruption to the community. Furthermore, the school will be in a central location in relation to the emerging Rhose Point scheme, the existing settlement and the new western expansion.

ii) A New Nursery. This new facility will be a modern multi- purpose centre to replace those existing services that have no potential for expansion.

iii) Park-And-Ride Facility. This will comprise a 200 space car park to enable and encourage more sustainable forms of transport, and to make Rhose Point Station a genuine public transport gateway entrance into South Wales from the Airport.

iv) Station Area Improvements. Additional facilities will be provided at the Station/Retail area in order to maximise the use of the public transport interchange and in turn make the facility more attractive to users of Cardiff International Airport. This will include public convenience facilities, a waiting room/café and a potential footbridge connecting to the north side platform (subject to Railtrack entering into an appropriate legal agreement).

v) Employment facilities. These facilities will provide essential resources for the settlement as a whole, whilst offering initiative design solutions to help establish the scheme. The proposals do not make provision for standard light industrial units but offer the potential to accommodate live/work craft units that can attract residents and tourists alike into the scheme. Cofton Limited

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

intends to establish a partnership approach with local sponsors and businesses to provide subsidised rental accommodation for emerging local craft enterprises. It is intended that the employment centre will attract visitors into Rhoose on market days, with a view to becoming a renowned alternative employment and tourist opportunity in South Wales.

vi) Recreational Opportunities. The existing asbestos tip site (south of the new railway station interchange) is now fully capped and ready to be put to alternative use. Following consultation with the Rhoose residents it has emerged that there is essential need for additional recreational football/rugby pitches, and a desire for a cricket pitch. These will be provided in this location, easily accessible to the existing and future residents, and meet the needs of the youth community. Furthermore, additional facilities for youth activities such as a skateboarding park will be provided south of the rail station interchange. Its location here will ensure that the area will be the subject of maximum security and safety.

vii) A New Leisure Centre. A new facility will be built providing facilities for a new 25 metre swimming pool, a new sports hall, squash courts and gym. If appropriate, the facility could be maintained by the Council and thus make it accessible to as much of the community as possible.

viii) Nature Conservation Area. Following the success of the emerging Rhoose Point Conservation Area, it is proposed to extend this designation to "wrap around" the proposed residential development. This will provide an attractive area of open space and will further act as a strong defensible boundary against any development encroaching further west.

ix) Improvements to the Local Footpath Network. Improvements will be made to the beach path from Station Road and the existing coastal footpath as part of the development proposals.

The above proposals represent a scheme that will benefit both the existing and future Rhoose community. The development site is located on part brownfield land which offers little or no benefit to the local landscape. The built form is sufficiently far back from the coastal footpath and the coast itself to prevent any visual intrusion from the Bristol Channel. Furthermore, the land has limited agricultural use and its development therefore complies with other UDP policies. The development is located centrally within Rhoose, and will therefore help integrate the emerging Rhoose Point scheme with the existing community. Access to and from the site will be readily available for pedestrians through Station Road and the local retail centre.

Access will be gained to the site from the existing new access road serving Rhoose Point. A secondary access will be gained through Station Road. A Traffic Impact Assessment will be submitted with the impending application and will demonstrate that there is no adverse traffic impact on the existing network.

Further contributions will also be made to the improvement of the public transport infrastructure serving Rhoose. As already set out, Cofton are committed to agreeing a Unilateral Undertaking with the Local Authority in order to cement their commitments to the improvement of community facilities in Rhoose.

Cofton recognise that 250 dwellings in Rhoose is not sufficient to meet the housing need for this UDP Plan period. Accordingly further sustainable development sites are proposed.

2) The Redevelopment of the School Site (50 dwellings) (Plan MRP3). It is considered that there is need for only one primary school in Rhoose. It is essential that only one school be provided in order to integrate the existing and future community of Rhoose. Accordingly, if the proposals are accepted, there will be land available at the existing school site for brownfield redevelopment. The school site in its present guise is located in an extremely sustainable location along the Font-y-Gary Road in close proximity to the local retail centre.

Redevelopment for sheltered accommodation is an issue that the local residents have raised through public consultation. This would appear to be a suitable use for the site given that it will cause least disruption to the local highway network. Furthermore, the site is ideally suited for the elderly population who would have ready access to local services. It is considered that this site can accommodate up to 50 sheltered accommodation units. If this is considered too many sheltered accommodation units, a mix of open market/affordable tenure and type can be integrated into this scheme. This strategy is considered to make maximum and efficient use of existing sites within Rhoose, thereby complying with the overarching UDP strategy.

3) Redevelopment of the Rhoose Point employment allocation (100 dwellings) (Plan MRP4). A separate application has already been made to develop the existing employment allocation at Rhoose Point for residential purposes. Within that application, it is set out that in the past 7 years since outline planning permission was granted for the Rhoose Point scheme, no interest has been shown in the site by commercial developers. This is despite a consistent and on-going marketing strategy for the site, which includes the identification of the land on the Vale's own Employment Land Register.

This site is considered unsuitable for employment related development. The site lies in a visually sensitive location on the top of the Rhoose Point Quarry. Any development here is highly visible and it is considered that employment related development would be visually intrusive.

In respect of Cofton's overall approach to development in Rhoose, this site is previously developed and is located in a sustainable location amongst existing housing development. It is therefore ideally suited to this housing and has potential to provide up to 100 new dwellings. This would therefore meet the overall requirement to provide 400 extra dwellings in Rhoose in this Plan period. Furthermore, given the comprehensive nature of the proposals, alternative land is supplied for employment related purposes at the "Western Expansion". As set out above, these are considered to be more viable in the short and medium term as up until now, no interest has been shown in this area of Rhoose for employment related development. If the proposals continue to emerge through the planning process, Cofton will be committed to constructing the employment buildings and thus make them more commercially attractive to potential occupiers.

18) The above proposals are considered to represent a sound and rational strategy for sustainable development in Rhoose. It is largely based on the reuse of previously developed land in more sustainable locations than that proposed north of the railway

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

line. The proposals will help integrate the existing and future communities of Rhoose together by providing a number of centrally located community facilities. These are facilities that the north of the railway line proposals cannot provide.

19) Submitted with these representations is an illustrative masterplan demonstrating the potential scope of development at the "Western Expansion" and other sites. The masterplan has been revised following the feedback received from Cofton's own public consultation exercise. Cofton are committed to finding the right solution for Rhoose. If the proposals are allowed to proceed, Cofton will continue to liaise with the Local Authority and the public to establish specific requirements and overall aspirations for development. In due course, Cofton will be happy to help and work with the LPA to establish a Development Brief for the site.

20) Although Cofton recognise that the proposals set out above have not been formally promoted through the UDP process up until these Modifications, it is considered essential in the wider community's interest that the Council reconsider the potential redevelopment and long term sustainability options in Rhoose. It is therefore recommended that a Modifications Inquiry be held in order to fully assess the potential for redevelopment on these alternative sites and overall provision of housing land in Rhoose.

21) Cofton Limited recommend that site HOUS1(22), Land North of the Railway Line, Rhoose be deleted. The allocation should be replaced by three more sustainable sites in Rhoose which can deliver the housing requirement for the Plan period in a more sustainable and co-ordinated manner. These are:

- The Western Expansion of Rhoose Point (37 ha gross) – 250 dwellings
- The Rhoose Point Employment Land site (2.62 ha gross) – 100 dwellings
- The Existing School site (1.43 ha gross) – 50 dwellings

22) The three sites should be viewed as a whole and be covered by a single Section 106 Agreement. Further policies should be introduced detailing the proposed Section 106 Heads of Terms that should accompany the allocation of the three sites. The Heads of Terms should include:

23) The provision of land and construction thereof of a new primary school to serve the whole community of Rhoose. This should be accompanied by a commencement clause which confirms that the construction of the school will begin before the occupation of the first dwelling, and be completed prior to the occupation of the 201st dwelling. Furthermore, the existing School site will not be passed to the developer until the new school is operational.

- The provision of land and construction thereof of a new nursery.
- The provision of land and construction thereof of a Park-And-Ride facility.
- The provision of land and construction thereof for station area enhancements (potential footbridge subject to Railtrack entering into an appropriate legal agreement).
- The provision of land and construction thereof of employment facilities.
- The provision of land and construction thereof of recreational opportunities including playing pitches and youth facilities.
- The provision of land and construction thereof of a leisure centre and associated parking.
- The provision of land and construction thereof of a nature conservation area.
- The provision of land and construction thereof of improvements to the local footpath network.

24) Cofton are committed to ensuring that the community proposals benefit the entirety of the Rhoose population. To that end, Cofton are committed to proceeding with the public consultation exercise and look forward to discussing and evolving the proposals with Officers in due course.

Representor No. 1668.12

Representation

- 1) Cofton Limited support the addition of the proposed paragraphs, although have made objections in other Representations concerning the precise definition of the settlement boundary at Rhoose.
- 2) In accordance with the other Representations submitted by Cofton Limited, consequential changes are required to the settlement boundary around Rhoose.

The following representations were made in respect of Modification No. E13 as found in the Proposed Modifications document dated February 2003

Representor No's.

1488.2	1492.3	1623.3	1627.1	1629.3	1633.3	1635.2
1491.3	1622.1	1626.3	1628.3	1630.3	1634.1	1636.1
						1637.2

Representation

The original Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development is not required (Housing Policy 3 4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhoose fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 4.1.5) Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhoose and St. Athan. The proposed developments are extensions not infills (Housing Policy 8 page 72). There are sufficient brownfield sites within the Vale to satisfy any projected need for new housing (Planning Guidance {Wales}, Joint Housing Land Availability Study, October 2002).

Development of the site would not aid urban regeneration, even though it is a key step in the "search sequence", as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002. Access to jobs, and services from the site will be severely limited except by car. Even after the rail station opens, they will not be able to use it to visit the primary school, surgeries, post office, library, local shops or nearest supermarkets. Air pollution in Rhosee from car exhausts, aircraft fumes and fallout from the nearby cement and power stations is already unacceptable. Local air pollution will increase with airport expansion and the start of the shuttle buses running from the train station. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality even further, with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population. The current transportation infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. Due to the space restrictions placed on Rhosee by the airport and the sea, it is unlikely there would be any improvement to the infrastructure of the village to accommodate any further housing developments. The social infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. The site is an important area for bird migration and feeding. It sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including threatened species. There is a potential threat of flooding due to water already coming across fields from Rhosee Village and Airport and the vulnerability of aquifer.

Representor No's. 1489.3 1490.3

Representation

The original Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development is not required (Housing Policy 3 4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhosee fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 4.1.5) Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhosee and St. Athan. The proposed developments are extensions not infills (Housing Policy 8 page 72). There are sufficient brownfield sites within the Vale to satisfy any projected need for new housing (Planning Guidance {Wales}, Joint Housing Land Availability Study, October 2002). Development of the site would not aid urban regeneration, even though it is a key step in the "search sequence", as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002. Access to jobs, and services from the site will be severely limited except by car. Even after the rail station opens, they will not be able to use it to visit the primary school, surgeries, post office, library, local shops or nearest supermarkets. Air pollution in Rhosee from car exhausts, aircraft fumes and fallout from the nearby cement and power stations is already unacceptable. Local air pollution will increase with airport expansion and the start of the shuttle buses running from the train station. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality even further, with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population. The current transportation infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. Due to the space restrictions placed on Rhosee by the airport and the sea, it is unlikely there would be any improvement to the infrastructure of the village to accommodate any further housing developments. The social infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. The site is an important area for bird migration and feeding. It sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including threatened species. There is a potential threat of flooding due to water already coming across fields from Rhosee Village and Airport and the vulnerability of aquifer. As a retired police Sergeant, I have firsthand experience of the effects of new housing projects that do not have facilities developed at the same time as the housing. As a Community Liaison Officer I was dealing with damage, theft, burglary, theft of and from vehicles, public order offences, assaults, drunkenness, substance abuse the whole spectrum of crimes being perpetuated by young people who had been abandoned to their own devices and complained of "being bored". The level of dog fouling pollution is already beyond belief, and the additional potential for filth on the footpaths does not fill me with hope for the future, bearing in mind the current lack of concern of dog owners, coupled with the apparent absence of Dog Fouling Enforcement Officers.

Representor No. 1550.5

Representation

Access to the proposed residential development is restricted to one road joining the new road from Porthkerry Road to Rhosee Point. This new road will not be adequate when the twice daily movement of approximately 600+ cars from the new development form this new are added to the 1000+ car journeys twice daily from a completed Rhosee Point. The other access to the proposed residential development will join Porthkerry Road. This access would need a roundabout or traffic lights to deal with approximately 600+ car movements twice daily onto an already busy road. This access already has a public footpath going through it. This footpath leads down to the coast, crossing the railway line. To remove or adjust the footpath would mean breaking local bylaws. There is no provision for safe pedestrian, disabled or cycle access across the railway line. The Draft Unitary Development Plan (MOD D028) states "underground water resources will be safeguarded". The proposed site is on an aquifer of high vulnerability (an underground water resources). "The Draft Unitary Development Plan (MOD D029) states "development which would exacerbate flood risk elsewhere should NOT be permitted". Rhosee Point has already been subject to flooding, affecting houses and forcing the closure of the railway line. A residential development can only increase run off rates from buildings and hard surfaces increasing the risk of flooding in Rhosee Point.

Representor No's. 1668.9 1668.10

Representation

1)Cofton Limited fundamentally object to the allocation of 400 dwellings (increasing to 600 dwellings in subsequent Plan periods) on land north of the railway line, Rhosee. This objection is based on a number of factors, which are set out below.

2) In its current use, the land lies as an area of attractive agricultural rural landscape. The site lies as a significant gateway feature for motorists and other vehicular users entering the settlement of Rhosee from Cardiff, Barry and Cardiff International Airport. This eastern entrance to Rhosee along the Porthkerry Road represents the more frequently used access into the settlement. In its present guise it affords attractive views across the landscape towards the Bristol Channel. If development was to occur on this site, that landscape would be lost forever to the detriment of the existing population and those entering the

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

settlement from the principal point of access. At present, the new roundabout serving the Rhoose Point development from Porthkerry Road acts as a traffic calming measure. Accordingly, motorists are encouraged to slow down and thus gain more appreciation of the landscape in its current setting.

3) Though undoubtedly located in a sustainable position within the Vale of Glamorgan, and despite repeated pressures for development growth, the settlement has retained its rural sense of place. This will be lost forever should development proceed north of the railway line.

4) 600 further households in Rhoose will considerably change the characteristics of the settlement to its detriment. Cofton Limited has supported the UDP's proposals for green wedges protecting encroachment into the countryside around Rhoose elsewhere in these representations. The development of 600 additional houses is considered to be too great a scale of development for the settlement to support and retain its rural feel. A community based development of 400 dwellings with no capacity for further growth is more suitable and sustainable for Rhoose in the long term.

5) The allocation of this land conflicts with Policy ENV2, which considers the protection of agricultural land. The site is currently in full agricultural use and its loss would be of detriment to the retention of best and most versatile agricultural land in the Vale of Glamorgan. As set out below, there are other potential options around Rhoose that do not contravene the objectives of the protection of valuable agricultural land.

6) The development of this site would fundamentally conflict with the sustainable aims set out elsewhere in the UDP. Although the re-opening of the railway line and location in respect of proximity to Cardiff and the employment opportunities at the airport make Rhoose a highly sustainable location, the addition of 600 extra houses in this location seriously contravenes the sustainable objectives of the plan. In particular the capacity of the site is "limited" to accommodating 600 dwellings. It is limited in respect of the fact that there is no further opportunity once those 600 dwellings have been built for additional areas of employment, public open space, retail, community facilities and recreational needs. In itself, the development will not be able to support the needs of 600 further households in Rhoose. Fundamentally, the needs of the existing population will not be addressed through development north of the railway line. There is a clear and established need for greater community based infrastructure in Rhoose to serve the needs of this settlement at present.

7) Following a public consultation exercise with the residents of Rhoose, Cofton has established that the existing provisions in Rhoose are incapable of meeting existing and certainly future need. In particular, the Rhws Primary School is already at full capacity. Children from Rhoose already have to travel to Barry and Llantwit Major for their primary education, and this is prior to the existing Rhoose Point scheme being fully occupied. The proposals north of the railway line will only exacerbate the situation. Cofton Limited notes that modification E32 requires that the development makes an "effective and positive contribution to the social economic and environmental wellbeing of the local community". A mere financial contribution to education in Rhoose is not considered to go far enough. The Council has failed to consider the repercussions of the eventual occupation of 500 dwellings at Rhoose Point and a further 600 dwellings on new land. This results in approximately 250 new pupils to be accommodated in the existing school.

8) If Rhoose is to support development of this scale, a new school to serve the entire Rhoose population should be built. This facility should replace the existing school; that the maintenance of one primary school designed to cater for all the demands of Rhoose in turn helps to maintain a united community.

9) Notwithstanding the fact that there is no commitment to building a new school, given the size of the allocation in terms of land area and number of dwellings, there is insufficient capacity on the allocated site to build a new school with associated playing fields and at the same time provide 600 dwellings. Rhoose cannot support the development of 600 additional dwellings without developing a new school. If the allocation north of the railway proceeds, this development cannot occur.

10) There is limited scope on the existing school site to extend without having to encroach into valuable playing fields. Furthermore, carrying out building works at the existing school site would render it impossible to continue day-to-day school activity.

11) This is an unacceptable position which is being enforced upon existing and future residents of Rhoose. If key services such as the school are not built, the sustainability at the settlement will not be maintained and the Council will therefore be faced with the resultant social consequences thereof.

12) There is an established lack of recreational facilities in Rhoose. Again, given the size of the allocation and number of dwellings to be accommodated, there is very little opportunity to implement any recreational development on site. It is evident from Cofton's own public consultation exercise that there is a need for a new stand alone facility such as a leisure centre and mere financial contributions to improve existing facilities are not enough.

13) Other essential community facilities such as surgeries and nurseries are already at full capacity in Rhoose. There is limited scope to make any extensions to these facilities and thus financial contributions will not be adequate.

14) A development of this scale requires significant developer contributions to allow it to be integrated with the existing community through the provision of additional facilities. It is understood that two of the developers promoting this site have yet to acquire the land and only control it through option agreements. They will therefore be obliged to purchase the site at residential land values (maximising the same) that will significantly reduce, and be in direct conflict with the potential to provide any significant degree of community facilities. It is further understood that there is no landowners agreement in place. A potential for future disputes arises given that only a comprehensive development should be considered by the LPA in accordance with a Section 106 Agreement. As set out below, there are other options available to the Council to accommodate the level of housing need for this Plan period in Rhoose and furthermore increase and enhance the level of community facilities available to them.

15) Cofton Limited recognise the sustainability potential of Rhoose. They therefore support the level of housing apportioned to the settlement in respect of the Inspector's recommendation to increase the overall housing provision and approve the strategy for development along the Urban Waterfront. Accordingly, Cofton recognise that it is insufficient merely to object to an allocation of this scale without proposing an alternative and more sustainable option for development. Cofton Limited considers

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

that there is a sustainable solution to development that can still deliver up to 400 dwellings within the Plan period. This scenario is set out below.

16) The proposed options for allocation comprise of three separate development sites. Cofton Limited recommend the deletion of site HOUS1(22) in favour of the following sites. The sites are identified on Plan MRP1 and are set out and addressed in turn below.

17) A planning application is being prepared to propose a comprehensive and co-ordinated development on the three sites set out below. Although not wishing to be premature to the UDP preparation, Cofton Limited are conscious that the proposals should be in the public domain where they can be subject to public consultation and further demonstrate that they are prepared to sign up to carrying out the proposed community works. Further, Cofton are committed to finding the right solution for Rhoose and are committed to a continual involvement of the proposals through the consultation process. The application will be submitted with a traffic impact assessment to demonstrate that there are adverse traffic impacts on the settlement of Rhoose.

1) The Western Expansion of Rhoose Point (capacity 250 dwellings). As part of the Rhoose Point approved scheme for 500 dwellings, Cofton Limited own this area of land, which has been secured at land values reflective of its current planning status. The land falls within the outline-approved scheme for Rhoose Point and is shown on the Masterplan for use as a golf course. Since planning consent was granted in 1996, there has been no interest shown in the development of the site for that use. Given the costs associated with the redevelopment of a quarry site and general accepted principle that golf courses run at a loss until long established, it is not expected that there will be any interest in developing a golf course at this location within the Plan period. Following a recent public exhibition of the proposals that Cofton intend to pursue through these UDP Modifications, it has emerged that the local community were more inclined to suggest that they would welcome other recreational uses instead of a golf course in this location. Cofton are therefore fully aware that the Rhoose residents both need and expect that additional recreational facilities will be provided in this location. Cofton Limited are however equally aware that in accordance with PPG Wales and other Central Government guidance, more efficient use of this land can be made.

The land consists in part of previously developed quarry land. Cofton Limited proposes to develop 250 dwellings on this western expansion land. Because Cofton Limited have acquired this land at values significantly less than current residential values, there is sufficient scope to make a number of community based enhancements for the entire community to prosper from. Furthermore, the sheer scale of land ownership at the western expansion is such that there is scope (in direct contrast to land north of the railway line) to provide these facilities on the proposed new allocation site. Because the land has been acquired at minimal land values, Cofton are in a position where they are prepared to sign a unilateral undertaking to not only provide the land for these essential services, but to also facilitate the construction of the buildings.

The proposed development at the western quarry is set out on Plan MRP2. The masterplan is submitted for illustrative purposes and will be the subject of ongoing consultation with the local community and the LPA. In respect of the community facilities, Cofton propose to build the following:

i) A New Primary School. The school is designed to replace the existing Rhws Primary School and therefore be a focus for the entire community. The provision of only one primary school is essential for sustainable community growth. The larger modern facility will enable latest technologies to be incorporated into the classroom, and will be relocated to a site less than 250 metres away from the existing facility, thereby causing minimal disruption to the community. Furthermore, the school will be in a central location in relation to the emerging Rhoose Point scheme, the existing settlement and the new western expansion.

ii) A New Nursery. This new facility will be a modern multi- purpose centre to replace those existing services that have no potential for expansion.

iii) Park-And-Ride Facility. This will comprise a 200 space car park to enable and encourage more sustainable forms of transport, and to make Rhoose Point Station a genuine public transport gateway entrance into South Wales from the Airport.

iv) Station Area Improvements. Additional facilities will be provided at the Station/Retail area in order to maximise the use of the public transport interchange and in turn make the facility more attractive to users of Cardiff International Airport. This will include public convenience facilities, a waiting room/café and a potential footbridge connecting to the north side platform (subject to Railtrack entering into an appropriate legal agreement).

v) Employment facilities. These facilities will provide essential resources for the settlement as a whole, whilst offering initiative design solutions to help establish the scheme. The proposals do not make provision for standard light industrial units but offer the potential to accommodate live/work craft units that can attract residents and tourists alike into the scheme. Cofton Limited intends to establish a partnership approach with local sponsors and businesses to provide subsidised rental accommodation for emerging local craft enterprises. It is intended that the employment centre will attract visitors into Rhoose on market days, with a view to becoming a renowned alternative employment and tourist opportunity in South Wales.

vi) Recreational Opportunities. The existing asbestos tip site (south of the new railway station interchange) is now fully capped and ready to be put to alternative use. Following consultation with the Rhoose residents it has emerged that there is essential need for additional recreational football/rugby pitches, and a desire for a cricket pitch. These will be provided in this location, easily accessible to the existing and future residents, and meet the needs of the youth community. Furthermore, additional facilities for youth activities such as a skateboarding park will be provided south of the rail station interchange. Its location here will ensure that the area will be the subject of maximum security and safety.

vii) A New Leisure Centre. A new facility will be built providing facilities for a new 25 metre swimming pool, a new sports hall, squash courts and gym. If appropriate, the facility could be maintained by the Council and thus make it accessible to as much of the community as possible.

viii) Nature Conservation Area. Following the success of the emerging Rhoose Point Conservation Area, it is proposed to extend this designation to "wrap around" the proposed residential development. This will provide an attractive area of open space and will further act as a strong defensible boundary against any development encroaching further west.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

ix) Improvements to the Local Footpath Network. Improvements will be made to the beach path from Station Road and the existing coastal footpath as part of the development proposals.

The above proposals represent a scheme that will benefit both the existing and future Rhoose community. The development site is located on part brownfield land which offers little or no benefit to the local landscape. The built form is sufficiently far back from the coastal footpath and the coast itself to prevent any visual intrusion from the Bristol Channel. Furthermore, the land has limited agricultural use and its development therefore complies with other UDP policies.

The development is located centrally within Rhoose, and will therefore help integrate the emerging Rhoose Point scheme with the existing community. Access to and from the site will be readily available for pedestrians through Station Road and the local retail centre.

Access will be gained to the site from the existing new access road serving Rhoose Point. A secondary access will be gained through Station Road. A Traffic Impact Assessment will be submitted with the impending application and will demonstrate that there is no adverse traffic impact on the existing network.

Further contributions will also be made to the improvement of the public transport infrastructure serving Rhoose. As already set out, Cofton are committed to agreeing a Unilateral Undertaking with the Local Authority in order to cement their commitments to the improvement of community facilities in Rhoose.

Cofton recognise that 250 dwellings in Rhoose is not sufficient to meet the housing need for this UDP Plan period. Accordingly further sustainable development sites are proposed.

2) The Redevelopment of the School Site (50 dwellings) (Plan MRP3). It is considered that there is need for only one primary school in Rhoose. It is essential that only one school be provided in order to integrate the existing and future community of Rhoose. Accordingly, if the proposals are accepted, there will be land available at the existing school site for brownfield redevelopment. The school site in its present guise is located in an extremely sustainable location along the Font-y-Gary Road in close proximity to the local retail centre.

Redevelopment for sheltered accommodation is an issue that the local residents have raised through public consultation. This would appear to be a suitable use for the site given that it will cause least disruption to the local highway network. Furthermore, the site is ideally suited for the elderly population who would have ready access to local services. It is considered that this site can accommodate up to 50 sheltered accommodation units. If this is considered too many sheltered accommodation units, a mix of open market/affordable tenure and type can be integrated into this scheme.

This strategy is considered to make maximum and efficient use of existing sites within Rhoose, thereby complying with the overarching UDP strategy.

3) Redevelopment of the Rhoose Point employment allocation (100 dwellings) (Plan MRP4). A separate application has already been made to develop the existing employment allocation at Rhoose Point for residential purposes. Within that application, it is set out that in the past 7 years since outline planning permission was granted for the Rhoose Point scheme, no interest has been shown in the site by commercial developers. This is despite a consistent and on-going marketing strategy for the site, which includes the identification of the land on the Vale's own Employment Land Register.

This site is considered unsuitable for employment related development. The site lies in a visually sensitive location on the top of the Rhoose Point Quarry. Any development here is highly visible and it is considered that employment related development would be visually intrusive.

In respect of Cofton's overall approach to development in Rhoose, this site is previously developed and is located in a sustainable location in amongst existing housing development. It is therefore ideally suited to this housing and has potential to provide up to 100 new dwellings. This would therefore meet the overall requirement to provide 400 extra dwellings in Rhoose in this Plan period. Furthermore, given the comprehensive nature of the proposals, alternative land is supplied for employment related purposes at the "Western Expansion". As set out above, these are considered to be more viable in the short and medium term as up until now, no interest has been shown in this area of Rhoose for employment related development. If the proposals continue to emerge through the planning process, Cofton will be committed to constructing the employment buildings and thus make them more commercially attractive to potential occupiers.

18) The above proposals are considered to represent a sound and rational strategy for sustainable development in Rhoose. It is largely based on the reuse of previously developed land in more sustainable locations than that proposed north of the railway line. The proposals will help integrate the existing and future communities of Rhoose together by providing a number of centrally located community facilities. These are facilities that the north of the railway line proposals cannot provide.

19) Submitted with these representations is an illustrative masterplan demonstrating the potential scope of development at the "Western Expansion" and other sites. The masterplan has been revised following the feedback received from Cofton's own public consultation exercise. Cofton are committed to finding the right solution for Rhoose. If the proposals are allowed to proceed, Cofton will continue to liaise with the Local Authority and the public to establish specific requirements and overall aspirations for development. In due course, Cofton will be happy to help and work with the LPA to establish a Development Brief for the site.

20) Although Cofton recognise that the proposals set out above have not been formally promoted through the UDP process up until these Modifications, it is considered essential in the wider community's interest that the Council reconsider the potential redevelopment and long term sustainability options in Rhoose. It is therefore recommended that a Modifications Inquiry be held in order to fully assess the potential for redevelopment on these alternative sites and overall provision of housing land in Rhoose.

21) Cofton Limited recommend that site HOUS1 (22), Land North of the Railway Line, Rhoose be deleted. The allocation should be replaced by three more sustainable sites in Rhoose which can deliver the housing requirement for the Plan period in a more sustainable and co-ordinated manner. These are:

- The Western Expansion of Rhoose Point (37 ha gross) – 250 dwellings
- The Rhoose Point Employment Land site (2.62 ha gross) – 100 dwellings

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

- The Existing School site (1.43 ha gross) – 50 dwellings

22) The three sites should be viewed as a whole and be covered by a single Section 106 Agreement. Further policies should be introduced detailing the proposed Section 106 Heads of Terms that should accompany the allocation of the three sites. The Heads of Terms should include:

23) The provision of land and construction thereof of a new primary school to serve the whole community of Rhoose. This should be accompanied by a commencement clause which confirms that the construction of the school will begin before the occupation of the first dwelling, and be completed prior to the occupation of the 201st dwelling. Furthermore, the existing School site will not be passed to the developer until the new school is operational.

- The provision of land and construction thereof of a new nursery.
- The provision of land and construction thereof of a Park-And-Ride facility.
- The provision of land and construction thereof for station area enhancements (potential footbridge subject to Railtrack entering into an appropriate legal agreement).
- The provision of land and construction thereof of employment facilities.
- The provision of land and construction thereof of recreational opportunities including playing pitches and youth facilities.
- The provision of land and construction thereof of a leisure centre and associated parking.
- The provision of land and construction thereof of a nature conservation area.
-
- The provision of land and construction thereof of improvements to the local footpath network.

24) Cofton are committed to ensuring that the community proposals benefit the entirety of the Rhoose population. To that end, Cofton are committed to proceeding with the public consultation exercise and look forward to discussing and evolving the proposals with Officers in due course.

The following representations were made in respect of Modification No. E07 & E08 as found in the Proposed Modifications document of February 2003.

Representor No's. 1668.18 1668.19

Representation

1) Cofton Limited supports the UDP's approach to the sequential release of housing sites. In particular, support is given to the need to prioritise the redevelopment of previously developed sites particularly where they are located in sustainable settlements.

2) Cofton Limited contends that the new allocations in the HOUS1 Policy do not reflect this strategy. In particular, objection is made to the allocation on land north of the railway at Rhoose (Policy HOUS1(22)). Although located on the urban edge of Rhoose, and thus located in a relatively sustainable location, this is a greenfield development site with limited capability of providing essential community based infrastructure.

3) In other Representations submitted by Cofton Limited, consideration is given to more sustainable development options in Rhoose. This includes the redevelopment of previously developed sites which are capable of supporting up to 400 dwellings. Cofton Limited proposes that the Authority reassess the options for development in Rhoose and delete the allocation north of the railway in favour of more sustainable options.

4) Cofton Limited support the recommendations of Modification E08 and note in particular that the search sequence has had regard to the ability to build communities to support new physical and social infrastructure and the need to provide sufficient demand to sustain appropriate local services and facilities. By allocating land north of the railway line, this objective will not be achieved. In other Representations submitted by Cofton Limited, consideration is given to the fact that an allocation of 400 houses increasing to 600 in future Local Plan periods is unsustainable for the settlement of Rhoose to support without major infrastructure improvements. Given the nature of the allocation north of the railway line, there is insufficient scope on site to provide any community facilities that will meet existing and future levels of demand in Rhoose.

The following representations were made in respect of Modification No. N032 as found in the Proposed Modifications document of February 2003.

Representor No's. 1487.3 1488.3

Representation

The original Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development is not required (Housing Policy 3 4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhoose fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 4.1.5) Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhoose and St. Athan. The proposed developments are extensions not infills (Housing Policy 8 page 72). There are sufficient brownfield sites within the Vale to satisfy any projected need for new housing (Planning Guidance {Wales}, Joint Housing Land Availability Study, October 2002). Development of the site would not aid urban regeneration, even though it is a key step in the "search sequence", as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002. Access to jobs, and services from the site will be severely limited except by car. Even after the rail station opens, they will not be able to use it to visit the primary school, surgeries, post office, library, local shops or nearest supermarkets. Air pollution in Rhoose from car exhausts, aircraft fumes and fallout from the nearby cement and power stations is already unacceptable. Local air pollution will increase with airport expansion and the start of the shuttle buses running from the train station. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality even further, with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population. The current transportation infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. Due to the space restrictions placed on Rhoose by the airport and the sea, it is unlikely there would be any improvement to the infrastructure of the village to accommodate any further housing developments. The social infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. The

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

site is an important area for bird migration and feeding. It sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including threatened species. There is a potential threat of flooding due to water already coming across fields from Rhoose Village and Airport and the vulnerability of aquifer.

The following representations were made in respect of Modification No. N032 as found in the Proposed Modifications document of February 2003.

Representor No's. 1489.1 1490.1

Representation

The original Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development is not required (Housing Policy 3 4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhoose fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 4.1.5) Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhoose and St. Athan. The proposed developments are extensions not infills (Housing Policy 8 page 72). There are sufficient brownfield sites within the Vale to satisfy any projected need for new housing (Planning Guidance {Wales}, Joint Housing Land Availability Study, October 2002). Development of the site would not aid urban regeneration, even though it is a key step in the "search sequence", as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002. Access to jobs, and services from the site will be severely limited except by car. Even after the rail station opens, they will not be able to use it to visit the primary school, surgeries, post office, library, local shops or nearest supermarkets. Air pollution in Rhoose from car exhausts, aircraft fumes and fallout from the nearby cement and power stations is already unacceptable. Local air pollution will increase with airport expansion and the start of the shuttle buses running from the train station. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality even further, with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population. The current transportation infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. Due to the space restrictions placed on Rhoose by the airport and the sea, it is unlikely there would be any improvement to the infrastructure of the village to accommodate any further housing developments. The social infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. The site is an important area for bird migration and feeding. It sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including threatened species. There is a potential threat of flooding due to water already coming across fields from Rhoose Village and Airport and the vulnerability of aquifer. As a retired police Sergeant, I have firsthand experience of the effects of new housing projects, that do not have facilities developed at the same time as the housing. As a Community Liaison Officer I was dealing with damage, theft, burglary, theft of and from vehicles, public order offences, assaults, drunkenness, substance abuse the whole spectrum of crimes being perpetrated by young people who had been abandoned to their own devices and complained of "being bored". The level of dog fouling pollution is already beyond belief, and the additional potential for filth on the footpaths does not fill me with hope for the future, bearing in mind the current lack of concern of dog owners, coupled with the apparent absence of Dog Fouling Enforcement Officers.

The following representations were made in respect of Modification No. N032 as found in the Proposed Modifications document dated February 2003.

Representor No's.

1491.2	1494.1	1624.1	1627.2	1629.1	1632.1	1634.2	1636.3
1492.2	1623.1	1626.2	1628.2	1630.2	1633.2	1635.3	1637.1

Representation

The original Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development is not required (Housing Policy 3 4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhoose fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 4.1.5) Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhoose and St. Athan. The proposed developments are extensions not infills (Housing Policy 8 page 72) There are sufficient brownfield sites within the Vale to satisfy any projected need for new housing (Planning Guidance (Wales), Joint Land Availability Study, October 2002). Development of the site would not aid in urban regeneration, even though this is a key step in the "search sequence" as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002. Access to jobs, shops and services from the site will be severely limited except by car. Even after the rail station opens, they not be able to use it to visit the Primary School. Surgeries, Post Office, Library, local shops or nearest supermarkets. Air pollution in Rhoose from car exhausts, aircraft fumes and fallout from the nearby cement and power stations is already unacceptable. Local air pollution will increase with airport expansion and the start of shuttle buses running from the rail station. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality even further, with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population. The current transport infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. Due to the space restrictions placed on Rhoose by the airport and the sea, it is unlikely there would be any improvement to the infrastructure of the village to accommodate any further housing developments. The social infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. The site is an important area for bird migration and feeding. It sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including threatened species.

Potential threat of flooding due to water already coming across fields from Rhoose Village and Airport and the vulnerability of aquifer.

The following representations were made in respect of Modification No. N032 as found in the Proposed Modifications document dated February 2003.

Representor No's 1548.3 1550.4

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Access to the proposed residential development is restricted to one road joining the new road from Porthkerry Road to Rhoose Point. This new road will not be adequate when the twice daily movement of approximately 600+ cars from the new development form this new are added to the 1000+ car journeys twice daily from a completed Rhoose Point. The other access to the proposed residential development will join Porthkerry Road. This access would need a roundabout or traffic lights to deal with approximately 600+ car movements twice daily onto an already busy road. This access already has a public footpath going through it. This footpath leads down to the coast, crossing the railway line. To remove or adjust the footpath would mean breaking local bylaws. There is no provision for safe pedestrian, disabled or cycle access across the railway line. The Draft Unitary Development Plan (MOD D028) states "underground water resources will be safeguarded". The proposed site is on an aquifer of high vulnerability (an underground water resources). "The Draft Unitary Development Plan (MOD D029) states "development which would exacerbate flood risk elsewhere should NOT be permitted". Rhoose Point has already been subject to flooding, affecting houses and forcing the closure of the railway line. A residential development can only increase run off rates from buildings and hard surfaces increasing the risk of flooding in Rhoose Point.

The following representations were made in respect of Modification No. N032 as found in the Proposed Modifications document dated February 2003.

Representor No's. 1668.24

Representation

- 1) As set out in other Representations submitted by Cofton Limited, it is recommended that the housing allocation at Land North of the Railway Line, Rhoose (Policy HOUS1(22)) be deleted.
 - 2) It is further recommended that the Proposals Map be altered to represent a new housing/mixed use allocation on Land at the Western Expansion.
 - 3) Furthermore it is recommended that the employment allocation at Rhoose Point be changed to a residential allocation and the existing school site be shown with a housing designation.
-

The following representations were made in respect of Modification No. N114 as found in the Proposed Modifications document dated February 2003.

Representor No's. 1668.25

Representation

- 1) As set out in other Representations submitted by Cofton Limited, it is recommended that the housing allocation at Land North of the Railway Line, Rhoose (Policy HOUS1(22)) be deleted.
 - 2) It is further recommended that the Proposals Map be altered to represent a new housing/mixed use allocation on Land at the Western Expansion.
 - 3) Furthermore it is recommended that the employment allocation at Rhoose Point be changed to a residential allocation and the existing school site be shown with a housing designation.
-

Issue: Housing allocation Rhoose (Desired Changes)

Representor Number	Desired change
1107 1206 1212	No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone. The coastal zone should be protected against all residential development
605 606	Reject the proposed modification. No residential development should be permitted on the land outside the current residential settlement boundaries or areas currently designated as coastal zone.
1632 1631	"No extension to the residential settlement boundary of Rhoose. "No" residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.
1619	1) A larger school with adequate facilities which will enable the school to meet Government policies on class sizes. 2) Better local amenities, including a hospital in the area (dealing with emergencies) etc.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Representor Number	Desired change
1636	I would like to see all plans for future development cancelled. The residential settlement boundary of Rhoose should not be extended. The objection site should remain outside the settlement boundary for Rhoose. The settlement boundary for Rhoose should be as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.
1635	All future plans for development should be cancelled. The residential settlement boundary of Rhoose should not be extended. The objection site should remain outside the settlement boundary for Rhoose. The settlement boundary for Rhoose should be as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.
1637	Cancel all plans for this proposed development. The residential settlement boundary of Rhoose should not be extended. The objection site should remain outside the settlement boundary for Rhoose. The settlement boundary for Rhoose should be as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.
1484	Don't grant permission to build the houses (600!).
237	Given the size of this site, CCW would look to the Council to seek where possible, the retention of hedgerows and other features of landscape or nature conservation importance to be incorporated into the future development of the site particularly in areas of public open space.
1637	I object to these plans as it would create a very busy environment which I would be unable to cope with. The residential settlement boundary of Rhoose should not be extended. The objection site should remain outside the settlement boundary for Rhoose. The settlement boundary for Rhoose should be as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.
521	I request that the phasing of land North of the Railway line be amended as follows: "Therefore no development shall commence until 80% beneficial occupation of the residential units on Rhoose Point site has been achieved."
1636	I would like to see all plans for future development cancelled. The residential settlement boundary of Rhoose should not be extended. The objection site should remain outside the settlement boundary for Rhoose. The settlement boundary for Rhoose should be as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.
1643	Land North of Railway Line, Rhoose. Should this development go ahead, it requires an effective Section 106 agreement to safeguard and manage the rest of the Rhoose Point area under the developer's control.
1551 1555	No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.
990 993 995 1024 1069 1070 1108 1533	No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone. The coastal zone should be protected against all residential developments.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Representor	Number	Desired change
509 540 548 549 577 598 638 1203 1326 1328 1335 1336 1339 1340 1345 1532 1545 1615 1616 395 414 415 416 425 441 442 469 487 520 528 535 572 599 658 674 675 681763 764 766 767 768 986 987 1160 1165 12011204 1205 1213 1219 1248 1272 1310 1316 1327 1543 1546 1604 1614		No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone. The coastal zone should be protected against all residential development.
1218		No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone. The coastal zone should be protected against all residential.
563 1209 1380 1387 1393 1414 1436 1465 1468 1469		No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone. The coastal zone should be protected from all residential developments.
396 397 408 519 602 607 1680 1681		No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone. The coastal zone should be protected against all residential development.
562 991 1005		No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zones. The coastal zone should be protected against all residential developments
248 293 521		None
1635		Object most strongly to any more development. Please cancel. The residential settlement boundary of Rhoose should not be extended. The objection site should remain outside the settlement boundary for Rhoose. The settlement boundary for Rhoose should be as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.
1637		Object strongly please cancel. The residential settlement boundary of Rhoose should not be extended. The objection site should remain outside the settlement boundary for Rhoose. The settlement boundary for Rhoose should be as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.
456		Reject the proposed modification as no residential development should be permitted on land outside the current residential settlement boundaries.
1638		Removal of housing allocation at Rhoose from HOUS 1
1485		Rescind planning approval for 600 houses on a greenfield site in Rhoose.
1001		See questions raised in 5.
453		Sympathetic planning should prevail be restricting houses to the eastern end of Rhoose Point Quarry only. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.
247		The allocation of the 1ha site, land north of the railway line, Rhoose be removed from the Housing allocation.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Representor Number	Desired change
377	The changes I wish to see to your proposal therefore, is to leave the area in question as it is.
1554	The objection site should remain outside the settlement boundary for Rhoose. The settlement boundary for Rhoose should be as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998.
1041 1042 1075	The original Unitary Development Plan indicated that there was a surplus of housing in the Vale. On the basis of need further development is not required (Housing Policy 3 4.1.17) Development was only to take place within identified settlement boundaries. All the development options identified at Rhoose fall outside these boundaries (Housing Policy 3 4.1.5) Residential development was not to be permitted which involved extension of the rural villages of Rhoose and St. Athan. The proposed developments are extensions not infills (Housing Policy 8 Page 72) There are sufficient brownfield sites within the Vale to satisfy any projected need for new housing (Planning Guidance [Wales], Joint Housing Land Availability Study, October 2002) Development of the site would not aid in urban regeneration, even though this is a key step in the "search sequence" as required by Planning Policy Wales 2002. Access to jobs, shops and services from the site will be severely limited except by car. Even after the rail station opens, they not be able to use it to visit the Primary School, Surgeries, Post Office, Library, local shops or nearest supermarkets. Air pollution in Rhoose from car exhausts, aircraft fumes and fallout from the nearby cement and power stations is already unacceptable. Local air pollution will increase with airport expansion and the start of shuttle busses running from the rail station. Destruction of our remaining greenfield sites and the introduction of a substantial number of cars will reduce air quality even further, with inevitable increases in respiratory problems amongst the population. The current transport infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. Due to the space restrictions placed on Rhoose by the airport and the sea, it is unlikely there would be any improvement to the infrastructure of the village to accommodate any further housing developments. The social infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any new development. The site is an important area for bird migration and feeding. It sustains a large migrating and resident bird population including threatened species.
640	The proposed modification should be rejected.
1621 1620	The proposed modification should be rejected. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the current residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.
525 352 1354 1355	The residential settlement boundary of Rhoose should not be extended. The objection site should remain outside the settlement boundary for Rhoose. The settlement boundary for Rhoose should be as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.
1553	The residential settlement boundary of Rhoose should not be extended. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Representor Number Desired change

1136 1137 1095 1096 1097 The residential settlement boundary of Rhoose should not be extended. The objection site
1098 1099 1100 1101 1102 should remain outside the settlement boundary for Rhoose. The settlement boundary for
751 996 998 999 1000 1002 Rhoose should be as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit
1003 1004 1006 1007 1008 Draft 1998. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing
1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.
1014 1015 1016 1017 10181
1019 1020 1031 1033 1034
1035 1036 1037 1038 1039
1040 1043 1021 1022 1023
1025 1026 1027 1028 1029
1030 1044 1045 1046 1047
1048 1049 1050 1051 1052
1053 1054 1055 1056 1057
1058 1059 1060 10611062
1063 1064 1065 1066 1067
1068 1071 1073 1074 1076
1077 1078 1079 1080 1081
1082 1083 1084 1085 1086
1087 1088 1089 1090 1091
1092 1093 1094 1103 1104
1105 1106 1109 1110 1111
1112 1113 1114 1115 1116
1117 1118 1119 1120 1121
1122 1123 1124 1125 1126
1127 1128 1129 1130 1131
1132 1133 1135 1138 1139
1140 1141 1143 1144 1145
1146 1147 1148 1149 1150
1151 1152 1153 1154 1155
1156 1157 1346 1347 1348
1350 1351 1353 1356 1357
1358 1611 1674 1675 1676
1677 1679 1682 1684 2239
1032 1072 1678 1134 1142
424 659 664 683 730 1449
1450 1415 1416 1417 1418
1419 1420 1421 473 474 475
477 478 479 480 481 482 484
485 486 488 489 490 491 492
493 494 495 496 497 498 499
500 501

708 709 476 483 457 460 463 The residential settlement boundary of Rhoose should not be extended. The objection site
should remain outside the settlement boundary for Rhoose. The settlement boundary for
Rhoose should be defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft
1998. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential
settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.

1552 The settlement boundary for Rhoose should be as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary
Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998.

529 The settlement boundary for Rhoose should be as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary
Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998. No residential development should be permitted on land
outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as
coastal zone.

1349 The settlement boundary of Rhoose should not be extended. The objection site should remain
outside the settlement boundary for Rhoose. The settlement boundary for Rhoose should be
as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998. No
residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement
boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.

1635 These plans are unbelievable as existing developments are unfinished and promised facilities
yet to materialise. The residential settlement boundary of Rhoose should not be extended. The
objection site should remain outside the settlement boundary for Rhoose. The settlement
boundary for Rhoose should be as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan
Deposit Draft 1998. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the
existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.

Representor Number	Desired change
411	This Plan should be shelved immediately. All of the villagers feel passionately that we need a rest from modernisation, and that we have enough new residents already to stretch the services available.
1636	Total abandonment of these plans is the only thing I would like done. The residential settlement boundary of Rhoose should not be extended. The objection site should remain outside the settlement boundary for Rhoose. The settlement boundary for Rhoose should be as defined in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998. No residential development should be permitted on land outside the existing residential settlement boundaries or in areas currently designated as coastal zone.
1602	What will happen in the future? Everything is too difficult to understand. Basically, 600 houses is too much for our village. We are in need of a primary school desperately - also a railway - I hope it will become a reality. We people in Rhoose are not - apart from these 2 issues - not interested in other people's "plush" properties. The new people will not be part of our community - they never are - they will just be superior! A golf course is a good thing of course but it will be for the elite again. Housing association property is also welcomed.
232 569 674 997 1612 1668	No desired change stated by the objector.

Issue: Housing allocation Rhoose (Composite Recommendation)

Recommendation

In view of the significant number of representations received in respect of the new housing allocation to the north of the railway line, Rhoose, the Council has prepared a composite response addressing all the various points raised by representors.

Full details of the Council's reasons for accepting Inspector's REC 1.8 in respect of strategic Policy 3 (Housing) are contained on pages 6 to 11 in the Statement of Decisions document (February 2003). However, in this context, it is considered that the allocation of the land to the north of the railway line will assist in satisfying the housing requirements during the Plan period (1996-2011).

In considering the suitability of the objection site for residential development, the Inspector concluded that "the visual effect of any new housing to the west of the road would be insignificant, either on the Coastal Zone or the overall setting of Rhoose." In addition, he noted that "this area enjoys a close physical and visual relationship with the existing built development in Rhoose and that the development of Rhoose Point would further extend this enclosure to the south." He also stated that "development of the area would, as a consequence, further the Council's stated objective for Rhoose Point of integrating the settlement of Rhoose with its coastline."

Furthermore, the Inspector inferred that the line of the new Rhoose Point access road provides a more appropriate, defensible and logical boundary for the residential settlement boundary for Rhoose. The Council concurs with the Inspector's conclusions referred to above and has subsequently allocated the site for housing under Policy HOUS 1 (22) and amended the residential settlement boundary of Rhoose accordingly (REC 4.79 refers).

In terms of the Coastal Zone, the Inspector noted that Policy ENV 5 makes a clear distinction between developed and undeveloped coast and therefore a clear distinction should also be made on the proposals map, ensuring that areas proposed for development are designated as developed coast (REC 3.27 refers). In line with this recommendation, he also suggested that the land to the north of the railway line, should be designated as part of the developed coast, along with other developed areas in Rhoose (REC 4.81 refers). The Council accepts the Inspector's reasoning on this issue and has modified the Plan accordingly.

The Council acknowledges that the development of brownfield sites is preferable over greenfield sites and has adopted a 'search sequence' approach to allocating new land for housing in accordance with national planning guidance contained within Planning Policy Wales (March 2002). Full details of the search sequence undertaken by the Council can be found on pages 6 to 11 in the Statement of Decisions document (February 2003). However, in addition to the use of previously developed land, criteria such as accessibility to public transport, shopping and leisure facilities together with employment opportunities should also be taken into account when assessing housing allocations. In line with the Inspector, the Council considers that the site is well located in terms of the above, particularly given that the Vale of Glamorgan railway line is due to re-open to passengers in 2005.

The Council acknowledges that the eastern part of the site is classified as Grade 2 agricultural land. However, the Inspector has previously considered this issue and concluded that the loss of such land within the area would not be significant. In addition, the Council consulted the former National Assembly for Wales Agricultural department on this issue and received no objection.

As recommended by the Inspector, the development of the site will be guided by a Development Brief, which will be produced in partnership with the Council (REC 4.80 refers). The purpose of the brief will be to ensure a comprehensive approach to the development of the site and to ensure that it makes an effective and positive contribution to the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the local community. In addition, 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 transportation solutions. However, access to the site is clearly achievable from the existing Rhoose Point access road.

The Council notes concerns raised in respect of flora and fauna on the site. The Council has already consulted the Countryside Council for Wales on this matter (who do not object in principle) but and will seek further advice from the Local Authority

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Ecologist to identify any mitigating measures in the development brief. Although small areas of semi-natural habitat have been identified within the boundary of the site, the Council is not aware of any protected species or habitats being present. Moreover, there are several policies within the Plan which seek to protect landscape features, areas of international /national/ local nature conservation importance and protected species (Policies ENV 12, ENV 13, ENV 14 and ENV XXX [protected species] refer). Although these matters were not addressed in the Inspector's Report, they have subsequently been considered in detail by the Council.

A large number of representors were perturbed about the increased pressure that the new housing allocation would place on existing village facilities such as the school and public open space. The Council recognises this issue and will seek through discussions with the site owners / developers to secure affordable housing, Public Open Space, children's play areas, appropriate landscaping and a contribution for educational, recreational, community and public transportation provision as planning gain.

In terms of water supply and sewerage, Dwr Cymru Welsh Water's Capital Investment to enable this site to proceed is considered to be long term. Development of this site in advance of the planned improvements would need to be subject to an appropriate planning agreement, to be agreed prior to the granting of planning permission. The Environment Agency has indicated that the site is located on a major aquifer of high vulnerability. Therefore, no discharge of foul or contaminated run-off must be made to ground. The Agency will therefore need to be consulted prior to any works being undertaken at the site to discuss the necessary measures required to protect the aquifer.

The Council notes the concerns raised such as loss of view, property devaluation, dogfouling and disturbance during construction etc. Although the first three issues are not planning matters that can be dealt with through the UDP process, the fourth issue can be mitigated against as part of the planning application process.

In his report, the Inspector commented that the development of the land to the north of the railway line could not be implemented at the same time as the Rhoose Point if the regeneration objectives of that development are to be given priority in accordance with the overall strategy of the Plan. It is anticipated that the site will yield 400 units during the current Plan period (1996 – 2011) and a further 200 units in the next Plan period (2011 – 2026). The Council is keen to ensure that anticipated development rates at the Rhoose Point site are achieved and that sufficient land at this location is available throughout the Plan period. Accordingly, the Council has decided not to grant planning permission for the development of the land to the north of the railway line until 80% beneficial occupation of the residential units on the Rhoose Point site has been achieved. This phasing approach is in line with national planning guidance set out in Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) and Inspector's REC 4.80.

One representor has advocated that the following three sites would be more suitable for residential development than the land to the north of the railway line:

- Site 1 Land to the west of the Rhoose Point site;
- Site 2 Employment site at Rhoose Point and
- Site 3 Existing school site on Porthkerry Road.

The Council strongly disagrees with this suggestion for the reasons set out below:

Site 1 is located outside the residential settlement boundary for Rhoose, in an area designated in the emerging UDP as both undeveloped coastal zone (Policy ENV 5 refers) and countryside (Policy ENV 1 refers). In addition, the site is allocated for recreational use under Policies REC 5 (iv) and REC 11 (v) of the UDP. The use of this site for residential development would be contrary to Policies ENV 1, HOUS 3, HOUS 2 and HOUS 9 of the emerging UDP. Whilst there would be no objection in principle to a primary school / community use on this site and the provision of open space, employment use would be contrary to Policies ENV 1 and EMP 3 (i) of the emerging UDP. The golf course / club house aspect of the proposal would have to be assessed under Policies REC 8 and REC 9 of the UDP and in light of the existing outline consent at Rhoose Point. Finally, although this site is a former quarry, it must be considered as a greenfield site as the definition in Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) specifically excludes previously developed land subsequently put to an amenity use.

Site 2 is allocated for employment use in the emerging UDP (Policy EMP 1 [12] refers) and was designated to complement the housing and other development at the Rhoose Point site. In addition, Policy EMP 5 seeks to protect existing employment sites and sites identified under Policy EMP 1 from uses not contained within Classes B1, B2 and B8 of the Town and Country Planning Use Classes Order 1987 (as amended). Although the Council acknowledges that there may not have been much employment interest in this site to date, it is likely that this situation will change as the development is nearing completion and when the new train station is implemented. Therefore, it is considered to be premature to allocate this site for residential purposes.

Site 3 is an important, established community facility within Rhoose and the Council would strongly resist the redevelopment of this site for residential purposes, particularly as no alternative suitable site has currently been identified and secured.

Notwithstanding the above comments, the Council believes that if the representor wished these sites to have been considered for housing development, he should have promoted them at Deposit Draft stage in 1998. In addition, objections should have been made to the appropriate employment and recreation allocations at the same time. Given that no objections were received in respect of Policies EMP 1 (12) and REC 11, the representations in so far as they seek housing allocations on these fresh sites do not arise either out of the Council's Proposed Modification or from rejection by the Council of any of the Inspector's recommendations and are not duly made.

Finally, it is considered that the allocation of the land to the north of the railway line for housing has already been thoroughly considered by the Inspector at the UDP Public Local Inquiry in 1999 / 2000 and therefore there is no justification to hold a Modification Inquiry to debate this matter further.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

HOUSING ALLOCATION THE WATERFRONT

Issue: Housing allocation The Waterfront

Organisation Barry Town Council

Contact Mr. Ian Harris

Representor No. 33

Representation No. 15

Accession No. 1751

Modification No. E15

Representation

The proposal for 200+ residential units at South Quay - Barry Waterfront, represents more than double the Inquiry Inspectors recommendation. More attention should be paid towards the economic development of this key area of Barry which will act as a through route from the rest of the Waterfront to Jackson's Bay and other forthcoming tourist attractions such as the steam railway and the maritime links. It is felt that to commit to "at least 200 units" disregards the principle of establishing a development brief for this particular area. Objections are therefore raised on grounds of sustainability, lack of amenities and massing, and the overemphasis of residential development on what is supposedly a mixed use allocation. The current proposal for 200+ residential units is considered to be totally unacceptable. This Council very strongly recommends that the Local Planning Authority should reconsider its thinking for South Quay in deciding upon the number of residential units. The original allocation of 100 units is felt to be far more suitable and the Town Council would be in agreement to not more than this figure. The Council looks forward to seeing a development at South Quay with a strong emphasis on appropriate leisure and retail provision which provides good access to Jackson's Bay.

Desired Change

The residential allocation for South Quay - Barry Waterfront be limited to 100 units.

Recommendation

The Council considers that the proposed allocation for approximately 200 dwellings on the South Quay is more realistic than the figure of 100 dwellings cited by the Inspector, as it is likely that the development will consist of high density development similar in style to those already completed along the Waterfront Development. The Council also considers that the development of approximately 200 dwellings will not compromise the development of the site for mixed use. The focus of the Proposed Development Brief will be for the development of the site for mixed-use development as proposed in the modifications.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation The Waterfront

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 97

Accession No. 2864

Modification No. E15

Representation

Support the inclusion of open space, landscaping and the requirement for Barry Waterfront site to make a positive contribution to the environmental well being of the local community.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Housing allocation The Waterfront

Organisation Plaid Cymru

Contact Janie Jones

Representor No. 270

Representation No. 45

Accession No. 3028

Modification No. E15

Representation

Background: Barry's South Quay has a vital part to play in the economic and environmental regeneration of the town and it is essential to prevent it from being used as a convenient area for absorbing the overspill of demand for housing elsewhere in the Vale. This modified proposal represents more than twice the inspector's recommendation and is also worded in such a fashion ('at least 200 units') that no ceiling is placed on it either. Our Position: In order to better integrate future residential development on the site, this proposal should look holistically at Issue: s involving the ongoing regeneration of Barry and also therefore at accompanying access Issue: s such as: i) the integration of the Island with the Waterfront, High Street and Broad

Street retail areas. ii) other exciting developments for the surrounding area involving tourism, leisure and retail These include access to Jackson's Bay (and on to Clements Colley Walk and Whitmore Bay), plans for the Steam Railway, any associated maritime links and the former Butlin's site. iii) existing aspirations to significantly improve and add to the quality of leisure and retail facilities from Whitmore Bay to the Waterfront. It is the opinion of both the Vale of Glamorgan Plaid Cymru Group and also of the local members on both the Town and Vale councils that the current modified proposals: ii) conflict with the economic and environmental regeneration of the 'South Quay' ii) could have a detrimental effect on pedestrian access to and from Barry Island, further isolating its residents from the mainland. In light of what is considered to be the over-emphasis of residential development on land that has been allocated for mixed-used allocation, we raise objections on the following grounds: i) sustainability ii) lack of amenities iii) massing. Joint representation made by: Local Baruc Ward Councilors Nic Hodges, Howard Provis & Steffan William. The Plaid Cymru - The Party of Wales group on the Vale of Glamorgan Council.

Desired Change

The inspector's original proposal for 100 units is felt to be far more suitable and responsible and both local members and the Plaid Cymru Group would be in agreement to no more than this at present.

Recommendation

The Council considers that the proposed allocation for approximately 200 dwellings on the South Quay is more realistic than the figure of 100 dwellings cited by the Inspector, as it is likely that the development will consist of high density development similar in style to those already completed along the Waterfront Development. The Council also considers that the development of approximately 200 dwellings will not compromise the development of the site for mixed use, as the focus of the Proposed Development Brief will be for the development of the site for mixed used development as proposed in the Modifications.

In view of the above no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation The Waterfront

Organisation

Contact

Barry Joint Initiative

Representor No. 1667

Representation No. 1

Accession No. 2832

Modification No. E15

Representation

The second paragraph of MOD E15, in respect of South Quay, Barry states, " The site is likely to yield approximately 200 dwellings. The Council is keen to ensure that current development rates at the waterfront are maintained and sufficient land at this location is available throughout the Plan period. Detailed planning permission for the residential development element of this mixed use scheme will therefore not be granted until 80% beneficial occupation of the residential units on the original Waterfront regeneration area has been achieved." The allocation of 200 dwellings at South Quay is supported and the representation in this respect is submitted in connection with proposed modification E04. However, an objection is submitted in respect of paragraph 2 of MOD E15 and this is detailed below. National Planning Policy is laid out within Planning Policy Wales (2002). With regard to development it states in paragraph 3.4.1 that, "Evidence that market demand would exhaust total planned provision in the early years of the UDP may also indicate a need for some overall phasing of development, though this generally will be justifiable only in areas which are under severe development pressure. Where phasing is included in a UDP its should normally take the form of a broad indication of the time-scale envisaged for the release of the main areas or identified sites, rather than an arbitrary numerical limit on permissions or a precise order of release of sites in particular." (emphasis added). Paragraph 3.4.2 further states that, "Proposals for phasing should allow for a reasonable degree of choice, and flexibility, for example to secure an efficient and effective housing market." Further guidance on the content of development plans is provided in Unitary Development Plans Wales (2001). Paragraph 3.15 states, "The reasoned justification should only contain an explanation behind the policies and proposals in the plan, it should not contain policies and proposals which will be used in themselves for taking decisions on planning applications." The Proposed Modifications and the accompanying Statement of Decisions document provides no justification for the requirement of 80% of the residential units on the original waterfront area to be beneficially occupied before detailed planning permission on the residential element of the South Quay site will be granted. Similarly, the documents provide no evidence to suggest that the area is subject to severe development pressure to warrant any phasing of development, or how the quoted figure of 80% beneficial occupation would contribute to maintaining building rates and land supply. It is therefore considered that the figure of 80% beneficial occupation is an entirely arbitrary, unsubstantiated and inappropriate inclusion within the text of the reasoned justification for Barry Waterfront. The concept of maintaining development rates on the Waterfront site, by effectively withholding the grant of detailed planning permission for the residential element of the South Quay site until 80% of the residential units on the Waterfront site have been beneficially occupied is fundamentally flawed and would preclude the determination of any planning application on South Quay on its merits. Furthermore, this approach, which effectively seeks to influence demand and supply of land for housing in this location, is contrary to national planing guidance. Paragraph 1.2.3 states, "The planning system should be efficient, effective and simple in operation. It is not the function of the planning system to interfere with or inhibit competition between users of and investors in land or to regulate development for other than land use planning reasons." This restriction would also conflict with the requirement of the Council, as local planning authority, to ensure that sufficient land is genuinely available or will become available to provide a 5-year free supply of land for housing. As stated in Planning Policy Wales, this means that "...sites must be free, or readily freed from planning, physical and ownership constraints, and capable of being developed economically, creating and supporting sustainable communities where people want to live, and that there must be sites suitable for the full range of housing types." It is considered, therefore that the statement in paragraph 2 of MOD E15 that detailed planning permission for the residential development of the mixed use scheme for South Quay will not be granted until 80% beneficial

occupation of the residential units on the original Waterfront regeneration area has been achieved is contrary to national planning guidance on the content of and the phasing of development in unitary development plans. It is further considered that the inclusion of this requirement in the Unitary Development Plan would be inappropriate and unduly restrictive and would conflict with the duty of the Council, as local planning authority, to maintain choice and flexibility in the

Desired Change

Delete the second paragraph of MOD E15. Relocate the first sentence of paragraph 2, "The site is likely to yield approximately 200 dwellings." to be second sentence of paragraph 1, to read as follows: "In addition to the comprehensive Redevelopment Site, an area 5.2 hectares of land at South Quay is allocated for mixed-use development to include residential. The site is likely to yield approximately 200 dwellings.."

Recommendation

In order to continue the current development rates experienced at the Barry Waterfront, the Council is of the opinion that it is justifiable to state that commencement of the redevelopment of the South Quay of Barry Docks not take place until 80% of the residential development of the original Waterfront has been achieved. This is to ensure that the development of the Waterfront is not prejudiced by development elsewhere in the redevelopment area. In relation to Barry Waterfront, this approach accords with Planning Policy Wales (March 2002), which indicates that local authorities can justify the phasing of developments "in areas which are under severe development pressure" (paragraph 3.4). Consequently, the Council considers paragraph 4.4.1 as written are clear and need to ensure that development rates are maintained over the whole plan period.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation The Waterfront

Organisation

Contact Barry Joint Initiative

Representor No. 1667

Representation No. 2

Accession No. 2833

Modification No. E04

Representation

The increased allocation of a further 400 residential units for Barry Waterfront in Table 1, creating a total of 1400 units for the site as referred to in paragraph 4.4.1 is supported. The allocation of 200 residential units in Table 1 at South Quay is supported. Proposed modification MOD E15 on South Quay is the subject of a separate representation and is submitted under separate cover.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Housing allocation The Waterfront

Organisation

Contact Barry Joint Initiative

Representor No. 1667

Representation No. 3

Accession No. 2834

Modification No. E14

Representation

The increased allocation of a further 400 residential units for Barry Waterfront in Table 1, creating a total of 1400 units for the site as referred to in paragraph 4.4.1 is supported. The allocation of 200 residential units in Table 1 at South Quay is supported. Proposed modification MOD E15 on South Quay is the subject of a separate representation and is submitted under separate cover.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Housing allocation The Waterfront

Organisation Contact Barry Joint Initiative

Representor No. 1667 **Representation No.** 4 **Accession No.** 2835 **Modification No.** N002

Representation

Proposed modification MOD N002 indicates that the land at South Quay will be allocated for residential development under HOUS 1(1). The allocation of the land for housing is supported, but for completeness and clarity the Proposals Map should be amended to include the site within the Barry Waterfront mixed use Comprehensive Redevelopment Area.

Desired Change

Amend the Proposals Map to include the land at South Quay within the Barry Waterfront mixed use Comprehensive Redevelopment Area.

Recommendation

Paragraph 4.41 as modified (MOD E15) makes it clear that the land at South Quay is included within the Barry Waterfront housing allocation. The purpose of the map within the proposed modification document is to show the area of land and not the whole of the Waterfront Development, which the South Quay is part of. Consequently, the final proposal map when produce will show all the Waterfront development including the South Quay. Therefore no changes to the plan will be required.

In view of the above, no changes are proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation The Waterfront

Organisation Contact Barry Joint Initiative

Representor No. 1667 **Representation No.** 5 **Accession No.** 2836 **Modification No.** N003

Representation

The inclusion of the land at South Quay within the settlement boundary is supported.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

HOUSING ALLOCATION WHITE FARM

Issue: Housing allocation White Farm

Organisation Barry Town Council

Contact Mr. Ian Harris

Representor No. 33

Representation No. 20

Accession No. 1756

Modification No. E29

Representation

In view of the Certificate of Alternative Appropriate Development which has been granted for part of the land, this Council reluctantly accepts the inevitability of a dual recreation/residential use of the land at White Farm. The Council is however, of the opinion that the residential element which is considered to be too large, should be reduced to an absolute minimum, not only in land area but also in terms of the number of dwelling units which would be built. This would enable as much of the site as possible to be retained and developed as informal public open space and would help to minimise the disruption of the surrounding areas of the town.

Desired Change

The residential allocation for White Farm should be reduced as far as possible 1) in land area 2) in terms of the number of dwellings, which would be permitted.

Recommendation

The Council considers that the 130 dwellings proposed by the inspector for White Farm represents an average density for such housing developments and is also in keeping with the surrounding residential development. Additionally, given that the proposed modification would require a proportion of affordable housing, a reduction in the capacity of the site would also result in the percentage of affordable housing being reduced.

Moreover, the Inspector noted that development of the site as proposed by the developer takes account of the topography of the site, allowing for the setting of the Church of St Dyfan and St Teilo to be preserved and enhanced (paragraph B11.6 of the Inspector's Report). Furthermore, the proposed modification indicates that a Development Brief will be produced in partnership with the developer, which will guide the development of the site. This brief will ensure that the overall design of the site respect its setting and also addresses issues such as recreational provision and nature conservation.

Therefore, the Council considers that your objections relating to the above matters concerning the possible impact that the development will have are satisfactorily addressed within the UDP, and will also be examined as a part of any planning application submitted on the site.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation White Farm

Organisation White Farm Anti-Development Campaign

Contact Mr. & Mrs. Steven & Helen Walker

Representor No. 147

Representation No. 2

Accession No. 1895

Modification No. N005A/5B

Representation

1. need to know how many hectares are there in MOD N005B we are told that there is 12.6 Hectares in MOD N005. The reason being we need to know the land that Mrs. Twigg will give back to the Council that she gained through adverse possession so then we will know whether this land has gone towards recreation as in MOD N005B or towards housing as in MOD N005A as by this map REC 4.29 White Farm does not go along the land swap recommended by the inspector for the UDP i.e. 5.2 Hectares for Housing Purposes 3 hectares for informal space. 2. In the context of the Councils accepting his reasoning. It is considered that the allocation at White Farm will assist in satisfying the housing requirement during the plan period the Council already know and has been told by the Welsh Assembly that even without housing on white farm the housing needs of the Vale of Glamorgan have been satisfied for the next five years and that is without the release, soon to be announced of more land at the Waterfront, plus housing on cemetery approach and the old council nurseries which takes that figure to approx. housing needs of eight years. 3How does the council expect the traffic generated by dwelling of 130 with 300 more vehicles to exit Whitewell Rd and onto the main Colcot Road. The Council's own highway department have already accepted that it would be unacceptable for that many dwellings generating the amount of increased, hence that they recommended only 85 dwellings on this site, with a 30 metre roundabout at the junction of Whitewell Road and the Pastures also another roundabout at the junction already a road hazard which has also claimed lives and numerous other accidents on this road.

Desired Change

The field numbered MOD N005A should be kept free of housing to protect the medieval church and its identity. Also protect the flora and the wildlife in their natural habitat.

Recommendation

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

The proposed modification indicates that the Council will seek to negotiate 7.4 acres of the site for recreational space, with the remaining 12.8 acres being developed for housing. Therefore securing recreational space for the area. The Inspector considered the development of housing at White Farm appropriate as it was judged that the site would be developed within the period covered by the Plan. Consequently, the allocation of 130 dwellings has been included within the overall housing land supply necessary to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. This proposed modification is in line with both the Inspectors recommendation and Planning Policy Wales (2002) which states that:

"Local planning authorities should ensure that sufficient land is genuinely available or will become available to provide a 5-year supply of land for housing judged against the general objectives and the scale and location of development provided for in the UDP. This means that sites must be free, or readily freed, from planning, physical and ownership constraints, and capable of being developed (paragraph 9.2.5)"

Additionally, the Joint Housing Land Availability Study (2001) indicated that of the total land readily available during the next 5 years 41% is on brownfield sites. These sites are located at Penarth Haven, Barry Waterfront, Barry Island and Blue Circle land at Rhoose. Therefore, while it is desirable to allocate all new housing on brownfield sites, there is an insufficient supply to accommodate all the housing needs of the Vale over the plan period.

With regard to your objection to the proposed modification on the basis that the development would increase traffic flows, leading to more congestion and road accidents, such Issue: s would be addressed at the planning application stage and if deemed necessary the developer would be required to include measures to alleviate such problems.

In relation to your objection regarding the impact that the development would have on the historical setting of the Church. The Inspector concluded that the development of the site and the proportion of land set aside for recreational land would allow for the setting of the Church of St Dyfan and St Teilo to be preserved and enhanced. Additionally, conservation and design policies found elsewhere within the plan ensure that development proposal respect the setting of listed buildings.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation White Farm

Organisation

Contact Mrs. M.E. Twigg

Representor No. 202

Representation No. 3

Accession No. 2825

Modification No. E29

Representation

The final paragraph of the proposed replacement text is inaccurate insofar as the Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust no longer require an archaeological field evaluation prior to the grant of planning permission. The field evaluation was carried out in 2002 and the resulting report submitted to both GGAT and the local planning authority in November 2002. The report concluded that despite extensive investigations "no archaeological features or deposits were observed during the course of the evaluation." As a result of the Inspector's recommendation on this site, and of proposed MOD N005B, the final sentence of paragraph 8.4.37 (page 134) of the deposit draft Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan should be deleted.

Desired Change

Amend the second sentence of the final paragraph to read as follows: " by the developer. As required by the Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust, a detailed archaeological field evaluation has been carried out at the site, as a result of which no archaeological features or deposits were found. In addition..." Delete the final sentence of paragraph 8.4.37.

Recommendation

The representation raised concerns the inaccurate statement requiring that an Archaeological Investigation be carried out prior to the granting of planning permission at White Farm. Your objection to this is that such an investigation is no longer required due to field investigation by Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust in 2002 concluded, "no archaeological features or deposits were observed during the course of the evaluation".

However, as part of the consultation undertaken on a planning application submitted on the site in February 2003, Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust stated:

"The evaluation work located no archaeological features in the application area though it is in close proximity to the know medieval village of Merthyr Dyfan. Most surprising was the failure to locate the buildings clearly depicted on the 19th century maps, which probably indicate inaccuracies in these plans rather than the failure of the archaeological investigations."

Therefore, the Council considers that your objections relating to the above matters concerning the possible. The result of the archaeological investigations is such that the Council has no objection to the positive impact that the development will have are satisfactorily addressed within the UDP, and will also will be examined determination of the current application. However, given that there is a possibility that the buildings depicted on as a part of any planning application submitted on the site the 19th century maps could be located during the development it is our opinion as the archaeological advisers to your Members that a condition requiring the applicant to submit a detailed programme of archaeological investigation prior to commencement of the development should be attached to any consent granted by your Members.

Therefore on the basis of the above, the Council maintains the requirement for a archaeological investigation to be undertaken

prior to the granting of planning permission at White Farm.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation White Farm

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 82

Accession No. 2849

Modification No. E28

Representation

CCW object to the wording of the modification

Desired Change

Given the size of the site CCW would look to the Council to seek where possible the retention of hedgerows, trees, linear features and other features of landscape or nature conservation importance to be incorporated into the future development of the site, particularly in areas of public open space.

Recommendation

It is the opinion of the Council that Issue: s regarding the retention of hedgerows, trees, linear features and other features of landscape associated specifically with the development of White Farm, including the areas of public open space are matters that would be better addressed within a Development Brief. The proposed modification states that:

"The Development of this site will be guided by a Development Brief, which will be produced in partnership with the Council"

Consequently on this basis, the Council considers it unnecessary to include references to the retention of hedgerows, trees, linear features and other features of landscape as it is satisfied that such aspects will be addressed within the Development Brief for White Farm.

In addition, Policy ENV10 of the plan ensures the protection of landscape features such as hedgerows, trees etc.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

Issue: Housing allocation White Farm

Organisation Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru

Contact Ryan Bowen

Representor No. 293

Representation No. 20

Accession No. 2776

Modification No. E29

Representation

In order to service this proposed development site, extensive off-site water mains are required to ensure provision of adequate infrastructure to this site without detriment to other customers.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Housing allocation White Farm

Organisation

Contact Mr. Keith Lewis

Representor No. 297

Representation No. 3

Accession No. 3073

Modification No. NOO5A/B

Representation

We need to know how many hectares are there in MOD N005B. We are told that there is ? Hectare in MOD N005A. Reason:- We need to know the land that Mrs. T will give back to this Council that she has gained through adverse possession so then we will know whether this land has gone towards recreation as in MOD NOO5B of towards housing as in MOD N005A as by this map Rec. 4.29 White Farm does not go along the land swap recommend by Inspector for the UDP i.e. 5.2 hectares for housing

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

purposes? Hectares as an informal open space. In the context of this Council's acceptance of the inspectors report REC 1.8, and this Council accepting his reasoning. It is considered that the allocation of land at White Farm will assist in satisfying the housing requirement during the plan period. This Council already know and has been told by the National Assembly that even without housing on White Farm the housing needs of the Vale of Glamorgan have been satisfied for the next five years and that is without the release soon to be announced of more land on the Waterfront plus housing on Cemetery Approach and the old Council nurseries which takes that figure to approx. meeting housing need for the next eight years. How does this Council expect the traffic generated by 130 dwellings possible 300 vehicles to exit Whitewell Road Barry onto Colcot Road Barry. This Councils own Highways Dept have already accepted that it would be unacceptable for that. many dwellings generating the same amount of increased traffic, hence that they recommend 85 dwelling only on this site would be a more realistic figure to exit this site, with a 30 metre roundabout at the junction with the Pastures. Also another roundabout on Colcot Road with Whitewell road which is already a road traffic hazard which has already claimed lives and numerous other road traffic accidents.

Desired Change

The field numbered with MOD N005A should be kept free of housing to protect the church and to keep the identity of White Farm and the church but also to protect the wildlife that is living in that area and the natural valley below with its medieval mill and also the history that goes with the field and its steep fall to the valley. Having walked to the proposed land i.e. MOD N005B and MOD N005A. On MOD 005A the boundary line that crosses the medieval footpath at the gate near to the pastures and then across what is called the Hilly Field G.C. the actual field with MOD N005A printed on it when we discussed this with the Inspector for the UDP He actually suggested that this field could remain free of housing. Councillor R. Curtis witnessed this as to protect the church and the natural valley which support tremendous wildlife so that need to be readdress.

Recommendation

The proposed modification indicates that the Council will seek to negotiate 7.4 acres of the site for recreational space, with the remaining 12.8 acres being developed for housing. Therefore securing recreational space for the area.

The Inspector considered the development of housing at White Farm appropriate as it was judged that the site would be developed within the period covered by the Plan. Consequently, the allocation of 130 dwellings has been included within the overall housing land supply necessary to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. This proposed modification is in line with both the Inspectors recommendation and Planning Policy Wales (2002) which states that:

"Local planning authorities should ensure that sufficient land is genuinely available or will become available to provide a 5-year supply of land for housing judged against the general objectives and the scale and location of development provided for in the UDP. This means that sites must be free, or readily freed, from planning, physical and ownership constraints, and capable of being developed (paragraph 9.2.5)"

With regard to your objection to the proposed modification on the basis that the development would increase traffic flows, leading to more congestion and road accidents, such Issue: s would be addressed at the planning application stage and if deemed necessary the developer would be required to include measures to elevate such problems.

In relation to your objection regarding the impact that the development would have on the historical setting of the Church. The Inspector concluded that the development of the site and the proportion of land set aside for recreational land would allow for the setting of the Church of St Dyfan and St Teilo to be preserved and enhanced. Additionally, conservation and design policies found elsewhere within the plan ensure that development proposal respect the setting of listed buildings.

Therefore, the Council considers that your objections relating to the above matters concerning the possible impact that the development will have are satisfactorily addressed within the UDP, and will also will be examined as a part of any planning application submitted on the site.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation White Farm

Organisation White Farm Anti Development

Contact Mrs. Wendy Jones

Representor No. 298

Representation No. 3

Accession No. 3072

Modification No. N005A/B

Representation

1. There is ample brown sites in Barry to build on without having to disrupt any green sights. 2. The Highways Dept have already stated that there is inadequate road space for further housing. 3. There should be no building in field marked MOD 005A, doing so would lose Whitefarms identity and swamp the church. 4. As the Council has spent a lot of money setting up a biodiversity dept. and advertising they're work in the Vale, it seems ironic that they are so eager to kill so much natural wildlife.

Desired Change

No permission should be granted to the field marked MOD N005A.

Recommendation

The Inspector considered the development of housing at White Farm appropriate as it was judged that the site would be developed within the period covered by the Plan. Consequently, the allocation of 130 dwellings has been included within the overall housing land supply necessary to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. This proposed modification is in line with both the Inspectors recommendation and Planning Policy Wales (2002) which states that:

"Local planning authorities should ensure that sufficient land is genuinely available or will become available to provide a 5-year supply of land for housing judged against the general objectives and the scale and location of development provided for in the UDP. This means that sites must be free, or readily freed, from planning, physical and ownership constraints, and capable of being developed (paragraph 9.2.5)"

Additionally, the Joint Housing Land Availability Study (2001) indicated that of the total land readily available during the next 5 years 41% is on brownfield sites. These sites are located at Penarth Haven, Barry Waterfront, Barry Island and Blue Circle land at Rhoose. Therefore, while it is desirable to allocate all new housing on brownfield sites, there is an insufficient supply to accommodate all the housing needs of the Vale over the plan period.

With regard to your objection to the proposed modification on the basis that the development would increase traffic flows, leading to more congestion and road accidents, such Issue: s would be addressed at the planning application stage and if deemed necessary the developer would be required to include measures to elevate such problems.

In relation to your objection regarding the impact that the development would have on the historical setting of the Church. The Inspector concluded that the development of the site and the proportion of land set aside for recreational land would allow for the setting of the Church of St Dyfan and St Teilo to be preserved and enhanced. Additionally, conservation and design policies found elsewhere within the plan ensure that development proposal respect the setting of listed buildings.

Therefore, the Council considers that your objections relating to the above matters concerning the possible impact that the development will have are satisfactorily addressed within the UDP, and will also will be examined as a part of any planning application submitted on the site.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation White Farm

Organisation

Contact Mrs. M O'Grady

Representor No. 306

Representation No. 3

Accession No. 2802

Modification No. N005B

Representation

1. We need to know how many hectares are there in MOD N005B. We are told that there is 12.6 Hectares in MOD N005A. Reason - we need to know the land that Mrs. Twigg will give back to this council that she has gained through adverse possession so then we will know whether the land has gone towards recreation as in MOD N005B or towards housing as in MOD N005A, as by this map REC 4.29 White Farm does go along the land swap recommended by the Inspection for the UDP i.e. 5.2 hectares for housing purpose 3 hectares as informal open space. 2. How does this council expect the traffic generated by 130 dwellings possible 300 vehicles to exit Whitewell Road onto Colcot Road this unacceptable.

Desired Change

The field number with MOD N005A should be kept free of housing to protect the church and to keep the identity of White Farm and the church but also to protect the wildlife that is living in that area and the natural valley below with medieval mill and also the history that goes with the field and its steep fall to the valley.

Recommendation

The proposed modification indicates that the Council will seek to negotiate 7.4 acres of the site for recreational space, with the remaining 12.8 acres being developed for housing. Therefore securing recreational space for the area.

With regard to your objection to the proposed modification on the basis that the development would increase traffic flows, leading to more congestion and road accidents, such Issue: s would be addressed at the planning application stage and if deemed necessary the developer would be required to include measures to elevate such problems.

In relation to your objection regarding the impact that the development would have on the historical setting of the Church. The Inspector concluded that the development of the site and the proportion of land set aside for recreational land would allow for the setting of the Church of St Dyfan and St Teilo to be preserved and enhanced. Additionally, conservation and design policies found elsewhere within the plan ensure that development proposal respect the setting of listed buildings.

Therefore, the Council considers that your objections relating to the above matters concerning the possible impact that the development will have are satisfactorily addressed within the UDP, and will also be examined as a part of any planning application submitted on the site.

In view of the above, no changes are proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation White Farm

Organisation Pastures Residents Association **Contact** Mr. & Mrs. Ceri & Angela Price
Representor No. 330 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 2805 **Modification No.** NO05A/NO05B

Representation

1. We wish to know how many Hectares are there in MOD N005B. We have been told that there is 12.6 Hectares in Mod N005A. Reason, we need to know the land that Mrs. Twigg will give back to this Council that we believe she has gained through adverse possession so then we will know whether this land has gone towards recreation as in MOD N005B of map. White Farm does not go along the land swap recommended by the Inspector for UDP i.e. 5.2 hectares for housing purposes 3. Hectares as Informal Open Space. 2. This Council already know and has been told by the National Assembly that even without housing on White Farm. The housing needs of the Vale of Glam have been satisfied for the next five years, and that is without the release, soon to be announced of more land on the Waterfront . Plus housing on Cemetery Approach and the Old Council Nurseries which takes that figure to approx. meeting housing needs for the next eight years. 3. How does this council expect the traffic generated by 130 dwellings - possibly 300 vehicles - to exit White Well Road, onto Colcot Road. The Councils own Highways dept have already accepted that it would be unacceptable for that many dwelling. There is no way you can support the infrastructure i.e. Education, Health, Police, Fire (especially Emergency) Hospital, nearest Full Time A & E to far.

Desired Change

The field numbered MOD N005A should be kept free of housing to protect the church and the identity of White Farm and Church Land. Also to protect the wildlife that is living in that area, and the natural valley below with its medieval mill and all the history that goes with the field and its steep fall to the valley. 1. Policy HOUS 9 - states within the residential settlement boundaries as defined in Policy HOUS 8, Proposals for new housing will be permitted if ALL of the criteria are met. They have not All been met. Regarding A. Traffic Congestion B. Exacerbation of Parking C. Historical, Archaeological or Ecological Importance. ". Adequate community and utility services exist, are reasonably accessible or can be readily and economically provided. Most of the above have not been met as recommended in Policy HOUS 9. Until all the criteria are met housing on field numbered MOD N005A.

Recommendation

The proposed modification indicates that the Council will seek to negotiate 7.4 acres of the site for recreational space, with the remaining 12.8 acres being developed for housing. Therefore securing recreational space for the area.

The Inspector considered the development of housing at White Farm appropriate as it was judged that the site would be developed within the period covered by the Plan. Consequently, the allocation of 130 dwellings has been included within the overall housing land supply necessary to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. This proposed modification is in line with both the Inspectors recommendation and Planning Policy Wales (2002) which states that:

"Local planning authorities should ensure that sufficient land is genuinely available or will become available to provide a 5-year supply of land for housing judged against the general objectives and the scale and location of development provided for in the UDP. This means that sites must be free, or readily freed, from planning, physical and ownership constraints, and capable of being developed (paragraph 9.2.5)"

Additionally, the Joint Housing Land Availability Study (2001) indicated that of the total land readily available during the next 5 years 41% is on brownfield sites. These sites are located at Penarth Haven, Barry Waterfront, Barry Island and Blue Circle land at Rhoose. Therefore, while it is desirable to allocate all new housing on brownfield sites, there is an insufficient supply to accommodate all the housing needs of the Vale over the plan period.

With regard to your objection to the proposed modification on the basis that the development would increase traffic flows, leading to more congestion and road accidents, such Issue: s would be addressed at the planning application stage and if deemed necessary the developer would be required to include measures to elevate such problems.

In relation to your objection regarding the impact that the development would have on the historical setting of the Church. The Inspector concluded that the development of the site and the proportion of land set aside for recreational land would allow for the setting of the Church of St Dyfan and St Teilo to be preserved and enhanced. Additionally, conservation and design policies found elsewhere within the plan ensure that development proposal respect the setting of listed buildings.

Therefore, the Council considers that your objections relating to the above matters concerning the possible impact that the development will have are satisfactorily addressed within the UDP, and will also will be examined as a part of any planning application submitted on the site.

In view of the above, no changes are proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation White Farm

Organisation

Contact Mrs. Bramble Coppins

Representor No. 561

Representation No. 1

Accession No. 1812 **Modification No.** N005 A/N005 B

Representation

Objection 1) The proposed housing on White Farm is considered necessary to satisfy housing requirements during the plan period, although these requirements are already sufficient for the next five years. Even without more development on the Waterfront, Cemetery Approach and the Old Council Nurseries, which will bring housing requirements up to sufficient for the next 8 years. Objection 2) The volume of traffic produced by the proposed developments will swamp road access/egress from Whitewell Road to Colcot Road, create more congestion and increase road accidents at what is already a dangerous junction. Objection 3) Proposed development will destroy the habitat of flora and fauna in the valley, causing irrevocable ecological damage. Objection 4) The church and ancient White Farm itself will lose their environment and historic setting. Objection 5) It is unclear what is the proportion of housing : recreation is a is land gained by Mrs. Twigg through adverse possession but appears unfavourable to recreational space. Objection 6) There are no doctors surgeries in this part of Barry and surgeries in town are already over loaded, as are local schools. There are no emergency facilities closer than Bridgend Hospital. The area of proposed development provides play space for children, which would be destroyed.

Desired Change

N005A should not go ahead. The proposed development is unnecessary, impractical and ecologically and socially destructive. I do not believe any residential development should be permitted on this site.

Recommendation

The Inspector considered the development of housing at White Farm appropriate as it was judged that the site would be developed within the period covered by the Plan. Consequently, the allocation of 130 dwellings has been included within the overall housing land supply necessary to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. This proposed modification is in line with both the Inspectors recommendation and Planning Policy Wales (2002) which states that:

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification. "Local planning authorities should ensure that sufficient land is genuinely available or will become available to provide a 5-year supply of land for housing judged against the general objectives and the scale and location of development provided for in the UDP. This means that sites must be free, or readily freed, from planning, physical and ownership constraints, and capable of being developed (paragraph 9.2.5)"

With regard to your objection to the proposed modification on the basis that the development would increase traffic flows, leading to more congestion and road accidents, such Issue: s would be addressed at the planning application stage and if deemed necessary the developer would be required to include measures to elevate such problems.

In relation to your objection regarding the impact that the development would have on the historical setting of the Church. The Inspector concluded that the development of the site and the proportion of land set aside for recreational land would allow for the setting of the Church of St Dyfan and St Teilo to be preserved and enhanced. Additionally, conservation and design policies found elsewhere within the plan ensure that development proposal respect the setting of listed buildings.

Similarly, the proposed modification indicates that the Council will seek to negotiate 7.4 acres of the site for recreational space, with the remaining 12.8 acres being developed for housing. Therefore securing recreational space for the area.

Finally, HOUS9 of the proposed modifications provides criteria by which housing developments are required to satisfy prior to the granting of planning permission, with criteria 6 stating that:

"ADEQUATE COMMUNITY AND UTILITY SERVICES EXIST, ARE REASONABLY ACCESSIBLE OR CAN BE READILY AND ECONOMICALLY PROVIDED"

Therefore, the Council considers that your objections relating to this and the above matters concerning the possible impact that the development will have on existing services are satisfactorily addressed within the UDP, and will also will be examined as a part of any planning application submitted on the site.

In view of the above, no changes are proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Housing allocation White Farm

Organisation

Contact Mr. and Mrs. E.W Frost

Representor No. 657

Representation No. 1

Accession No. 1938 **Modification No.** N005A and B

Representation

How many hectares in Mod N005B? We should be told how much land Mrs. Twigg is giving back to the Council land which was

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

gained through adverse possession! Which land for recreational purposes. The National Assembly stated that without the land at White Farm, housing needs in the Vale are met for the next five years, and with the proposed release of more land at the Waterfront, this takes it to approx. eight years. We feel that the increased traffic this scheme would generate, has not been fully considered. To conceive of this number of cars trying to exit onto an already congested Colcot Rd, which caters for a college, two schools and a hospital, as well as being a primary route for emergency vehicles, also for traffic to local beaches, is idiotic to say the least. Under Policy HOUS 9 of V.O.G U.D.P Deposit Draft it states all following criteria to be met: (i) The scale and form of the proposed development is in keeping with surrounding uses (ii) Traffic congestion exacerbation of parking problems or visual intrusion (iii) Historical, archaeological or ecological importance (vi) Community and utility services exist are reasonably accessible. Excerpts of particular importance we feel given that nearest A and E hospitals are Bridgend or the far side of Cardiff, local schools are full as are doctors' surgeries. The vast majority of which need to be accessed by Colcot Rd!

Desired Change

Having not been fully informed as to the proposed changes i.e. housing density accessible open space cannot comment at present.

Recommendation

The proposed modification indicates that the Council will seek to negotiate 7.4 acres of the site for recreational space, with the remaining 12.8 acres being developed for housing. Therefore securing recreational space for the area.

The Inspector considered the development of housing at White Farm appropriate as it was judged that the site would be developed within the period covered by the Plan. Consequently, the allocation of 130 dwellings has been included within the overall housing land supply necessary to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period. This proposed modification is in line with both the Inspectors recommendation and Planning Policy Wales (2002) which states that:

"Local planning authorities should ensure that sufficient land is genuinely available or will become available to provide a 5-year supply of land for housing judged against the general objectives and the scale and location of development provided for in the UDP. This means that sites must be free, or readily freed, from planning, physical and ownership constraints, and capable of being developed (paragraph 9.2.5)"

With regard to your objection to the proposed modification on the basis that the development would increase traffic flows, leading to more congestion and road accidents, such issues would be addressed at the planning application stage and if deemed necessary the developer would be required to include measures to alleviate such problems.

In relation to your objection regarding the impact that the development would have on the historical setting of the Church. The Inspector concluded that the development of the site and the proportion of land set aside for recreational land would allow for the setting of the Church of St Dyfan and St Teilo to be preserved and enhanced. Additionally, conservation and design policies found elsewhere within the plan ensure that development proposals respect the setting of listed buildings.

Therefore, the Council considers that your objections relating to the above matters concerning the possible impact that the development will have are satisfactorily addressed within the UDP, and will also be examined as a part of any planning application submitted on the site.

In view of the above, no changes are proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

INTRODUCTION

Issue: Introduction

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 19 **Accession No.** 2942 **Modification No.** A007

Representation

The Town Council supports this modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Introduction

Organisation **Contact** Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 3080 **Modification No.** A008

Representation

1) Cofton Limited broadly supports the additional text setting out the Sub-Regional Planning Context for the Vale of Glamorgan. In particular, the reference to Planning Guidance (Wales) and the introduction of major growth areas in Wales gives clarity to the wider strategy. 2) As noted in the text, the Vale is inextricably linked to development pressures due its proximity to the major centres of Cardiff and Bridgend. As part of the sustainable approach, it is essential that housing and employment related development is focused within and around existing settlements that are capable of supporting sustainable modes of transport and growth. In particular, the reopening of the Vale of Glamorgan railway line and station thereon will greatly assist the sustainable principles proposed in the Modifications. Cofton Limited welcome the approach adopted by the Council in focusing the majority of additional development in those towns along the new railway line route. 3) additionally, within those towns development should be focussed in the areas that enable walk to work opportunities and easy access to the new station interchanges. In order for development to be truly sustainable, any development on any significant scale must ensure that it provides for the community infrastructure needs of the new and existing population.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

MINERALS

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 47 **Accession No.** 2970 **Modification No.** J010

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modifications.

Desired Change
None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 48 **Accession No.** 2971 **Modification No.** J013

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change
None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 83 **Accession No.** 2850 **Modification No.** J012

Representation

CCW object to the current wording

Desired Change

CCW recommends the addition of & recognition of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)

Recommendation

The paragraph as worded allows for further statutory designations which may arise during the plan period and the paragraph is not designed to be exhaustive. Also no alteration is proposed to this paragraph so the objection is not duly made.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 106 **Accession No.** 2873 **Modification No.** J021

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 107

Accession No. 2874

Modification No. J015

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 108

Accession No. 2875

Modification No. J014

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 126

Accession No. 2893

Modification No. J013

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 127

Accession No. 2894

Modification No. J011

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 128

Accession No. 2895

Modification No. J007

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Welsh Assembly Government

Contact Mrs. Elaine Ancrum

Representor No. 244

Representation No. 41

Accession No. 2839

Modification No.

Representation

The Plan needs to be modified to indicate on the Proposals Map the location of the resources in the Vale of Glamorgan and a new policy included as follows: "SAFEGUARDING AREAS ARE IDENTIFIED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP AS POTENTIAL RESOURCES OF SAND AND GRAVEL. PROPOSALS FOR PERMANENT DEVELOPMENT WITHIN ANY PART OF THESE AREAS WILL BE STRONGLY RESISTED." Furthermore, the reasoned justification should indicate that the purpose of the policy is to protect the areas from permanent development that would sterilise or hinder the extraction of the potential mineral resources if the need for the resources should be proven. It does not indicate an acceptance of the working of any of the sites identified.

Desired Change

Amend accordingly.

Recommendation

AGREED. Amend Policy MIN 3 to read:

POLICY MIN 3 - PROTECTION OF FURTHER LIMESTONE RESOURCES AND POTENTIAL RESOURCES OF SAND AND GRAVEL

THE FOLLOWING AREAS, AS IDENTIFIED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP SHALL BE PROTECTED FROM ALL FORMS OF PERMANENT BUILDING DEVELOPMENT IN ORDER THAT THE WORKABLE RESOURCES OF LIMESTONE OR SAND AND GRAVEL WITHIN THOSE AREAS MAY BE PRESERVED FOR THE FUTURE SHOULD A DEMONSTRABLE NEED FOR THOSE RESOURCES ARISE:

- (i) LAND TO THE SOUTH-WEST OF FOREST WOOD QUARRY (LIMESTONE);
- (ii) LAND TO THE SOUTH OF RUTHIN QUARRY (LIMESTONE);
- (iii) LAND TO THE SOUTH OF PANTYFFYNNON QUARRY (LIMESTONE);
- (iv) LAND TO THE NORTH WEST OF PANT QUARRY (LIMESTONE);
- (v) LAND TO THE NORTH OF CITY (SG1 - SG2);
- (vi) LAND WITHIN THE UPPER THAW VALLEY (SG3 - SG6); AND
- (vii) LAND WITHIN THE ELY VALLEY (SG7 - SG12).

Insert new paragraph after paragraph 9.4.10 to read as follows and re-number all subsequent paragraph numbers.

9.4.11 South Wales has a unique dependency on marine dredged aggregates to provide sand and gravel. However, following research carried out by the Symonds Group, on behalf of the Welsh Assembly Government, there is uncertainty about future aggregates dredging continuing to supply the South Wales market. The recently granted licence for dredging at Nash Bank requires activities to cease by 2010, and there are currently no adequate replacement resources. Whilst recognising that land based extraction is not appropriate at present, the Minerals TAN maintains the requirement first expressed in the consultation draft for Mineral Planning Authorities to identify and safeguard land based sand and gravel resources in their development plans now for potential use by future generations. Accordingly, the Council has amended Policy MIN 3 to include sand and

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

gravel resources and indicated the location of these on the proposals map. The purpose of this policy is therefore to protect the identified areas from permanent development that would sterilise or hinder the extraction of the potential mineral resources if the need for the resources should be proven. It does not indicate an acceptance of the working of any of the sites identified, particularly as many of them lie within sensitive rural locations.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Welsh Assembly Government

Contact Mrs. Elaine Ancrum

Representor No. 244

Representation No. 42

Accession No. 2840

Modification No. J010

Representation

Proposed modification J010 proposes amending policy MIN 4 relating to new or extended mineral workings. It is noted that there was debate in the Inquiry about the use of "rigorous examination". The Inspector considered that this was only appropriate to designations of national importance not the Heritage Coast or coastal zones. It appears that the Council have not accepted this and argued strongly to retain this text. The proposed wording in the modification is clearly not in accord with the policy in MPPW.

Desired Change

Either amend policy in accordance with Inspector's recommendation or provide adequate justification for divergence from national mineral planning policy.

Recommendation

The phrase "rigorous examination" has not been given any particular legal definition, which would restrict its use only to use in connection with Minerals Policy. For example, paragraph 21 of MPPW lists the matters that consideration of such minerals applications must include, but the list is not exclusive and cannot be said to be a legal definition of what would constitute "rigorous examination".

Therefore the inclusion of the term "rigorous examination" is considered appropriate on the grounds that it is relevant to the consideration of proposals affecting the highest category of protected land in the Vale. The Inspector supported the use of "rigorous examination" provided it was consistent with the status of the special protection area designation. As a consequence the Council has amended MIN4 to reflect this position which states that: "will be subject to rigorous examination consistent with the status of their designation".

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Environment Agency

Contact Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247

Representation No. 107

Accession No. 3136

Modification No. J015

Representation

The Agency objects to the modifications proposed to Criterion viii, as it does not protect surface water resources. The criterion should be expanded to ensure that the quality and/or quantity of surface water and ground water resources are fully protected from potential adverse impacts from existing and proposed mineral working sites.

Desired Change

Criterion viii should read:

"Measure to protect groundwater and surface water resources.

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru

Contact Ryan Bowen

Representor No. 293

Representation No. 29

Accession No. 2785

Modification No. J013

Representation

River abstraction and groundwater springs are a vital source, after treatment, of potable water supplies to our domestic and industrial customers. Responsibility for the protection of groundwater catchments fall with the Environment Agency, under the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Groundwater protection Policy. Any potential for the possible derogation of water resources is not something to be taken lightly, as it is almost unthinkable in terms of cost, inconvenience and operational problems if such sources are polluted, contaminated or lost.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru

Contact Ryan Bowen

Representor No. 293

Representation No. 30

Accession No. 2786

Modification No. J014

Representation

River abstraction and groundwater springs are a vital source, after treatment, of potable water supplies to our domestic and industrial customers. Responsibility for the protection of groundwater catchments fall with the Environment Agency, under the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Groundwater Protection Policy. Any potential for the possible derogation of water resources is not something to be taken lightly, as it is almost unthinkable in terms of costs, inconvenience and operational problems if such sources are polluted, contaminated or lost.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru

Contact Ryan Bowen

Representor No. 293

Representation No. 31

Accession No. 2787

Modification No. J015

Representation

DCWW welcome the inclusion of a new Policy for Environmental Impact in particular point (viii) for measures to protect groundwater sources.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376 **Representation No.** 28 **Accession No.** 3042 **Modification No.** J020

Representation

Object to MOD J020, p179 MIN 7 on after use of sites - Instead of APPROPRIATE we propose ACCEPTABLE.

Desired Change

Object to MOD J020, p179 MIN 7 on after use of sites - Instead of APPROPRIATE we propose ACCEPTABLE.

Recommendation

The Council has amend Policy MIN7 in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation 9.19 which stated "by the deletion of 'firm' and the insertion of 'appropriate' in Policy MIN7." The Council concurs with the Inspector's reasoning. The insert of 'appropriate' allows for agreement of the broad principles of restoration and aftercare. The use of the word 'acceptable' does not mean that the proposal would be appropriate to the development.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376 **Representation No.** 29 **Accession No.** 3043 **Modification No.** J017

Representation

We object to MOD J017, p178 on Planning Obligations, because it repeats a 1997 Welsh Office circular that is less positive than Planning Policy Wales.

Desired Change

We object to MOD J017, p178 on Planning Obligations, because it repeats a 1997 Welsh Office circular that is less positive than Planning Policy Wales.

Recommendation

It is considered that para. 4.7.2 of Planning Policy Wales is as contained in para. 9.4.13 of the UDP which refers to Welsh Office Circular 13/97 on planning obligations. In any case when a mineral planning authority is considering whether to enter in to a planning obligation it will consider all relevant guidance, circulars and the adopted Development Plan.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376 **Representation No.** 30 **Accession No.** 3044 **Modification No.** J015

Representation

While supporting the new policy MOD J015, p.177, we object to the wording e.g.. IMPROVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT, and consider that openness and public consultation need to be included in view of the Council's poor past record on controlling limestone quarrying.

Desired Change

While supporting the new policy MOD J015, p.177, we object to the wording e.g.. IMPROVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT, and consider that openness and public consultation need to be included in view of the Council's poor past record on controlling limestone quarrying.

Recommendation

MOD J015 is made as a result of Inspector's recommendation 9.14. The proposed modification provides operators/developers with a detailed list of information that will be required by the Council prior to its consideration of planning applications in respect

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

of existing and proposed mineral working sites. Obviously on receipt of an application the normal consultation and public notification procedures will be followed.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 31

Accession No. 3045

Modification No. J012

Representation

We object to the deletion of the entire concept of buffer zones from 9.4.6. While the figure of 300m may not be sustainable, we want another figure and/or criteria as are maintained by other local mineral planning authorities. We object to the last sentence of 5.4.10, noting that mineral permissions can now be reviewed to stop the working of sensitive areas without any buying off, as is proposed.

Desired Change

We object to the deletion of the entire concept of buffer zones from 9.4.6. While the figure of 300m may not be sustainable, we want another figure and/or criteria as are maintained by other local mineral planning authorities. We object to the last sentence of 5.4.10, noting that mineral permissions can now be reviewed to stop the working of sensitive areas without any buying off, as is proposed

Recommendation

Buffer Zones are covered by Policy MIN6. Policy MIN4 covers new or extended universal sites for all minerals. This policy has been supported by the Inspector (REC 9.9 + 9.10 refer).

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 32

Accession No. 3046

Modification No. J010

Representation

Object to MOD J010 p.173 while supporting the addition of the East Vale Coastal zone to the areas excluded, we propose to add other exclusions, including the Green Belt as proposed by the Inspector and areas of landscape value. We also object to dropping the exclusion of lands within 300 metres of residential development. We consider all these should be subject to the same hard exclusion (demonstration of overriding need).

Desired Change

Object to MOD J010 p.173 while supporting the addition of the East Vale Coastal zone to the areas excluded, we propose to add other exclusions, including the Green Belt as proposed by the Inspector and areas of landscape value. We also object to dropping the exclusion of lands within 300 metres of residential development. We consider all these should be subject to the same hard exclusion (demonstration of overriding need).

Recommendation

Policy MIN4 as worded provides for all areas designated for special protection consistent with the status of their designation. The issue of the Green Belt (REC 3.20 refers) has not been accepted by the Council and is considered separately under your representation numbers 378.47 and 378.48.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 33

Accession No. 3047

Modification No. J008

Representation

Object to MOD J008 p.172 addition of land to the south of Cwm Slade and Wenvoe Quarry. We object to this dreadful extension into valuable countryside and what should be the green belt, There is no after-use plan on the present quarry, not any practical one. ARC's destructive march must be stopped. High quality limestone has to be reserved for special uses, and local needs, not sold for the market and exported well outside Cardiff and the Vale.

Desired Change

Object to MOD J008 p.172 addition of land to the south of Cwm Slade and Wenvoe Quarry. We object to this dreadful extension into valuable countryside and what should be the green belt, There is no after-use plan on the present quarry, not any practical one. ARC's destructive march must be stopped. High quality limestone has to be reserved for special uses, and local needs, not sold for the market and exported well outside Cardiff and the Vale.

Recommendation

The issue of the Green Belt (REC 3.20 refers) has not been accepted by the Council and is considered separately under your representation numbers 378.47 and 378.48. With regard to land south of Cwm Slade, the Inspector (REC 9.7) recognises that the extension of the Wenvoe Quarry will allow for the continued production from this important quarry beyond its current expected 9 years (from 1999) life, he in turn supported the change. There is an approved after use plan for the quarry. ARC do not operate Wenvoe Quarry- RMC do. There is no evidence that the limestone at Wenvoe is of particular high quality hence its use primarily for road stone.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales

Contact Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643

Representation No. 29

Accession No. 3018

Modification No. J011

Representation

WTSWW support this modification on p.144-145.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales

Contact Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643

Representation No. 30

Accession No. 3019

Modification No. J012

Representation

WTSWW object to wording as currently proposed on p.145, and recommend the addition of and recognition of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)

Desired Change

WTSWW object to wording as currently proposed on p.145, and recommend the addition of and recognition of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)

Recommendation

The paragraph as worded allows for further statutory designations which may arise during the plan period and the paragraph is not designed to be exhaustive. Also no alteration is proposed to this paragraph so the objection is not valid.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 31 **Accession No.** 3020 **Modification No.** J013

Representation

WTSWW support this modification on p.145.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 32 **Accession No.** 3021 **Modification No.** J015

Representation

WTSWW support this modification on p.146.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Minerals

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 33 **Accession No.** 3022 **Modification No.** J021

Representation

WTSWW support this modification on p.65.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

NATURE CONSERVATION

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 34 **Accession No.** 2957 **Modification No.** DO59

Representation

The Town Council welcomes this modification on health and safety grounds, particularly because the mainly commercial developments in the town could cause smell, noise and light emissions.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 78 **Accession No.** 2845 **Modification No.** D039

Representation

Object to policy as currently worded.

Desired Change

Recommend replace "may be used to.." with "will be used to..". The use of the word may does not produce the certainty that the amendment sets out to achieve.

Recommendation

The Vale of Glamorgan Council notes and accepts the amendments proposed by the Countryside Council for Wales in respect of the revised wording to Policy ENV 14 - LOCAL SITES OF NATURE CONSERVATION SIGNIFICANCE and has amended the policy to read as follows:

POLICY ENV 14 - LOCAL SITES OF NATURE CONSERVATION SIGNIFICANCE

DEVELOPMENT AND LAND USE CHANGE LIKELY TO HAVE AN UNACCEPTABLE EFFECT ON A LOCAL NATURE RESERVE, A REGIONALLY IMPORTANT GEOLOGICAL / GEOMORHOLOGICAL SITE, OR A SITE SHOWN TO BE OF IMPORTANCE FOR NATURE CONSERVATION WILL NOT BE PERMITTED UNLESS THE REASONS FOR THE PROPOSAL CLEARLY OUTWEIGH THE LOCAL IMPORTANCE OF THE SITE. IF DEVELOPMENT IS PERMITTED, APPROPRIATE CONDITIONS OR AGREED PLANNING OBLIGATIONS WILL BE USED TO ENSURE THE IMPACT ON NATURE CONSERVATION IS MINIMISED.

CHANGE AS DESCRIBED

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 79 **Accession No.** 2846 **Modification No.** M002

Representation

TYPO

Desired Change

Amend list of SSSI - Barry Islands should read Barry Island

Recommendation

The Council notes the typographical error in respect of the list of Sites of Special Scientific Interest and will amend the entry for Barry Islands accordingly to read "Barry Island". This is considered to be a non-material change and as a consequence will not

be advertised.

NON-MATERIAL CHANGE TO BE MADE.

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 84

Accession No. 2851

Modification No. D044

Representation

CCW object to the wording

Desired Change

Recommend reference to the high level of statutory protection afforded to European Protected Species under the Conservation (Natural Habitats) Regulations

Recommendation

The Vale of Glamorgan Council notes and accepts the amendment proposed by the Countryside Council for Wales in respect of the wording of the newly inserted paragraph 3.4.42 and has amended the paragraph to read as follows:

3.4.42 The presence of a species protected by legislation, such as The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994, the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or The Protection of Badgers Act 1992, is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. When evaluating any development proposal, which, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to a protected species or its habitat, the Council will be guided by advice received from the Countryside Council for Wales. Applicants will also be advised of the need to conform to any statutory species protection that may affect the site concerned.

CHANGE AS DESCRIBED

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 92

Accession No. 2859

Modification No. D040

Representation

CCW object to the policy as currently worded.

Desired Change

To be consistent with the Conservation (Natural Habitats & C) Regulations 1994, CCW recommend that the policy be amended to read as follows: PERMISSION WILL ONLY BE GIVEN FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT WOULD CAUSE HARM OR THREATEN THE CONTINUED VIABILITY OF A PROTECTED SPECIES IF IT CAN BE CLEARLY DEMONSTRATED THAT:

- I) THERE ARE EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT JUSTIFY THE PROPOSALS
- II) THERE IS NO SATISFACTORY ALTERNATIVE
- III) EFFECTIVE MITIGATION MEASURES ARE PROVIDED BY THE DEVELOPER.

Recommendation

The Vale of Glamorgan Council notes and accepts the amendment proposed by the Countryside Council for Wales in respect of the new Policy ENV XXX - PROTECTED SPECIES and has amended it to read as follows:

ENV XXX - PROTECTED SPECIES

PERMISSION WILL ONLY BE GIVEN FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT WOULD CAUSE HARM TO OR THREATEN THE CONTINUED VIABILITY OF A PROTECTED SPECIES IF IT CAN BE CLEARLY DEMONSTRATED THAT:

- (i) THERE ARE EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT JUSTIFY THE PROPOSALS;
- (ii) THERE IS NO SATISFACTORY ALTERNATIVE; AND
- (iii) EFFECTIVE MITIGATION MEASURES ARE PROVIDED BY THE DEVELOPER.

CHANGE AS DESCRIBED

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 111 **Accession No.** 2878 **Modification No.** D042
Representation
Desired Change
None
Recommendation
Support is welcomed

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 112 **Accession No.** 2879 **Modification No.** D038
Representation
Desired Change
None
Recommendation
Support is welcomed

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 113 **Accession No.** 2880 **Modification No.** D037
Representation
Desired Change
None
Recommendation
Support is welcomed

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 114 **Accession No.** 2881 **Modification No.** D036
Representation
Desired Change
None
Recommendation
Support is welcomed

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 115

Accession No. 2882

Modification No. D035

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Environment Agency

Contact Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247

Representation No. 91

Accession No. 3120

Modification No. D036

Representation

It is noted that the Agency's culverting policy is supported.

Desired Change

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Environment Agency

Contact Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247

Representation No. 104

Accession No. 3133

Modification No. D040

Representation

The Policy as drafted is too limiting by virtue of the use of the term 'Destroy'. The Policy should apply to areas where protected species or their habitats are impacted upon but not necessarily destroyed. In addition, given the importance of this species/habitat referenced to in this Policy both criteria one and two should apply in that the effects should always be minimised and effective mitigation measures be provided by the developer.

Desired Change

The Agency would recommend the following changes to the Policy. Permission will only be given for development which may impact upon protected species or their habitats if it can be clearly demonstrated that:

- i) The effects will be minimised by careful design and work scheduling; and
- ii) Effective mitigation measures are provided by the developer.

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 38

Accession No. 3052

Modification No. D055

Representation

Add that capping of contaminated land does not satisfy long-term sustainability, unless natural remediation processes are enabled.

Desired Change

Add that capping of contaminated land does not satisfy long-term sustainability, unless natural remediation processes are enabled.

Recommendation

Policy ENV 24 seeks the re-use and reclamation of derelict or contaminated land where it can be shown that the level of contamination and/or instability can be reduced or removed as a result of the development. The supporting text also states that any development should ensure that any remaining contamination is effectively retained within the site and not allowed to spread to the surrounding areas. The objective of the policy is the reuse of contaminated or unstable land in preference to green field sites.

Prior to the granting of any planning permission, it is the responsibility of the planning authority to ensure that the land in question is suitable for its proposed use. Any developer will therefore need to provide sufficient information to both the local planning authority and the enforcing authority under Part II A of the Environmental Protection Act to enable such a judgement to be made and remediation measures can be enforced through the planning process.

In view of the obligations placed on the local planning authority when determining planning applications in respect of contaminated or unstable land it is considered that the addition of the textual amendment as proposed will not improve the objectives of the policy.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 39

Accession No. 3053

Modification No. D040

Representation

We object this is not consistent with the Habitats Directive, particularly the absolute protection accorded to protected species.

Desired Change

We object this is not consistent with the Habitats Directive, particularly the absolute protection accorded to protected species.

Recommendation

Paragraph 3.4.42 states that the presence of a species protected by legislation are a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. When evaluating any development proposal, that, if carried out would be likely to result in harm to a protected species or its habitat, the Council will be guided by advice received from the Countryside Council for Wales. The granting of planning permission for such proposals may be acceptable in exceptional conditions. Such a departure, derogation, is permissible under the provisions of the Conservation (Natural Habitats, & c) Regulations 1994.

Any such derogation would be granted by a license issued by the Welsh Assembly Government.

In view of the above therefore, the Council is of the view that the proposed amendment is consistent with the Habitats Directive.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 40

Accession No. 3054

Modification No. D039

Representation

Add to the provisos "unless there is no alternative and"

Desired Change

Add to the provisos "unless there is no alternative and"

Recommendation

This representation is not duly made as it does not relate directly to the proposed modification shown in bold in the February 2003 published proposed modifications document. The representation seeks to include additional text within the previously accepted policy wording.

Notwithstanding the above, the Council is of the view that the policy as modified adequately protects Local Sites of Nature Conservation Importance and accords with National Guidance in Planning Policy Wales.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 41

Accession No. 3055

Modification No. D038

Representation

Add to the provisos "unless there is no alternative and"

Desired Change

Add to the provisos "unless there is no alternative and"

Recommendation

This representation is not duly made, as it does not relate directly to the proposed modification shown in bold in the February 2003 published proposed modifications document. The representation seeks to include additional text within the previously accepted policy wording.

Notwithstanding the above, the Council is of the view that the policy as modified adequately protects National Sites of Nature Conservation Importance and accords with national guidance in Planning Policy Wales.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 43

Accession No. 3057

Modification No. D027

Representation

The addition on the Severn Estuary SAC is inadequate as it does not specify the shoreward extension of the SPA and SAC interests, e.g. to the feeding/resting grounds of migrating birds.

Desired Change

Rewrite addition.

PLAYING FIELD/ RECREATIONAL PROVISION

Recommendation

The proposed modification supplements the supporting text to Policy ENV 5 - EAST VALE COAST. In conjunction with the amended policy, the modification is designed to protect the undeveloped coast and to direct appropriate new coastal developments towards that part of the coast that is already developed.

The boundaries of proposed Special Areas of Conservation (pSAC) and Special Protection Areas (SPA), have been designated under the EC Habitats Directive and the EC Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds. Between Penarth and Lavernock Point, the boundaries of these designations as well as that of the Severn Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest coincide. The Council considers that in making reference to the Severn Estuary proposed Special Area of Conservation and Policy ENV 12 it is clarifying that, as with all policies within the Plan, they should not be read in isolation. The Council concurs with the Inspector in his view that Policy ENV 5 read in conjunction with other protective policies in the Plan such as Policy ENV 12 strike an adequate balance between development and protection/conservation.

Policies ENV 12 - INTERNATIONAL AREAS OF NATURE CONSERVATION IMPORTANCE, ENV 13 – NATIONAL SITES OF NATURE CONSERVATION IMPORTANCE and ENV 14 - LOCAL SITES OF NATURE CONSERVATION SIGNIFICANCE are especially relevant and in the view of the Council directly address the concerns expressed by the Friends of the Earth, Barry in their representation.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 45

Accession No. 3059

Modification No. D022

Representation

We object that this does not give protection to ancient woodland as required in PPW, nor to historic hedgerows required under the Hedgerow Regs, nor to wildlife required under the Habitats Regs., nor to the parts of the East Vale coast designated as European conservation site. The potential cost to the public purse in future sea defences should also be a factor in decision making. A policy statement is needed with respect to coastal erosion, based on the Shoreline Management studies done for the VoG and shelved.

Desired Change

Insert new sentence/clauses to cover. Add policy statement.

Recommendation

The objection submitted relates to the supporting text to Policy ENV 4 and to the lack of protection afforded by the policy to ancient woodland, historic hedgerows and wildlife.

This policy relates directly to the Glamorgan Heritage Coast and recognises its national importance as an area of attractive undeveloped coastline. The UDP is a policy document that addresses the issues raised by development and applications for development will be assessed against all of the relevant policies within the Plan. The Council is of the view that the objection seeks to include matters within this policy that are adequately covered by other policies within the Plan, specifically Policies ENV 9 - CONSERVATION OF THE COUNTRYSIDE, ENV 10 - PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE FEATURES, ENV 11 - WOODLAND MANAGEMENT, ENV 12 - INTERNATIONAL AREAS OF NATURE CONSERVATION, ENV 13 - NATIONAL SITES OF NATURE CONSERVATION IMPORTANCE, ENV 14 - LOCAL SITES OF NATURE CONSERVATION IMPORTANCE, ENV XXX - PROTECTED SPECIES and ENV - 15 PROTECTION OF THE BUILT AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT.

The Council is of the view that the element of the representation in respect of sea defence and coastal erosion does not relate to the proposed modification MOD D022 and is therefore not duly made.

Notwithstanding this, in accordance with guidance contained within Planning Policy Wales 2002, the Vale of Glamorgan Council has participated in the preparation and development of the Swansea Bay and Severn Estuary Shoreline Management Plans. Promoted by DEFRA and including maritime local authorities, the Countryside Council for Wales, the Environment Agency and other relevant coastal organisations or companies such as Associated British Ports and BP, the Plans have been adopted by the Council and will inform all those who are engaged in the development planning process about the proposed future strategies for coastal defence.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 46

Accession No. 3060

Modification No. D021

Representation

We object to development being permitted that ignores ecology, conservation and other material factors in the proposed landscape areas. Landscape areas within the "interim Green Belt" should be subject to similar restrictions to a full Green Belt. We propose that the Wenvoe valley and hillsides to the Cwrt yr Ala basin all be included as Special Landscape Areas.

Desired Change

Insert new restrictive phrases to cover.

Recommendation

The objection submitted relates to the new policy ENV XXX - SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS and in particular, to the fact that the policy ignores ecology, conservation and other material factors in the proposed landscape areas.

In defining the Special Landscape areas, the Council has drawn on the detailed work undertaken in the production of the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" study in 1999. This study, based on the LANDMAP methodology developed by the Countryside Council for Wales, assessed the landscape under the five aspect headings of Earth Sciences, Biodiversity, Visual and Sensory, History and Archaeology, and Culture. The Council is of the view therefore that in defining Special Landscape Areas, issues in respect of ecology have been duly considered. Notwithstanding the above, the Council maintain that issues relating the impact of development on the ecology of the Vale of Glamorgan are also adequately addressed in other policies within the Plan.

The Council considered that the acceptance of the Inspector's recommendation to designate a Green Belt would be contrary to Planning Policy Wales 2002 and Strategic Planning Guidance for South East Wales. The Designation of a Green Belt in the Vale of Glamorgan could have a serious detrimental effect upon both the growth dynamics of the region and regional sustainability. In the absence of any green belt designation therefore, the issue of landscape areas within interim green belts being subject to similar restrictions to a full green belt as raised by the representation is considered by the Council to be irrelevant.

Special Landscape Areas are designated to identify those landscapes which are of particularly high intrinsic value and which require special protection for their own sake as part of an areas landscape resource. They should not be used as a multi-purpose designation to protect landscapes from urban sprawl or to maintain corridors of green space within the urban areas for the purposes of recreation and general amenity. Other designations such as green wedges or areas of open countryside are considered more appropriate to serve this function. In designating the Special Landscape Areas detailed in Policy ENV XXX, the Council is of the view that the LANDMAP methodology and the Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan study provide a robust basis for area designations. Further, the Council consider that the extent and boundaries of the Special Landscape Areas defined are logical and well defined.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales

Contact Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643

Representation No. 6

Accession No. 2995

Modification No. D035

Representation

WTSWW support this modification

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales

Contact Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 7 **Accession No.** 2996 **Modification No.** D036

Representation

WTSWW support this modification

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 8 **Accession No.** 2997 **Modification No.** D037

Representation

WTSWW support this modification

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 9 **Accession No.** 2998 **Modification No.** D038

Representation

WTSWW support this modification

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 10 **Accession No.** 2999 **Modification No.** D039

Representation

WTSWW object to policy as currently worded recommended replace 'may be use to ...' with 'will be used to ..' The use of the word 'may' does not provide the certainty that the amendment sets out to achieve, on p.47.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

The Vale of Glamorgan Council notes and accepts the amendments proposed by the Countryside Council for Wales in respect of the revised wording to Policy ENV 14 - LOCAL SITES OF NATURE CONSERVATION SIGNIFICANCE and has amended the policy to read as follows:

POLICY ENV 14 - LOCAL SITES OF NATURE CONSERVATION SIGNIFICANCE

DEVELOPMENT AND LAND USE CHANGE LIKELY TO HAVE AN UNACCEPTABLE EFFECT ON A LOCAL NATURE RESERVE, A REGIONALLY IMPORTANT GEOLOGICAL / GEOMORHOLOGICAL SITE, OR A SITE SHOWN TO BE OF IMPORTANCE FOR NATURE CONSERVATION WILL NOT BE PERMITTED UNLESS THE REASONS FOR THE PROPOSAL CLEARLY OUTWEIGH THE LOCAL IMPORTANCE OF THE SITE. IF DEVELOPMENT IS PERMITTED, APPROPRIATE CONDITIONS OR AGREED PLANNING OBLIGATIONS WILL BE USED TO ENSURE THE IMPACT ON NATURE CONSERVATION IS MINIMISED.

CHANGE AS DESCRIBED

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 11 **Accession No.** 3000 **Modification No.** D042

Representation

WTSWW support this modification

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 12 **Accession No.** 3001 **Modification No.** D044

Representation

WRSWW object to the wording of this new paragraph for p.48, and suggest that there should be a reference to the high level of statutory protection afforded to European protected species under the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) Regulations 1994.

Desired Change

Recommendation

The Council notes and accepts the amendment proposed by the Wildlife Trust for South and West Wales in respect of the newly inserted paragraph 3.4.42 and has amended it accordingly to read:

3.4.42 The presence of a species protected by legislation, such as the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994, the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or the Protection of Badgers Act 1992, is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. When evaluating any development, which, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to a protected species or its habitat, the Council will be guided by advice received from the Countryside Council for Wales. Applicants will also be advised of the need to conform with any statutory species protection that may affect the site concerned.

CHANGE AS DESCRIBED

Issue: Nature Conservation

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 37 **Accession No.** 3026 **Modification No.** M002

Representation

Under Section 4, the title of the Glamorgan Wildlife Trust requires to be changed to the Wildlife Trust South & West Wales.

Desired Change

Recommendation

The Council notes the typographical error under section 4 and will amend the reference to the "Glamorgan Wildlife Trust" accordingly to read "The Wildlife Trust of South & West Wales". This is considered to be a non-material change and as a

consequence this change will not be advertised.

NON-MATERIAL CHANGE TO BE MADE

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Sports Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Ivey Darren

Representor No. 18

Representation No. 4

Accession No. 1738

Modification No. B009

Representation

The Sports Council for Wales supports MOD B009 and welcomes the Council's clear support for National Guidance with regard to sport and recreational facilities.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Sports Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Ivey Darren

Representor No. 18

Representation No. 5

Accession No. 1739

Modification No. G011

Representation

The Sports Council for Wales welcomes the Council's commitment to developing cycling routes and facilities in the Vale of Glamorgan. The Sports Council for Wales supports MOD G011 (Policy TRAN 8) and its aim to develop a network of cycle routes and links to the National Cycle Network.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Sports Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Ivey Darren

Representor No. 18

Representation No. 6

Accession No. 1740

Modification No. I003

Representation

The Sports Council for Wales supports MOD I003 (REC 08.01) as it follows national guidelines on the correct procedures and consultations required prior to the development of land with recreational value.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Sports Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Ivey Darren

Representor No. 18

Representation No. 7

Accession No. 1741

Modification No. I004

Representation

The Sports Council for Wales welcomes this clear policy statement supporting the protection of existing recreational facilities. Policy REC 1 will safeguard existing sites in line with national policy guidelines.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Sports Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Ivey Darren

Representor No. 18

Representation No. 8

Accession No. 1742

Modification No. I006

Representation

MOD I006 (REC 08.03) to modify Policy REC 3 is welcomed by the Sports Councils for Wales. The policy regarding open space provision within new residential developments meets national guidelines and sets out the Council's commitment to safeguarding open spaces. The Sports Council for Wales supports the Council's commitment to the "six acre standard" as set out in Planning Guidance Wales March 1998.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Sports Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Ivey Darren

Representor No. 18

Representation No. 9

Accession No. 1743

Modification No. I010

Representation

The Sports Council for Wales supports modification I010 and continues to support the Council's policy aimed at decreasing the deficit in playing field provision in the Vale of Glamorgan.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Sports Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Ivey Darren

Representor No. 18

Representation No. 10

Accession No. 1744

Modification No. I012

Representation

The Sports Council for Wales welcomes additional children's play facilities at the identified sites in POLICY REC 6 and acknowledges that such developments meet national minimum standards for the provision of children's play space.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Sports Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Ivey Darren

Representor No. 18 **Representation No.** 11 **Accession No.** 1745 **Modification No.** I019

Representation

The Sports Council for Wales supports Policy REC12 and the recommendation REC 08.12 MOD I019. The Sports Council for Wales supports the maintenance and improvement of public rights of way and recreational routes.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Sports Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Ivey Darren

Representor No. 18 **Representation No.** 12 **Accession No.** 1746 **Modification No.** I025

Representation

The Sports Council for Wales supports Policy REC 13 and MOD I025 which will result in improved sailing facilities in the Vale of Glamorgan.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 42 **Accession No.** 2965 **Modification No.** I006

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 43 **Accession No.** 2966 **Modification No.** 1011

Representation

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed. Although, it is the Council's responsibility to maintain existing facilities this is not a function of the UDP.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 44 **Accession No.** 2967 **Modification No.** 1013

Representation

The Town Council supports this Modification

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 45 **Accession No.** 2968 **Modification No.** 1022

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 46 **Accession No.** 2969 **Modification No.** 1024

Representation

The Town Council fully supports this Modification and would like to see Modifications to be commenced as soon as possible.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 129 **Accession No.** 2896 **Modification No.** 1024

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 130 **Accession No.** 2897 **Modification No.** 1022

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 131 **Accession No.** 2898 **Modification No.** 1021

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 132 **Accession No.** 2899 **Modification No.** 1019

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 134

Accession No. 2901

Modification No. 1015

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 35

Accession No. 3049

Modification No. 1010

Representation

We object to this addition. The Council does nothing and has done nothing toward seeking to make up the deficit in playing fields. We need a statement here on identified or identifiable playing field provision in development areas, including Rhoose Point, White Farm, Barry Waterfront; also on what steps it is taking and what budget it is allocating to make up the deficits in each locality.

Desired Change

We object to this addition. The Council does nothing and has done nothing toward seeking to make up the deficit in playing fields. We need a statement here on identified or identifiable playing field provision in development areas, including Rhoose Point, White Farm, Barry Waterfront; also on what steps it is taking and what budget it is allocating to make up the deficits in each locality.

Recommendation

The Council has amended Para. 8.4.13 in accordance with the Inspector's Rec. 8.4. The Plan acknowledges that there is a deficit in playing fields provision in the Vale of Glamorgan and the Council is seeking to identify new playing field provision within new residential developments (UDP Policy REC3 refers).

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 36

Accession No. 3050

Modification No. 1009

Representation

We question that the figures for existing provision have not changed since 1998. We object to including the whole of school playing fields, including the parts not actively used, in the schools column. We object to including the whole of the schools total (rather than the fraction available to the public) in calculating the deficit. We object to calculating the "East Vale" provision as a single figure, when provision is needed for each community (Wenvoe, Dinas Powys, Penarth and Sully).

Desired Change

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

We question that the figures for existing provision have not changed since 1998. We object to including the whole of school playing fields, including the parts not actively used, in the schools column. We object to including the whole of the schools total (rather than the fraction available to the public) in calculating the deficit. We object to calculating the "East Vale" provision as a single figure, when provision is needed for each community (Wenvoe, Dinas Powys, Penarth and Sully).

Recommendation

In the first instance, the Council uses the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) recommended minimum standard for outdoor playing space. This is set at 2.4 ha (6 acres) per 1000 people (The Six Acre Standard, 2001, National Playing Fields Association refers). The definition of such space (according to the afore mentioned standard) is inclusive of:

- i) Facilities such as pitches, greens, courts, athletics tracks and miscellaneous sites such as croquet lawns and training areas owned by local authorities at all tiers.
- ii) Facilities described in i) within the education sector which are available for public use by written agreement.
- iii) Facilities described in i) within the voluntary, private, industrial and commercial sectors, which serve the leisure time needs for outdoor recreation of their members, or the public.

The allocation in the table (Table 1) of school playing field provision is in accordance with the NPFA standard.

With respect to the objection to the East Vale provision as a single figure - the Inspector, in his report, states that (Para 8.4.8 of the report refers) " In the circumstances of overall deficit in the Borough revealed by Table 1, I find no compelling need to elaborate the tabulation". The Council therefore accepts the Inspector's recommendation 8.4.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 37

Accession No. 3051

Modification No. 1008

Representation

We object to the addition of school playing fields, except when the school has signed an agreement, long-term, that the public has access and use of those playing fields.

Desired Change

We object to the addition of school playing fields, except when the school has signed an agreement, long-term, that the public has access and use of those playing fields.

Recommendation

The proposed amendment to Para. 8.4.11 is made in line with Inspector's Rec. 8.5 as all pitches play a part in satisfying need regardless of their ownership.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West
Wales

Contact Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643

Representation No. 27

Accession No. 3016

Modification No. 1017

Representation

WTSWW support this modification on p.132.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Contact Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668 **Representation No.** 3 **Accession No.** 3082 **Modification No.** B009

Representation

1)Cofton Limited notes the addition of an assessment of need for additional recreation facilities. In the case of large scale developments, such as that proposed at Rhose (HOUS1(22) north of the railway line) it is essential that developments of this nature not only address the recreation and sporting needs of people moving into the settlement, but must critically readdress the needs of the indigenous population. 2) At present the sporting and recreational needs of the settlements such as Rhose are not being addressed satisfactorily. There are already deficiencies in provision, particularly in Rhose, that will only be exacerbated by inappropriate development. The scale of residential development proposed on the land north of the railway renders it incapable of meeting the recreational and other community needs of the settlement. 3) Prior to making any allocation, the Authority must consider whether there is scope on the allocation site itself to accommodate sufficient recreational facilities and if not must make additional land available to provide these facilities elsewhere.

Desired Change

Recommendation

The Council has replaced the word 'demand' with 'need' in Policy 11, in line with the Inspector's Rec. 2.8. Policy REC03 aims to secure the provision of open space within new developments. The Council acknowledges that there is a need for additional public open space in Rhose and will seek to secure such provision through the use of a development brief and appropriate legal agreements, on the new housing site to the north of the railway line.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Playing Field/Recreational Provision

Organisation Contact Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668 **Representation No.** 16 **Accession No.** 3095 **Modification No.** I006

Representation

1) Cofton Limited supports the proposed addition to the policy in respect of the need to assess existing POS provision in any given locality.

2) In respect of the allocation on land north of the railway line in Rhose, it is considered that this particular allocation will be unable to fulfil the requirement of Policy REC3. Following the public exhibition work carried out by Cofton Limited, it is evident that there is a lack of existing public open space in Rhose. The situation will not be improved should the allocation north of the railway line be realised. A development of 600 houses on this site will prevent any significant areas of public open space being provided on-site. There are limited opportunities for providing off-site open space within Rhose. It is considered that there will be no community benefit to the addition of 600 extra houses in Rhose during this and subsequent Plan periods.

3) It is essential that any additional housing development in Rhose is able to not only support its self in terms of community facilities and public open space, but make equivalent improvements for the existing community. Only then will there be a truly sustainable community in Rhose.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support for MOD I006 is welcomed.

Please refer to the Council's other response to your comments with specific regard to proposed changes to the Rhose settlement boundary and the housing allocation at land to the north of the railway line, Rhose (No.s 1668.3-1668.25).

RETAILING

Issue: Retailing

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 135

Accession No. 2902

Modification No. H008

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Retailing

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 54

Accession No. 3068

Modification No. H005

Representation

We propose to delete Barry Waterfront, as opposing significant additions to retailing there. We object to adding the section on highways, unless there are also clauses to cover access by walking, cycling and public transport. We object to the omission of pollution from the list in subsection (i). We require an addition on the provision of recycling banks. This is particularly necessary in view of the failure at the new Morrisons store.

Desired Change

We propose to delete Barry Waterfront, as opposing significant additions to retailing there. We object to adding the section on highways, unless there are also clauses to cover access by walking, cycling and public transport. We object to the omission of pollution from the list in subsection (i). We require an addition on the provision of recycling banks. This is particularly necessary in view of the failure at the new Morrisons store.

Recommendation

The Council considers that the objection raised in relation the deletion of the reference to Barry Waterfront in Policy SHOP 2 is not duly made as the objection does not refer to a proposed modification.

The proposed modification to criteria (ii) of Policy SHOP2 refers to the capability of the highway network to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposal. The Council views traffic in the wider context, which encompasses motor vehicles (private and public) walking and cycling. Therefore the Council considers it unnecessary to amend the proposed modification so that it list all modes of transport as suggested.

The Council considers that the objection raised in respect of the inclusion of a reference to the omission of pollution from criteria (i) within Policy SHOP 2 is not duly made as the objection does not refer to a proposed modification.

The Council considers that criteria (v) "PROVIDES CAR PARKING AND SERVICING FACILITIES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPROVED COUNCIL GUIDELINES" adequately allows the Council the scope for requesting such facilities as part of any retail development in Barry Waterfront where it is deemed appropriate.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Retailing

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 55

Accession No. 3069

Modification No. B008

Representation

Addition of INCLUDING THE WATERFRONT BARRY We object to this addition because more retailing there detracts from the Town Centre and High Street shopping centres, and because developments will be mainly car-served in preference to public transport, walking and cycling. While the Council proposes an addition to SHOP 4 to meet this point, it's empty words as they did nothing on it when allowing the Morrisons etc

Desired Change

Addition of INCLUDING THE WATERFRONT BARRY We object to this addition because more retailing there detracts from the Town Centre and High Street shopping centres, and because developments will be mainly car-served in preference to public transport, walking and cycling. While the Council proposes an addition to SHOP 4 to meet this point, it's empty words, as they did nothing on it when allowing the Morrisons etc

Recommendation

The allocation of Retailing within the Barry Waterfront is in line with the "Sequential Test" for allocating sites for retail, in accordance with National Policy contained in Planning Policy Wales (March 2002). Paragraph 10.2.11 states:

"Adopting a sequential approach means that first preference should be for town centre locations, where suitable sites or buildings suitable for conversion are available, followed by edge of centre sites, then by district and local centres and, only then, out-of-centre sites in locations that are accessible by a choice of means of transport."

The Council considers that the site allocated for retailing at the Barry Waterfront fulfils the sequential test contained within Planning Policy Wales, and shall contribute towards the promotion of mixed used development within the redevelopment of the Barry Waterfront as a whole.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Retailing

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 25 **Accession No.** 3014 **Modification No.** E45

Representation

WTSWW support this modification on p.69.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Retailing

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 26 **Accession No.** 3015 **Modification No.** H008

Representation

WTSWW support this modification on p.118.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

RURAL BUILDINGS

Issue: Rural Buildings

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 117 **Accession No.** 2884 **Modification No.** D031

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Rural Buildings

Organisation Harmer Partnership **Contact** Mr. Laurence Forse
Representor No. 356 **Representation No.** 34 **Accession No.** 2914 **Modification No.** D030

Representation

The Inspector in reporting on Policy ENV 7 recognised that the policy, as drafted did not fully reflect Planning Policy Guidance Wales advice on the subject. The advice has in any event been updated by the publication of Planning Policy Wales 2002. Whilst the supporting text has been modified to include reference to PGW 2002 (MOD D031), the Modification D030 is superfluous and potentially misleading. In fact the supporting text clearly indicates that in the first instance business use of rural buildings is to be preferred to residential conversions, it does not necessarily rule out residential conversions. However, the revision proposed that the policy text MOD D030 by specifically referring to "conversion to business use" erroneously suggest that such concerns would NOT apply to residential conversions. That is clearly not the intention, and the introduction of the wording proposed in D030 adds little, other than confusion to the terms of the policy. The supporting text makes clear the preference for business conversions, and D030 should be deleted to ensure concerns re form and design continue to apply to any residential conversions.

Desired Change

DELETE amended wording opposed by MOD D030 as it adds nothing to the terms of the policy, and contradictingly implies that concern regarding form and design would not apply to any residential conversions.

Recommendation

The insertion at the start of criterion (iii) was made in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation number 3.30. Paragraph 7.6.9 in Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) specifically advises that the matters in criterion (iii) are taken into account in considering the conversion of rural buildings for business re-use. It is therefore considered that Policy ENV 7 complies with national planning guidance and should remain unchanged.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Rural Buildings

Organisation **Contact** WTGL Limited
Representor No. 1666 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 2826 **Modification No.** D031

Representation

This proposed modification relates to the supporting text that accompanies Policy ENV 7. As presently written, the text does not complement the policy as proposed for modification following the Inspectors recommendation. In particular: 1. The Inspector recommended the deletion of criterion (l) which required residential conversions to be located within groups of existing dwellings. In view of the fact that criterion is now to be deleted, the paragraph that commences "There are a number of hamlets..." should be deleted as it is inappropriate (save for the final sentence of that paragraph, which could be incorporated in the succeeding paragraph). 2. The Council proposes to quote extensively from paragraph 7.6.10 of Planning Policy Wales (March 2002). Much of this quote deals with the position when councils have chosen to include policies within the UDP which do not allow residential re-use unless certain criteria are met. In particular, it introduces a kind of sequential test. The Vale of Glamorgan Council has not chosen to follow this course and as such, it is very inappropriate that this part of the advice should be emphasised.

Desired Change

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

1. Make the following changes: Delete from "there are a number of hamlets.." to "..into the rural landscape." Insert the sentence "Residential conversions .. historic farm buildings." as the second sentence in the next paragraph. 2. Delete that part of the quote from 7.6.10 of Planning Policy Wales from "Especially in areas where.." to "..affordable housing for local need."

Recommendation

The changes to the supporting text to Policy ENV 7 were made in accordance with Inspector's recommendation number 3.31. The Council concurs with the Inspector's reasoning on this issue and it is maintained that the penultimate paragraph of MOD D031 should remain unchanged.

NO CHANGE

With regard to the quote from Planning Policy Wales (2002) this reference was included as a result of a clerical error and consequently it is agreed that the first paragraph of MOD D301 (para.3.4.22) should be deleted.

AGREED

Delete MOD D301 (para.3.4.22)

SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Cowbridge Local History Society **Contact** Mr. A.J.L Alden

Representor No. 13 **Representation No.** 9 **Accession No.** 3029 **Modification No.** N069

Representation

Even though the boundary includes the curtilage of 'Longfield', the new "envelope" would be of an irregular shape, and the Longfield extension into open countryside would be an invitation for future 'rounding off' and extending building into open countryside. From the field pattern it is evident that the Long field and others nearby were once part of Llanblethian's openfield system and therefore should be preserved.

Desired Change

Maintain existing settlement boundary

Recommendation

The proposed modification MOD N069 to amend the UDP proposals map accepts the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.10) that the residential settlement boundaries should be revised to include the residential curtilage of the residential buildings included within them. The Inspector concluded in his report that logical residential settlement boundaries around settlements that are considered as being outside a countryside designation, should include the land which is being used for residential purposes within such settlements."

The Council considers that MOD N069 should be maintained as it revises the Cowbridge with Llanblethian settlement boundary to include the entire garden curtilage of the existing property known as The Longfield and is therefore in accordance with the Inspectors recommendation. The revised settlement boundary represents a logical line around the existing garden currently in residential use.

With regard to your concerns about subsequent development in this location, any planning application received by the local planning authority in the future will be subject to the relevant plan policies that control development in the usual manner, for example Policies HOUS2, HOUS9, ENV25 etc. Therefore, if any proposal does not comply with these policies a planning application will not be permitted on the site for development.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Cowbridge Local History Society **Contact** Mr. A.J.L Alden

Representor No. 13 **Representation No.** 10 **Accession No.** 3030 **Modification No.** N070

Representation

The extension to include Old Factory House garden would be an invitation to develop in the future, into open and unspoiled countryside.

Desired Change

Continue boundary on W side of Factory House to the next field boundary south, then east along that boundary, i.e. incorporate small area of "shaded" land.

Recommendation

The proposed modification to amend the UDP proposals map accepts the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.10) that the residential settlement boundaries should be revised to include the residential curtilages of the residential buildings included within them. The Inspector concluded in his report "that logical residential settlement boundaries around settlements that are considered as being outside a countryside designation, should include the land which is being used for residential purposes within such settlements."

The Council considers that MOD N070 should be maintained as it revises the settlement boundary to include the entire garden curtilage of the existing property and is therefore in accordance with the Inspectors recommendation. The revised settlement boundary represents a logical line around the existing garden currently in residential use.

With regard to your concerns about subsequent development in this location, any planning application received by the local planning authority in the future will be subject to the relevant plan policies that control development in the usual manner, for example Policies HOUS2, HOUS9, ENV25 etc. Therefore, if any proposal does not comply with these policies a planning application will not be permitted on the site for development.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 20 **Accession No.** 2987 **Modification No.** N115

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 54 **Accession No.** 2978 **Modification No.** N057

Representation

The Town Council objects to the Proposed Modification MOD N057 (residential settlement boundary). Members see it as an intrusion into the countryside which may extend the village in the future.

Desired Change

The Town Council would like to see the Proposed Modification removed.

Recommendation

The proposed modification to amend the UDP proposals map accepts the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.10) that the residential settlement boundaries should be revised to include the residential curtilages of the residential buildings included within them. The Inspector concluded in his report "that logical residential settlement boundaries around settlements that are considered as being outside a countryside designation, should include the land which is being used for residential purposes within such settlements."

The Council considers that MOD N057 should be maintained as it revises the Aberthin settlement boundary to include the entire garden curtilage of the existing property and is therefore in accordance with the Inspectors recommendation. The revised settlement boundary represents a logical line around the existing garden currently in residential use.

With regard to your concerns about subsequent development in this location, any planning application received by the local planning authority in the future will be subject to the relevant plan policies that control development in the usual manner, for example Policies HOUS2, HOUS9, ENV25 etc. Therefore, if any proposal does not comply with these policies a planning application will not be permitted on the site for development.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 55 **Accession No.** 2977 **Modification No.** N039

Representation

The Town Council objects to the Proposed Modification, the grounds being: 1) Intrusion into the open countryside; 2) Detrimental to the open view south of Great House, Llanblethian in the centre of the Conservation Area; 3) Will lead to future

"infill" claims and 4) Will have serious effect on the flood plain of the River thaw and may exacerbate flooding in Bridge Road.

The Town Council would like to see the proposal removed.

Recommendation

The proposed modification MOD N039 to amend the UDP proposals map accepts the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.10) that the residential settlement boundaries should be revised to include the residential curtilage of the residential buildings included within them. The Inspector concluded in his report "that logical residential settlement boundaries around settlements that are considered as being outside a countryside designation, should include the land which is being used for residential purposes within such settlements."

The Council considers that MOD N039 should be maintained as it revises the Cowbridge with Llanblethian settlement boundary to include the entire garden curtilage of the recently developed properties at Llanblethian Farm and is therefore in accordance with the Inspectors recommendation. The revised settlement boundary represents a logical line around the existing gardens currently in residential use. Issues in respect of any effect that the development may have had on the flood plain of the River Thaw would have been considered by the Environment Agency at the time of the original planning application and is therefore not considered an issue at this time.

With regard to your concerns about subsequent development in this location, any planning application received by the local planning authority in the future will be subject to the relevant plan policies that control development in the usual manner, for example Policies HOUS2, HOUS9, ENV25 etc. Therefore, if any proposal does not comply with these policies a planning application will not be permitted on the site for development.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 56 **Accession No.** 2979 **Modification No.** NO58

Representation

The Town Council objects to the proposed modification. It is seen to be an intrusion into the countryside which may extend the village in the future.

Desired Change

The Town Council would like to see the proposed modification removed.

Recommendation

The proposed modification MOD N058 to amend the UDP proposals map accepts the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.10 refers) that the residential settlement boundaries should be revised to include the residential curtilage of the residential buildings included within them. The Inspector concluded in his report "that logical residential settlement boundaries around settlements that are considered as being outside a countryside designation, should include the land which is being used for residential purposes within such settlements."

The Council considers that MOD N058 should be maintained as it revises the residential settlement boundary for Aberthin to include the entire garden curtilages of the properties identified and is therefore in accordance with the Inspectors recommendation. The revised settlement boundary represents a logical line around the existing garden currently in residential use.

With regard to your concerns about subsequent development in this location, any planning application received by the local planning authority in the future will be subject to the relevant plan policies that control development in the usual manner, for example Policies HOUS2, HOUS9, ENV 25 etc. Therefore, if any proposal does not comply with these policies a planning application will not be permitted on the site for development.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 57 **Accession No.** 2980 **Modification No.** NO66

Representation

The Town Council supports this Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 58 **Accession No.** 2981 **Modification No.** NO67

Representation

The Town Council supports this Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 59 **Accession No.** 2982 **Modification No.** NO68

Representation

The Town Council supports the proposed modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 60 **Accession No.** 2983 **Modification No.** NO69

Representation

The Town Council objects to the proposed modification as they see it as an intrusion into the countryside. The field and adjacent field are believed to be the last remnants of the medieval "strip" system of agriculture in.

Desired Change

The Town Council would like to see the modification removed.

Recommendation

The proposed modification MOD N069 to amend the UDP proposals map accepts the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.10 refers) that the residential settlement boundaries should be revised to include the residential curtilage of the residential buildings included within them. The Inspector concluded in his report "that logical residential settlement boundaries around settlements that are considered as being outside a countryside designation, should include the land which is being used for residential purposes within such settlements."

The Council considers that MOD N069 should be maintained as it revises the Cowbridge with Llanblethian settlement boundary to include the entire garden curtilage of the existing property known as The Longfield and is therefore in accordance with the Inspectors recommendation. The revised settlement boundary represents a logical line around the existing garden currently in residential use.

With regard to your concerns about subsequent development in this location, any planning application received by the local planning authority in the future will be subject to the relevant plan policies that control development in the usual manner, for example Policies HOUS2, HOUS9, ENV 25 etc. Therefore, if any proposal does not comply with these policies a planning application will not be permitted on the site for development.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 61 **Accession No.** 2984 **Modification No.** NO70

Representation

The Town Council objects to the proposed modification - previous planning applications have been rejected for this area and considered to have a detrimental visual impact if it were developed.

Desired Change

The Town Council would like to see the proposed modification removed.

Recommendation

The proposed modification MOD N070 to amend the UDP proposals map accepts the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.10 refers) that the residential settlement boundaries should be revised to include the residential curtilage of the residential buildings included within them. The Inspector concluded in his report "that logical residential settlement boundaries around settlements that are considered as being outside a countryside designation, should include the land which is being used for residential purposes within such settlements."

The Council considers that MOD N070 should be maintained as it revises the settlement boundary to include the entire garden curtilage of the existing property known as Old Factory House, and is therefore in accordance with the Inspectors recommendation. The revised settlement boundary represents a logical line around the existing garden currently in residential use.

With regard to the concerns expressed in respect of subsequent development in this location, any planning application received by the local planning authority will be subject to the relevant plan policies that control development in the usual manner, for example Policies HOUS2, HOUS9, ENV 25 etc. Therefore, if any proposal does not comply with these policies a planning application will not be permitted on the site for development.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 62 **Accession No.** 2985 **Modification No.** N107

Representation

The Town council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Contact Joy Kipling
Representor No. 59 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 1941 **Modification No.** N103

Representation

This modification clearly "sticks-out" and is not a smooth rounding off of the existing village boundary. I am concerned that this could be a "green light" for subsequent development in this location/area of the village.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

The proposed modification MOD N103 to amend the UDP proposals map accepts the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.10 refers) that the residential settlement boundaries should be revised to include the residential curtilage of the residential buildings included within them. The Inspector concluded in his report "that logical residential settlement boundaries around settlements that are considered as being outside a countryside designation, should include the land which is being used for residential purposes within such settlements."

The Council considers that MOD N103 should be maintained as it revises the Ystradowen settlement boundary to include the entire garden curtilage of the existing property at 1 Ash Park, and is therefore in accordance with the Inspectors recommendation. The revised settlement boundary represents a logical line around the existing garden currently in residential use.

With regard to your concerns about subsequent development in this location, any planning application received by the local planning authority in the future will be subject to the relevant plan policies that control development in the usual manner, for example Policies HOUS2, HOUS9, ENV 25 etc. Therefore, if any proposal does not comply with these policies a planning application will not be permitted on the site for development.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Contact Mr. C.W. Kipling
Representor No. 60 **Representation No.** 4 **Accession No.** 2794 **Modification No.** N103

Representation

This modification clearly "sticks out" and is not a smooth rounding off of the existing village boundary. I am concerned that this could be a "green light" for subsequent development in this location/area of the village.

Desired Change

Recommendation

The proposed modification MOD N103 to amend the UDP proposals map accepts the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.10 refers) that the residential settlement boundaries should be revised to include the residential curtilage of the residential buildings included within them. The Inspector concluded in his report "that logical residential settlement boundaries around settlements that are considered as being outside a countryside designation, should include the land which is being used for residential purposes within such settlements."

The Council considers that MOD N103 should be maintained as it revises the Ystradowen settlement boundary to include the entire garden curtilage of the existing property at 1 Ash Park, and is therefore in accordance with the Inspectors recommendation. The revised settlement boundary represents a logical line around the existing garden currently in residential use.

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

With regard to your concerns about subsequent development in this location, any planning application received by the local planning authority in the future will be subject to the relevant plan policies that control development in the usual manner, for example Policies HOUS2, HOUS9, ENV 25 etc. Therefore, if any proposal does not comply with these policies a planning application will not be permitted on the site for development.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Contact R H Rees Esq.
Representor No. 128 **Representation No.** 3 **Accession No.** 2798 **Modification No.** N010

Representation

Recommendation 4.55 of the Inspectors report seeks the modification of the Plan to exclude "all properties west of St.Andrews School from the Dinas Powys residential settlement boundary". Modification N010 has done this. However, there is no logical or good planning reason why properties in this area of Dinas Powys should be removed from the settlement boundary. Opportunities exist for sensitive in filling within the area which will neither erode the semi-rural feel, lead to coalescence, or have a detrimental effect upon residential amenity. Consequently my client seeks the reinstatement of the settlement boundary as originally drawn in the deposit

Desired Change

The reinstatement of the settlement boundary around the Westra, Dinas Powys as shown on the deposit UDP proposals map.

Recommendation

The Council has amended the Dinas Powys residential settlement boundary in accordance with the Inspector's Rec. 4.55. It is considered that "although this ribbon form of development is attached to the main urban area of Dinas Powys, it does not clearly represent the urban form and character of the settlement as a whole and is more rural in character".

The Inspector also noted that this area has a similar rural character to that which exists at Southra which is not included within the settlement boundary. Therefore, in order to ensure consistency the Council considers that the dwellings to the west of St Andrew's school should be excluded from the Dinas Powys residential settlement boundary.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Contact Mrs. J. A. Perkins
Representor No. 216 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 1937 **Modification No.** N027

Representation

The extension of the settlement boundary by modification No.27 is supported.

Desired Change

Not applicable

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 81 **Accession No.** 2848 **Modification No.** E32

Representation

Objection to amendment as currently worded.

Desired Change

We suggested the addition of the following "...settlement boundary, and is identified as a "logical" rounding off of the settlement boundary.."

Recommendation

The Council notes the desired change proposed by the Countryside Council for Wales in respect of rounding off. However, the Council is of the view that the concerns expressed by the desired change are adequately addressed by the modified paragraph 4.4.45. This states that "All site boundaries should be existing man made or natural physical features. Arbitrary lines drawn for the convenience of plot size do not qualify as such."

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 88 **Accession No.** 2855 **Modification No.** E34

Representation

CCW is concerned at the opportunity for "rounding off" on the edges of settlement boundaries. It appears that settlement boundaries have been established around settlements, therefore the opportunity for rounding off should have already been assessed and the boundaries drawn accordingly.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Policy HOUS 2 and the relevant reasoned justification have been revised in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations REC 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 4.5, 4.64, 4.66 and 4.68 to permit, subject to the provisions of HOUS 9, housing infill, small-scale development and redevelopment and rounding-off.

It was the view of the Inspector that previous versions of the Plan were overly restrictive and those settlement boundaries had been drawn so tightly around the built up areas of HOUS 2 settlements as to cause an unnecessary degree of constraint. The Council considers that only those settlements identified in HOUS 2 have sufficient physical form and capacity to facilitate further development. The Inspector considered that this approach was not consistent with government guidance at the time, Planning Guidance (Wales) Planning Policy First Revision 1999, nor indeed with current guidance, Planning Policy Wales 22002, which considers that infilling or minor extensions to existing settlements may be acceptable (paragraph 2.5.7).

The revised policies and reasoned justification therefore permit infill, small scale development and redevelopment and rounding off that is within or closely related to defined settlement boundaries provided that it meets the criteria listed within policy HOUS 9.

The Council notes the concerns expressed by the Countryside Council for Wales in respect of the above amendments. However, it is considered that while the amendments made introduce a level of flexibility to the approach taken by the Council in assessing development within or adjacent to settlement boundaries, the overall objectives of policies HOUS 2 and HOUS 9 and their reasoned justifications, remains robust. In association with other environmental protection policies within the Plan the Council is confident that inappropriate development can be resisted.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken
Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 89 **Accession No.** 2856 **Modification No.** E35

Representation

CCW is concerned at the opportunity for "rounding off" on the edges of settlement boundaries. It appears that settlement boundaries have been established around settlement, therefore the opportunity for rounding off, should have been assessed and the boundaries drawn accordingly.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Policy HOUS 2 and the relevant reasoned justification have been revised in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations REC 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 4.5, 4.64, 4.66 and 4.68 to permit, subject to the provisions of HOUS 9, housing infill, small-scale development and redevelopment and rounding-off.

It was the view of the Inspector that previous versions of the Plan were overly restrictive and those settlement boundaries had been drawn so tightly around the built up areas of HOUS 2 settlements as to cause an unnecessary degree of constraint. The Council considers that only those settlements identified in HOUS 2 have sufficient physical form and capacity to facilitate further development. The Inspector considered that this approach was not consistent with government guidance at the time, Planning Guidance (Wales) Planning Policy First Revision 1999, nor indeed with current guidance, Planning Policy Wales 22002, which considers that infilling or minor extensions to existing settlements may be acceptable (paragraph 2.5.7).

The revised policies and reasoned justification therefore permit infill, small scale development and redevelopment and rounding off that is within or closely related to defined settlement boundaries provided that it meets the criteria listed within policy HOUS 9.

The Council notes the concerns expressed by the Countryside Council for Wales in respect of the above amendments. However, it is considered that while the amendments made introduce a level of flexibility to the approach taken by the Council in assessing development within or adjacent to settlement boundaries, the overall objectives of policies HOUS 2 and HOUS 9 and their reasoned justifications, remains robust. In association with other environmental protection policies within the Plan the Council is confident that inappropriate development can be resisted.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Environment Agency

Contact Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247

Representation No. 101

Accession No. 3130

Modification No. N088

Representation

Any development of this proposed site must be designed to incorporate the pond as a feature within the site. This is not an OBJECTION to the allocation of the site.

Desired Change

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Environment Agency

Contact Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247

Representation No. 102

Accession No. 3131

Modification No. N099

Representation

Any development of this proposed site must be designed to incorporate the pond as a feature within the site. This is not an OBJECTION to the allocation of the site.

Desired Change

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country

Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation House Builders Federation **Contact** Mr. Gareth Williams

Representor No. 249 **Representation No.** 23 **Accession No.** 3031 **Modification No.** E04

Representation

The House Builders Federation objects to the Council's approach to only partly accepting the Inspector's Recommendations in respect of Strategic Policy 3. The HBF Supports the Council's acceptance of the Inspector's recommendation in terms of the housing requirement figure but is concerned at the way it intends to meet this new figure. Provision for Housing in Cowbridge: The HBF does not normally become involved in site specifics but in this instance considers it necessary to object to the lack of housing provision in Cowbridge. The Inspector in his report considered there were several draw-backs with the approach being taken by the council to housing provision in Cowbridge. Firstly, he considered that given the restrictive nature of the delineated settlement boundary and the fact that the future provision by windfall and conversion is likely to decrease further there was a need for further housing provision to be made for Cowbridge (IR C7.0.3). Secondly, he considered that given there were no residential developments to serve the principal employment location at Llandow, Llantwit Major and Cowbridge were the closest settlements that currently provide sufficient shopping, leisure and public transport facilities to accommodate the residential needs of such an employment centre (IR C7.0.5). He also considered that additional commuting caused by Llandow employment development was inevitable and if it is to be minimised then either one or other or both these settlements should help relieve the development pressure caused. The Inspector favoured Cowbridge to fulfil this role due to it being "a small country town with a public transport system to serve the rural villages" (IR C7.0.6). The Inspector considered that "some limited development is not only possible but desirable if Cowbridge is to maintain its important service and function in the Rural Vale" (IR C7.0.6). The Inspector concluded "The plan provides no reasonable allocations for Cowbridge within the plan period and is patently too restrictive for such a vibrant small town. Consequently I consider that an allocation should be made providing for about 250 dwellings during the remainder of the plan period. Such an allocation, given the other restrictive policies that still apply in the Rural Vale, is not so large as to undermine the strategy which allocates major development to the settlements of the Waterfront Strip" (IR C7.0.7). The HBF concurs with this statement. The UDP fails to accommodate for the sustainable growth of Cowbridge and fails to deal in a sustainable manner with the Llandow employment allocation. Therefore, the HBF considers that the council have failed to properly consider the Inspector's recommendations in respect of Cowbridge. Density Increases: The council have responded to the shortfall of housing by increasing densities on existing allocations without providing a justification of their new assessment. The claim that "due to increased building densities" South Quay will yield 100 (double the anticipated rate) and an extra 400 at Barry Waterfront is not sufficiently robust. The Inspector estimated that these two sites would yield an extra 100 each. The council need to set out their assessment of the density of these sites in relation to the site constraints, proximity of neighbouring uses, the need to provide open space etc. Double counting of small sites: The HBF objected to the double counting of small sites, which the Inspector agreed with and the authority accepted, yet the council are attempting to do the exact same thing again. The inclusion of The Limes and the River Walk site in the list of allocated sites will result in the double counting of small sites. These two sites must be deleted. Inclusion of Land at edge of northern settlement boundary: The inclusion of 12 ha of land within the settlement boundary to the north of Cowbridge in line with the Inspectors recommendation is supported. However, the council's reluctance to allocate the site and the reasoned justification suggested for inclusion leads the HBF to conclude there is little chance of this site being able to contribute to the sustainable growth of Cowbridge.

Desired Change

Allocate more land for housing in Cowbridge. Provide more detailed analysis of the density forecasts. Delete the Limes and the River Walk from Policy HOUS 1.

Recommendation

The Council is satisfied that the sites allocated for housing will adequately meet the dwelling requirements for The Vale of Glamorgan over the plan period. This is supported in the latest Joint Housing Land Availability Study (April 2002), indicating that the Vale currently has a 7.5 housing supply (excluding windfall sites).

Whilst the Council is satisfied that it can meet its housing requirements fully without allocating this land for housing, the Council has considered the inclusion of the land at the edge of the northern settlement boundary of Cowbridge to be a logical settlement boundary for Cowbridge. The proposed modification identifies the sites potential as a windfall site, which would be appropriate for development within the latter part of the plan period. This site has been subject to an assessment, which concluded that the site would be capable of accommodating approximately 250 dwellings. Consequently, the Council is of the opinion that sufficient land is available within the settlement boundary for Cowbridge during the plan period.

Whilst the Limes and River Walk allocated sites contribute 6 dwellings each, the Council considers it justifiable to include these within the overall housing contribution as they both are uncompleted sites, whose capacity was originally over 10 dwellings each. Furthermore, these sites are included within the annual Joint Housing Land Availability Study, and as such would not be subject to double counting as you have suggested.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Dinas Powys Community Council

Contact

Representor No. 262 **Representation No.** 10 **Accession No.** 2815 **Modification No.** N071

Representation

Support

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Dinas Powys Community Council

Contact

Representor No. 262 **Representation No.** 11 **Accession No.** 2816 **Modification No.** N010

Representation

Support

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation

Contact Mrs. J.K. Williams

Representor No. 307 **Representation No.** 3 **Accession No.** 3107 **Modification No.** NO30

Representation

The changes to the settlement boundary for Llantwit-Major/Boverton proposed under MOD NO30 are supported because they now include the garden of Orchard Farm House and the ancillary buildings in the garden, within the settlement boundary.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation

Contact Mr. T Bowles

Representor No. 332 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 2916 **Modification No.** N010

Representation

In REC 3.10, and in the body of his report, the Inspector argued quite forcibly that (3.3.19) "Logical settlement boundaries around settlements that are considered as being outside a countryside designation, should include land which is being used for residential purposes within such settlements". As such, his subsequent recommendation 4.55 (as incorporated in MOD N010) to exclude properties at Westra/St Andrews Road is entirely inconsistent with his earlier expressed views. These properties are, in the main, a long standing feature, and comprise part of the settlement of Dinas Powys. They should not, as such, be excluded from settlement limits on the possibility of the introduction of more restrictive control over development in this area (Inspectors report recommendation REC 3.20 - 3.23).

Desired Change

Deletion of MOD N010 as currently proposed, and the substitution of a revised settlement boundary, in accordance with REC 3.10 (MOD's N057 - N110) recognising garden curtilages and taking in immediately contiguous properties on the south side of the Westra, and others such as St.Hilary to the north of the Westra.

Recommendation

The Council has amended the Dinas Powys residential settlement boundary in accordance with the Inspector's Rec. 4.55. It is considered that "although this ribbon form of development is attached to the main urban area of Dinas Powys, it does not clearly represent the urban form and character of the settlement as a whole and is more rural in character".

The Inspector also noted that this area has a similar rural character to that which exists at Southra which is not included within the settlement boundary. Therefore, in order to ensure consistency the Council considers that the dwellings to the west of St Andrew's school should be excluded from the Dinas Powys residential settlement boundary.

The Inspector's Rec. 3.10 only refers to dwellings within the residential settlement boundaries which have previously had their gardens severed to prevent additional inappropriate development. The Council has accepted this recommendation and is confident that the revised Policy HOUS9 would prevent such development occurring.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Harmer Partnership

Contact Mr. Laurence Forse

Representor No. 356

Representation No. 35

Accession No. 2931

Modification No. E36

Representation

The original policy HOUS 2 and its supporting text was based on a restrictive definition of "in filling". Notwithstanding that the Inspector recommended a less restrictive policy permitting "...infill, small scale development and redevelopment." and the policy has been recommended for change (MOD E34) the supporting text has not been subject to comprehensive and complementary rewording. The introduction of a new paragraph after paragraph 4.4.44 (MOD E35) and an amended paragraph 4.4.45 do not read consistently with the policy proposed by the Inspector. Despite the revised policy-permitting small scale development constituting "rounding off". MOD E35 suggests development outside settlement boundaries is unacceptable in principle, and that such provision should be restricted to affordable housing. The modification proposed is therefore inconsistent with the policy proposed. Similarly, MOD E36 does not fully recognise the revised scope of the policy and reads in a stilted fashion. The introduction of a single sentence in the middle of the paragraph does not adequately deal with the change of emphasis of the policy. The whole of the paragraph needs re-drafting to espouse the Inspectors recommendation. The continuing reliance on a restrictive definition of in filling is confusing, and despite the reference to small scale rounding off, the paragraph then continues to refer to: "Each proposal, is accepted as in filling". Clearly rounding off and small scale development may not be in filling, and the suggested addition to the end of the paragraph referring to the exception provided by HOUS 14 is unnecessary and again suggests that development outside settlement limits will not be permitted.

Desired Change

- (1) Delete MOD E35 as this is not consistent with the Inspector's recommendation. (2) Delete MODE36 in its present form. Substitute revised text consistent with the revised policy MOD E34 making it clear that small scale development and rounding off may be acceptable within and adjoining settlement boundaries, and as such references to restrictive definitions of infill development may be deleted from the policy.

Recommendation

While the supporting text at 4.4.44 outlines the overall objective of Policy HOUS 2 to restrict residential development in the countryside and to prevent urban sprawl, the policy clearly states that housing infill, small-scale development, redevelopment and rounding off will be permitted subject to the criteria listed in Policy HOUS 9 and the acceptance of logical boundaries. However, the Council accepts the criticism of the supporting paragraph 4.4.45 and has amended it to clarify the situation with regard to infilling and rounding off as follows:

4.4.45 The Council considers only those villages listed under Policy HOUS 2 to have sufficient physical form and capacity to assimilate further infill development without it having a detrimental impact on the existing character and environment. An infill plot is defined as a site enclosed or surrounded by existing development in the sense of the filling of a small gap within an

otherwise built up frontage. The fact that an infill site exists, however, does not mean this will automatically receive planning permission. Small scale rounding off, which for the purpose of this Plan is defined as development which constitutes no more than five dwellings, may also be permitted where the site lies immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary and conforms to a logical site boundary. All site boundaries should be existing man made or natural physical features. Arbitrary lines drawn for the convenience of plot size do not qualify as such. Each proposal, if accepted as infilling or rounding off, will be assessed against the policy criteria and will need to be considered in the context of the relationship to areas of attractive landscape, high quality townscape and areas of historical, archaeological or ecological importance. (See also HOUS 14 Exception Sites for Affordable Housing in the Rural Vale).

Policy HOUS 14 is referenced to clarify the Council's position in respect of exception sites for affordable housing, criteria (1) of which provides that development must be within or adjoining the existing residential settlement boundary. Provided therefore that a clear need can be demonstrated for affordable housing, the Council will, subject to the provisions of the criteria listed and other policies within the Plan, permit development proposals for affordable housing adjacent to residential settlement boundaries that may not be considered to be infilling or rounding off.

CHANGE AS DESCRIBED

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Harmer Partnership

Contact Mr. Laurence Forse

Representor No. 356

Representation No. 36

Accession No. 2932

Modification No. E35

Representation

The original policy HOUS 2 and its supporting text was based on a restrictive definition of "in filling". Notwithstanding that the Inspector recommended a less restrictive policy permitting "...infill, small scale development and redevelopment..." and the policy has been recommended for change (MOD E34) the supporting text has not been subject to comprehensive and complementary rewording. The introduction of a new paragraph after paragraph 4.4.44 (MOD E35) and an amended paragraph 4.4.45 do not read consistently with the policy proposed by the Inspector. Despite the revised policy permitting small scale development constituting "rounding off", MOD E35 suggests development outside settlement boundaries is unacceptable in principle, and that such provision should be restricted to affordable housing. The modification proposed is therefore inconsistent with the policy proposed. Similarly, MOD E36 does not fully recognise the revised scope of the policy and reads in a stilted fashion. The introduction of a single sentence in the middle of the paragraph does not adequately deal with the change of emphasis of the policy. The whole of the paragraph needs re-drafting to espouse the Inspectors recommendation. The continuing reliance on a restrictive definition of in filling is confusing, and despite the reference to small scale rounding off, the paragraph then continues to refer to: "Each proposal, is accepted as in filling". Clearly rounding off and small scale development may not be in filling, and the suggested addition to the end of the paragraph referring to the exception provided by HOUS 14 is unnecessary and again suggests that development outside settlement limits will not be permitted.

Desired Change

(1) Delete MOD E35 as this is not consistent with the Inspector's recommendation. (2) Delete MOD E36 in its present form. Substitute revised text with the revised policy MOD E34 making it clear that small scale development and rounding off may be acceptable within and adjoining settlement boundaries, and such reference to restrictive definitions of infill development may be deleted from the policy.

Recommendation

While the supporting text at 4.4.44 outlines the overall objective of Policy HOUS 2 to restrict residential development in the countryside and to prevent urban sprawl, the policy clearly states that housing infill, small-scale development, redevelopment and rounding off will be permitted subject to the criteria listed in Policy HOUS 9 and the acceptance of logical boundaries. However, the Council accepts the criticism of the supporting paragraph 4.4.45 and has amended it to clarify the situation with regard to infilling and rounding off as follows:

4.4.45 The Council considers only those villages listed under Policy HOUS 2 to have sufficient physical form and capacity to assimilate further infill development without it having a detrimental impact on the existing character and environment. An infill plot is defined as a site enclosed or surrounded by existing development in the sense of the filling of a small gap within an otherwise built up frontage. The fact that an infill site exists, however, does not mean this will automatically receive planning permission. Small scale rounding off, which for the purpose of this Plan is defined as development which constitutes no more than five dwellings, may also be permitted where the site lies immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary and conforms to a logical site boundary. All site boundaries should be existing man made or natural physical features. Arbitrary lines drawn for the convenience of plot size do not qualify as such. Each proposal, if accepted as infilling or rounding off, will be assessed against the policy criteria and will need to be considered in the context of the relationship to areas of attractive landscape, high quality townscape and areas of historical, archaeological or ecological importance. (See also HOUS 14 Exception Sites for Affordable Housing in the Rural Vale).

Policy HOUS 14 is referenced to clarify the Council's position in respect of exception sites for affordable housing, criteria (1) of which provides that development must be within or adjoining the existing residential settlement boundary. Provided therefore that a clear need can be demonstrated for affordable housing, the Council will, subject to the provisions of the criteria listed and other policies within the Plan, permit development proposals for affordable housing adjacent to residential settlement boundaries that may not be considered to be infilling or rounding off.

CHANGE AS DESCRIBED

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Contact Mr. S. Whitehead
Representor No. 462 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 1691 **Modification No.** N104

Representation

While accepting Modification No. 104 to the Unitary Development Plan, which goes part of the way to meeting the Inspector's recommendation to the settlement boundary for Ystradowen, Mr. Whithead, the owner of "Tregof", is of the opinion that he has to object to the omission of the remainder of his residential curtilage from within the settlement boundary. This omission goes against the Inspector's recommendation in his "Report on the Objections" to the UDP in "Chapter 3 - Environment", paragraph 3.3.19, which states:-"Consequently, it seems to me that logical residential settlement boundaries around settlements that are considered as being outside a countryside designation, should include the land which is being used for residential purposes within such settlements." The Inspector goes on to state:- "The Council's approach is in my view subjective and manipulative and as result the settlement boundaries are often illogical." It is noted that the Council in the Draft Proposed Modifications - December 2002" in Mod No. 57 --- N110 REC 3.10 state :- "Reason. In accordance with the Inspector's reasoning and recommendation, the Council has undertaken an assessment of all the settlements identified in the Inspector's modified Policy HOUS 2 (REC.3.7 refers) and proposes to amend the defined residential settlement boundaries to include the curtilages of residential buildings within them." Naturally, in the light of these comments, Mr. Whithead has some difficulty in understanding why much of his residential curtilage has been excluded from the modification settlement boundary. Mr. Whithead is aware of other modifications proposed for the settlement of Ystradowen which seem to include all the residential curtilage of the properties involved. He is also aware of the Council's proposals for other settlements which appear to include complete residential curtilages.

Desired Change

The land edged red on the plan (1:2500) submitted with the representation form which is part of the residential curtilage of "Tregof", should be included within the settlement boundary for Ystradowen to comply with the requirements of the Inspector and the intent of the Council.

Recommendation

The proposed modification to amend the UDP proposals map accepts the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.10) that the residential settlement boundaries be revised to include the residential curtilages of the residential buildings included within them. The Inspector concluded in his report "that logical residential settlement boundaries around settlements that are considered as being outside a countryside designation, should include the land which is being used for residential purposes within such settlements."

The Council considers that MOD N104 should be maintained as it revises the Ystradowen settlement boundary to include the entire garden curtilage of the existing property at 'Tregof', and is therefore in accordance with the Inspectors recommendation. The revised settlement boundary reflects the existing garden serving the property.

The Council does not accept that the red line shown on your submitted plan would represent a logical boundary. A search of the planning history of the site also reveals that an Inspector at appeal (reference APP 72/25) concluded that the land to which you refer "projects significantly beyond the existing village limits". Despite the existence of a tennis court in this area, the site is clearly a field and not in residential use. The designation of this land within the residential settlement boundary would create an unnecessary intrusion into the countryside. It should be noted however that Policy HOUS 2 does allow for favourable consideration to be given (other than within areas identified as green wedges), to small-scale development which constitutes the "rounding off" of the edge of settlement boundaries where it can be shown to be consistent with the provisions of Policy HOUS 9 and particularly Criterion (1).

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Contact Mr. Neil.T Moaksom
Representor No. 517 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 1765 **Modification No.** N060

Representation

The settlement boundary appears to cut through the middle of my garden to the rear of the property. NB. Please see copy of attached letter second page for information

Desired Change

The settlement boundary position amended to include the whole of my garden.

Recommendation

The proposed modification MOD N060 to amend the UDP proposals map accepts the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.10) that the residential settlement boundaries should be revised to include the residential curtilages of the residential buildings included within them. MOD N060 does not relate to your objection, but to Ty-Mawr. However, the Council acknowledges that the settlement boundary as shown in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended 2003), appears to divide the residential curtilage of your property and the settlement boundary for Bonvilston shall therefore be amended accordingly.

AGREED. Amend Bonvilston settlement boundary.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Contact Mr. & Mrs. John & Bridget Otto-Jones

Representor No. 518 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 1766 **Modification No.** N090

Representation

We support the realignment of the settlement boundary as shown on UDP modifications REC 3.10 St Nicholas dated 11th December 2001 and being proposed modification N090.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Contact Mr. Nicholas Hourmont

Representor No. 571 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 2941 **Modification No.** N089

Representation

I am at a loss to understand why my paddock has not been included in the recent UDP Modifications particularly as the land directly adjoining the northern boundary of the paddock (Mod 89) has now been brought into the UDP. The paddock is surrounded to the west, south and now the north by properties and their curtilages which are within the settlement boundary and to the east there is a large mature hedge which forms a natural boundary to St.Nicholas. The hedge joins exactly with the curtilages of the properties to the north and south of the paddock making an obvious straight line to the St.Nicholas settlement boundary. It seems so logical and obvious especially when viewing a plan or aerial photograph - which I enclose - that the paddock is physically within St.Nicholas and if it left out of the UDP it just makes a strange and unnatural indentation into what should be an obvious straight line. An inspection of the site would also show this anomaly. The paddock has no agricultural use whatsoever and I consider its hedge just as much a curtilage to my property as other UDP modifications in St.Nicholas particularly as it is my only means of access to another part of my garden which joins the south-western boundary to the paddock. (see enclosed map). For more than 30 years the site has been used solely for the keeping of horses and ponies, a use which is now totally impractical due to the residential nature surrounding the area. This results in the animals being unable to enjoy the peace they need and deserve because of barbecues, parties with outdoor sound systems, general garden noise and the tipping of garden refuse and most of all because of the ridiculously loud fireworks which are now used for any excuse. My paddock is not open countryside. This starts immediately to the east of the aforementioned hedge. It is simply a small area of land adjoining Laurence House and lies within St Nicholas. In view of this would you please give your most serious consideration to the inclusion of the paddock within the recent proposed modifications.

Desired Change

Inclusion of paddock within settlement boundary for St.Nicholas.

Recommendation

In the first instance, it should be noted that an objection of this nature should have been raised during the Deposit Stage of the Plan. Notwithstanding this, the following points are relevant in this case.

In the Inspector's Rec.3.10 it states that "...the Council should) amend the defined settlement boundaries to include the curtilages of the residential buildings within them". As part of the Modifications process this was carried out by Council officers, who studied the areas in question in order to determine the new boundaries, this was carried out using GIS mapping, aerial photographs and work on the ground.

The Council notes your representation but does not accept that the 'paddock' in question constitutes an inclusion within the

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

settlement boundary of St Nicholas. In Para.3.3.19 of his Report, the Inspector states that "...logical residential settlement boundaries around settlements that are considered as being outside a countryside designation, should include the land which is being used for residential purposes within such settlements". In this case your paddock is not used for residential purposes but, as stated in your representation, "...solely for the keeping of horses and ponies...".

In the General Permitted Development Order, 1995, Schedule 2, Part 1, Para.3B-2055 the definition of a curtilage is recognised as that determined by the Oxford English Dictionary, which is: "A small court, yard, garth or piece of ground attached to a dwellinghouse, and forming one enclosure with it...the area attached to and containing a dwellinghouse...". The document further states that "...that kind of ground usually attached to a dwellinghouse would be a garden".

The definitions above again suggest that your 'paddock' cannot be determined as any part of the curtilage to your property and is therefore a standalone element of the open countryside. With respect, however, to MOD 89, the designated area to the north of your paddock has been recognised as within the curtilage of Broadway House and is therefore classified as garden.

To include your paddock would constitute an unjustified and illogical extension to the settlement boundary of St Nicholas and this would contravene Policy HOUS 2 (UDPDD 1998, as amended 2003).

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation

Contact Mr. Neil McLean

Representor No. 591

Representation No. 2

Accession No. 2717

Modification No. E35

Representation

Policy HOUS 2 states that "favourable consideration will be given to small scale development, which constitutes the rounding-off of the edge of settlement boundaries where it can be shown to be consistent with the provisions of Policy HOUS 9 and particularly with criterion(l)." The proposed modified paragraph 4.4.45 then states that small scale rounding off, which for the purposes of this Plan is defined as development which constitutes no more than 5 dwellings, will be permitted where the site lies immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. But Policy HOUS 2 does not refer to "small scale rounding off" it refers only to "small scale development" and I believe that the reasoned justification should, therefore, be more precise and refer to the same words that appear in the policy itself. I believe also that the definition of small scale development should be more explicit. The definition only says that it is development which constitutes no more than 5 dwellings but it is not clear what kind of development is included below this upper limit. Since this is a housing policy, then I think that the reasoned justification should make it clear that small scale development referred to is only housing and housing related developments, such as garages, driveways, ancillary buildings etc. (See section 6 for suggested amendments to wording).

Desired Change

Paragraph 4.4.5 which is part of the reasoned justification for Policy HOUS 2 should be changed to read as follows:

... Small scale development, which for the purposes of this Policy is defined as housing and housing related development not exceeding five dwellings, will be permitted where the site lies within or immediately adjacent to

Recommendation

While the supporting text at 4.4.44 outlines the overall objective of Policy HOUS 2 to restrict residential development in the countryside and to prevent urban sprawl, the policy clearly states that housing infill, small-scale development, redevelopment and rounding off will be permitted subject to the criteria listed in Policy HOUS 9 and the acceptance of logical boundaries. However, the Council accepts the criticism of the supporting paragraph 4.4.45 and has amended it to clarify the situation with regard to infilling and rounding off as follows:

4.4.45 The Council considers only those villages listed under Policy HOUS 2 to have sufficient physical form and capacity to assimilate further infill development without it having a detrimental impact on the existing character and environment. An infill plot is defined as a site enclosed or surrounded by existing development in the sense of the filling of a small gap within an otherwise built up frontage. The fact that an infill site exists, however, does not mean this will automatically receive planning permission. Small scale rounding off, which for the purpose of this Plan is defined as development which constitutes no more than five dwellings, may also be permitted where the site lies immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary and conforms to a logical site boundary. All site boundaries should be existing man made or natural physical features. Arbitrary lines drawn for the convenience of plot size do not qualify as such. Each proposal, if accepted as infilling or rounding off, will be assessed against the policy criteria and will need to be considered in the context of the relationship to areas of attractive landscape, high quality townscape and areas of historical, archaeological or ecological importance. (See also HOUS 14 Exception Sites for Affordable Housing in the Rural Vale).

Finally, the Council rejects your representation regarding the change to the written justification to also include housing related developments as constituting rounding off. This is considered to be unnecessary as the chapter is house specific and other ancillary residential development would be considered in respect of other policies contained within the Plan.

CHANGE AS DESCRIBED

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation

Contact

Mr. Russell Evans

Representor No. 617

Representation Nos. .1 & .2

Accession No. 2791

Modification Nos. E34 & E36

Representation

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The objection is to amended Policy HOUS 2, modification number E34, of the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft – Proposed Modification (Draft UDP).

1.2 It is proposed that the site be included within the settlement boundary for the Cowbridge and Llanblethian settlement.

1.3 Objection is also lodged to the wording of proposed amendment paragraph 4.4.45 of the Draft UDP. The proposed amendments states:

“Small scale rounding off which for the purposes of this plan is identified as development which constitutes no more than 5 dwellings, will be permitted where the site lies within or immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary.”

1.4 A plan indicating the objection site is attached.

2.0 Summary objection

2.1 the objection can be summarised in the following main points:

1. The development of the site would be a minor extension of the existing settlement.
2. Development can be accommodated in terms of access and infrastructure.
3. There will be no adverse impact on landscape and would be of an appropriate character and design.
4. A choice of housing would be provided in the area.
5. There are no readily available sites in the locality.

3.0 The objection

Minor extensions to existing settlement

Paragraph 9.3.1 of Planning Policy Wales states that ‘new housing development should be well integrated with and connected to the existing pattern of settlements’.

The objection site is well within the existing form of development of Llanblethian. It is situated on the main arterial route through this part of the settlement. It is situated between existing housing development. To the west is Marlborough Farm, which fronts on to the road and defines what is the beginning of the settlement on the approach from the west. Indeed the village sign is situated further to the west and thereby includes the objection site within its natural boundaries. There is therefore ‘built-up’ frontage on either side of the site.

Planning Policy Wales also identifies that the expansion of towns and villages should avoid creating a ‘ribbon development’, coalescence of settlement or a fragmented development pattern. Whilst the development of the objection site would result in development on one side of the road, the opposite side contains the remnants of an ancient castle, resulting in a rising land form and setting the contained context for the settlement of this area. The objection site would not therefore be seen as ‘ribbon development’, especially as it would be within the context of the built form of the village and its historic development.

Choice of housing and available sites

Planning Policy Wales advocates a greater choice of housing and the location of which people live. In the immediate area there is little site availability given the tightly drawn settlement boundary and lack of available ‘infill’ plots. Development of the objection site would provide opportunity for houses in this part of the settlement in line with an appropriate distribution of houses in rural areas in accordance with the Government Sustainability Objectives. Further development would allow a small portion of affordable houses as part of the new development, thereby contributing to the tenure mix and vitality of the community in this part of Llanblethian.

Character and amenity

The development of the site would not change the character and amenity of the area. Frontage development along the objection site would fit in with those properties already adjacent to the site. The character of this part of Llanblethian is that of development along the road through this part of the village with development along its frontages. The objection site development would continue that character.

The site has long distance views from the south-west where it would be seen in the context of development along the ridgeline of the road. Most views of the site are from the immediate area where there is already an impression gained of the village environment given the adjacent development.

4.0 There are no constraints to the development of the objection site. It can be readily accessed and there are no environmental or other constraints to its development.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

5.0 The Council's suggested wording of paragraph 4.4.45 of the Draft UDP to limit 'round off' to 5 dwellings is not accepted. The issue with 'rounding off' is how the development site fits in with the form and character of the settlement. Whilst it is accepted that in some smaller settlements, less than 5 dwellings may be appropriate on a 'round off' site in the case of this objection site, the scale of the settlement into which it adjoins is large. There is therefore scope for more than 5 dwellings to be added to the settlement without ruining its character. There is no logical reason why 'round off' sites should only be limited to 5 dwellings.

Desired Change

Inclusion of the site within the Cowbridge with Llanblethian settlement boundary.

Recommendation

In accordance with the Inspector's recommendations REC 3.7, REC 4.64, REC 4.66 and REC 4.68, the Council has made Modification E34 to allow rounding off, infill and small-scale development within urban and rural settlements as identified in policy HOUS2. This policy is a general policy and is not site specific. That is, it does not identify sites within those settlements listed.

The objection site that you propose for inclusion within the settlement boundary for Cowbridge with Llanblethian, was not included at the Deposit Draft stage in 1998, and as such would have not been considered by the Inspector. Therefore it is the view of the Council, that your objection to the exclusion of this site is a new issue that cannot be addressed at the modification stage of the Unitary Development Plan process. Your representation on this matter therefore is considered by the Council to be not duly made.

Notwithstanding the Council's decision on the validity of your representation, for information, I have addressed below the primary issues raised in your representation.

The Council therefore does not consider the identified site to be a minor extension or rounding off of the settlement of Cowbridge with Llanblethian. The Council considers that the development of the site would form ribbon development within the countryside that would clearly be contrary to Planning Policy Wales 2002 paragraph 9.3.1. In addition, amended paragraph 4.4.45 of the Plan clearly states that in considering additional small-scale development, all site boundaries should be existing man made or natural physical features, not arbitrary lines drawn for the convenience of plot size. The site identified in your representation is clearly contrary to this.

With regard to your objection to the limiting of small-scale rounding-off sites to no more than 5 dwellings, the Council has accepted the Inspector's reasoning and recommendation on this matter (REC 3.7 and REC 3.8) that seek to clarify the Council's previous stance on minor extensions to existing settlements.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation		Contact	Mr. Russell Evans
Representor No.	617	Representation No.	3
		Accession No.	2792
		Modification No.	REC 3.10

Representation

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The objection is to amended Policy HOUS 2, modification number E34, of the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft – Proposed Modification (Draft UDP).

1.2 It is proposed that the site be included within the settlement boundary for the Cowbridge and Llanblethian settlement.

1.3 Objection is also lodged to the wording of proposed amendment paragraph 4.4.45 of the Draft UDP. The proposed amendments states:

"Small scale rounding off which for the purposes of this plan is identified as development which constitutes no more than 5 dwellings, will be permitted where the site lies within or immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary." 1.4 A plan indicating the objection site is attached.

2.0 Summary objection

2.1 the objection can be summarised in the following main points:

1. The development of the site would be a minor extension of the existing settlement.
2. Development can be accommodated in terms of access and infrastructure.
3. There will be no adverse impact on landscape and would be of an appropriate character and design.
4. A choice of housing would be provided in the area.
5. There are no readily available sites in the locality.

3.0 The objection

Minor extensions to existing settlement

Paragraph 9.3.1 of Planning Policy Wales states that 'new housing development should be well integrated with and connected to the existing pattern of settlements'.

The objection site is well within the existing form of development of Llanblethian. It is situated on the main arterial route through this part of the settlement. It is situated between existing housing development. To the west is Marlborough Farm, which fronts on to the road and defines what is the beginning of the settlement on the approach from the west. Indeed the village sign is situated further to the west and thereby includes the objection site within its natural boundaries. There is therefore 'built-up' frontage on either side of the site.

Planning Policy Wales also identifies that the expansion of towns and villages should avoid creating a 'ribbon development', coalescence of settlement or a fragmented development pattern. Whilst the development of the objection site would result in development on one side of the road, the opposite side contains the remnants of an ancient castle, resulting in a rising land form and setting the contained context for the settlement of this area. The objection site would not therefore be seen as 'ribbon development', especially as it would be within the context of the built form of the village and its historic development.

Choice of housing and available sites

Planning Policy Wales advocates a greater choice of housing and the location of which people live. In the immediate area there is little site availability given the tightly drawn settlement boundary and lack of available 'infill' plots. Development of the objection site would provide opportunity for houses in this part of the settlement in line with an appropriate distribution of houses in rural areas in accordance with the Government Sustainability Objectives. Further development would allow a small portion of affordable houses as part of the new development, thereby contributing to the tenure mix and vitality of the community in this part of Llanblethian.

Character and amenity

The development of the site would not change the character and amenity of the area. Frontage development along the objection site would fit in with those properties already adjacent to the site. The character of this part of Llanblethian is that of development along the road through this part of the village with development along its frontages. The objection site development would continue that character.

The site has long distance views from the south-west where it would be seen in the context of development along the ridgeline of the road. Most views of the site are from the immediate area where there is already an impression gained of the village environment given the adjacent development.

4.0 There are no constraints to the development of the objection site. It can be readily accessed and there are no environmental or other constraints to its development.

5.0 The Council's suggested wording of paragraph 4.4.45 of the Draft UDP to limit 'round off' to 5 dwellings is not accepted. The issue with 'rounding off' is how the development site fits in with the form and character of the settlement. Whilst it is accepted that in some smaller settlements, less than 5 dwellings may be appropriate on a 'round off' site in the case of this objection site, the scale of the settlement into which it adjoins is large. There is therefore scope for more than 5 dwellings to be added to the settlement without ruining its character. There is no logical reason why 'round off' sites should only be limited to 5 dwellings.

Desired Change

The inclusion of the site within the Cowbridge with Llanblethian settlement boundary

Recommendation

In accordance with the Inspector's recommendations REC 3.7, REC 4.64, REC 4.66 and REC 4.68, the Council has made Modification E34 to allow rounding off, infill and small-scale development within urban and rural settlements as identified in policy HOUS2. This policy is a general policy and is not site specific. That is, it does not identify sites within those settlements listed.

The objection site that you propose for inclusion within the settlement boundary for Cowbridge with Llanblethian, was not included at the Deposit Draft stage in 1998, and as such would have not been considered by the Inspector. Therefore it is the view of the Council, that your objection to the exclusion of this site is a new issue that cannot be addressed at the modification stage of the Unitary Development Plan process. Your representation on this matter therefore is considered by the Council to be not duly made.

Notwithstanding the Council's decision on the validity of your representation, for information, I have addressed below the primary issues raised in your representation.

The Council therefore does not consider the identified site to be a minor extension or rounding off of the settlement of Cowbridge with Llanblethian. The Council considers that the development of the site would form ribbon development within the countryside that would clearly be contrary to Planning Policy Wales 2002 paragraph 9.3.1. In addition, amended paragraph 4.4.45 of the Plan clearly states that in considering additional small-scale development, all site boundaries should be existing man made or natural physical features, not arbitrary lines drawn for the convenience of plot size. The site identified in your representation is clearly contrary to this.

With regard to your objection to the limiting of small-scale rounding-off sites to no more than 5 dwellings, the Council has accepted the Inspector's reasoning and recommendation on this matter (REC 3.7 and REC 3.8) that seek to clarify the Council's previous stance on minor extensions to existing settlements.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Contact MR & MRS K.W & J Ward
Representor No. 620 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 1898 **Modification No.** N089

Representation

I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL MOD NO89

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Contact Mr. Stephen C Powell
Representor No. 655 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 1942 **Modification No.** N079

Representation

In relation to my property Ty Uchaf, School Lane, Llancarfan, in the Vale of Glamorgan the modified plan prepared by the Council does not correctly indicate the curtilage of my property. I attach herewith office copy entries and file plans in relation to the property and the title numbers WA 167723 and WA 183826. There are two separate title numbers because I had to give security to Barclays Bank Plc and I only wished to give them security over part of my property and as such the title deeds were not consolidated. Both parcels of land are in constant use and form the curtilage of Ty Uchaf, Llancarfan. The plan provided by the Council has not been amended in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations REC3.10 as it has not amended the defined residential settlement boundaries to include the residential curtilages of Ty Uchaf, Llancarfan within the plan.

Desired Change

Amend residential settlement boundary to include land highlighted in both plans (land on opposite side of lane already included).

Recommendation

The proposed modification MOD N079 to amend the UDP proposals map accepts the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.10) that the residential settlement boundaries should be revised to include the residential curtilages of the residential buildings included within them, not entire new sites. The Council is satisfied that the residential settlement boundary for Llancarfan appropriately defines the residential curtilage of the dwelling at Ty Uchaf and does not concur with your view that the boundary should be extended.

For your information, I can advise that the settlement boundary as it currently stands does not effect your permitted development rights under the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) and the revised Policy HOUS2 of the UDP allows for small scale 'rounding-off' of the edge of settlement boundaries for additional residential development. Any planning application received by the local planning authority in the future will be subject to the relevant plan policies, such as ENV25, HOUS2 and HOUS9, that control development in the usual manner.

It should be noted however that Policy HOUS 2 does allow for favourable consideration to be given (other than within areas identified as green wedges), to small-scale development which constitutes the "rounding off" of the edge of settlement boundaries where it can be shown to be consistent with the provisions of Policy HOUS 9 and particularly Criterion (1).
In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation

Contact Mr. Andrew Jenkins

Representor No. 656 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 1936 **Modification No.** N010

Representation

The original UDP cut through part of "Woodland Rise" at the time I objected as I felt that the whole of the property should be classed as part of Dinas Powys, and I still believe it should be: but in accepting that the property consists of both residential and agricultural land, I can see why the Inspector could classify part of the property as being outside the defined settlement boundary of Dinas Powys. Taking into account the boundary of the property excluding the agricultural land, and comparing the size of the residential area with the plots and property types to the East as far as the Twyncyn Road, I would say that they all have similarities throughout and therefore all should be included in the settlement boundary of Dinas Powys as per the originally suggested UDP. If you were to drive through the village along Britway Road and on to St. Andrews Road, you would not see a natural break in the properties on the northern side of the road until you passed "Woodland Rise". This is because the properties to the West of "Woodland Rise" are few and far between. Hence my reason for believing that this is where the cut off point should be.

Desired Change

The defined settlement boundary for Dinas Powys on the northern side of St Andrews Road, should include all properties West of St Andrews school up to and including "Woodland Rise" as shown in the shaded area of REC 4.55 and as per the original suggested UDP.

Recommendation

The Council has amended the Dinas Powys residential settlement boundary in accordance with the Inspector's Rec. 4.55, as it concurs with his reasoning. It is considered that although this ribbon form of development is attached to the main urban area of Dinas Powys, it does not clearly represent the urban form and character of the settlement as a whole and is more rural in character.

The area has a similar rural character to that which exists at Southra which is also not included within the settlement boundary. Therefore, in order to ensure consistency the Council considers that the dwellings to the west of St Andrew's school should be excluded from the Dinas Powys residential settlement boundary.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales

Contact Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 23 **Accession No.** 3012 **Modification No.** E32

Representation

WTSWW is concerned at the opportunity for 'rounding off' on the edges of settlement boundaries on p.68 and 69. It appears that settlement boundaries have been established around settlements, therefore the opportunity for rounding off, should have already been assessed and the boundaries drawn accordingly. A wildlife conservation problem arises with the position of the Great Thomas estate at Rhoose, which was built on the site of a colony of the European protected species, the Great Crested Newt. Any extension of this settlement in the future would cause even more problems.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Residential settlement boundaries have been defined around those villages that the Council considers have sufficient physical form and capacity to assimilate further infill development without it having a detrimental impact on their existing character and environment.

The Inspector in his assessment of the Council's policies in respect of this matter was of the view that residential settlement boundaries had been so tightly drawn around built up areas within settlements as to cause an unnecessary degree of constraint. The Inspector's recommendation, accepted by the Council, has therefore modified policy HOUS 2 to include reference to rounding off as follows:

FAVOURABLE CONSIDERATION WILL BE GIVEN, OTHER THAN WITHIN AREAS IDENTIFIED AS GREEN WEDGES, TO SMALL-SCALE DEVELOPMENT WHICH CONSTITUTES THE "ROUNDING OFF" OF THE EDGE OF SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES WHERE IT CAN BE SHOWN TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE PROVISIONS OF POLICY HOUS 9 AND PARTICULARLY CRITERION (i).

Small scale rounding off, which for the purposes of the Plan is defined as development which constitutes no more than five dwellings, will be permitted where the site lies within or immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. The criteria detailed in Policy HOUS 9 will be used to evaluate all proposals made for development under policy HOUS 2.

Additionally, while Policies HOUS 2 and HOUS 9 may allow for development within or closely related to residential settlement boundaries, other policies within the Plan will also be used to assess, and if warranted, refuse, any planning applications received by the Council.

Therefore, while the modifications made may result in a modest amount of additional housing development over the plan period, the criteria detailed in HOUS 9 and other protectionist policies within the Plan will ensure that such development can be accommodated without detriment to areas of attractive landscape, high quality townscape and areas of historical, archaeological or ecological importance.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 24 **Accession No.** 3013 **Modification No.** E35

Representation

WTSWW is concerned at the opportunity for 'rounding off' on the edges of settlement boundaries on p.68 and 69. It appears that settlement boundaries have been established around settlements, therefore the opportunity for rounding off, should have already been assessed and the boundaries drawn accordingly. A wildlife conservation problem arises with the position of the Great Thomas estate at Rhoose, which was built on the site of a colony of the European protected species, the Great Crested Newt. Any extension of this settlement in the future would cause even more problems.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Residential settlement boundaries have been defined around those villages that the Council considers have sufficient physical form and capacity to assimilate further infill development without it having a detrimental impact on their existing character and environment.

The Inspector in his assessment of the Council's policies in respect of this matter was of the view that residential settlement boundaries had been so tightly drawn around built up areas within settlements as to cause an unnecessary degree of constraint. The Inspector's recommendation, accepted by the Council, has therefore modified policy HOUS 2 to include reference to rounding off as follows:

FAVOURABLE CONSIDERATION WILL BE GIVEN, OTHER THAN WITHIN AREAS IDENTIFIED AS GREEN WEDGES, TO SMALL-SCALE DEVELOPMENT WHICH CONSTITUTES THE "ROUNDING OFF" OF THE EDGE OF SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES WHERE IT CAN BE SHOWN TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE PROVISIONS OF POLICY HOUS 9 AND PARTICULARLY CRITERION (i).

Small scale rounding off, which for the purposes of the Plan is defined as development which constitutes no more than five dwellings, will be permitted where the site lies within or immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. The criteria detailed in Policy HOUS 9 will be used to evaluate all proposals made for development under policy HOUS 2.

Additionally, while Policies HOUS 2 and HOUS 9 may allow for development within or closely related to residential settlement boundaries, other policies within the Plan will also be used to assess, and if warranted, refuse, any planning applications received by the Council.

Therefore, while the modifications made may result in a modest amount of additional housing development over the plan period, the criteria detailed in HOUS 9 and other protectionist policies within the Plan will ensure that such development can be accommodated without detriment to areas of attractive landscape, high quality townscape and areas of historical, archaeological or ecological importance.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation **Contact** L Pudge

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation **Contact** Mr. and Mrs. P.B Pudge
Representor No. 1654 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 2820 **Modification No.**

Representation

The current UDP modifications has not included or considered recommendations on 3.10(Treoes) in relation to our property and garden. A copy of HM Registry title no. 368494 is attached outlining the additional garden which we purchased approx. 16 yrs ago.

Desired Change

We should like to see our additional garden to be included in the proposed boundary change . The inspectors do not seem to have taken that on board or considered this end of the village in particular Ty Deri, our house.

Recommendation

The proposed modification to amend the UDP proposals map accepts the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.10) that the residential settlement boundaries should be revised to include the residential curtilages of the residential buildings included within them. The Council notes that the settlement boundary as shown in the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended 2003), appears to divide the residential curtilage of your property and the settlement boundary for Treoes shall therefore be amended accordingly.

AGREED. Amend Treoes settlement boundary.

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation **Contact** Mr. Peter Davies
Representor No. 1655 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 2823 **Modification No.** N047

Representation

This modification proposes a "settlement boundary" for Llandow where none was shown in the deposit UDP, published in 1998. Examination of the proposed boundary highlights some apparent anomalies in the way it has been defined e.g. 1. It excludes a stone barn and stables on land immediately adjoining Church Farm. The Farm, a medieval "hall House", has its origins in the 13th century and is a listed Grade II*. The age of the barn and stables is not recorded but they are shown on the Llandow, First Edition OS map dated 1877. Those buildings have undoubtedly formed an integral part of Church Farm, possibly over several centuries. To exclude them from within the settlement boundary significantly devalues their historical and physical associations with this uniquely important buildings. 2. Similarly, the Village Hall, formerly the Llandow Church in Wales Primary School. This, too, is shown on the First Edition OS Map, and the building has clearly formed an important element of village life since early Victorian times. To exclude it from within the settlement boundary is presumably an unintentional cartographic error. These anomalies are highlighted by the unexpected inclusion of two parcels of land within the proposed settlement boundary, for which there seems to be no obvious justification. These are: First - the triangular area of disused land lying at the foot of the western edge of the railway embankment, just to the west of the underbridge at Ty Draw. This site is on the edge of the settlement; dominated by the high embankment at this point and physically and visually separated from the main fabric of the village. Second - the land immediately to the rear of Great House. There is nothing on the OS map to indicate outlying buildings associated with this dwelling and it is difficult to understand why this particular boundary configuration has been adopted. These observations are made only to underline the logic of including the Church Farm and stables and the Village Hall within the settlement boundary. It is emphasised that no objection is being raised to the inclusion of the triangular site and the land to the rear of the Great House, within the settlement boundary.

Desired Change

The proposed modification boundary excludes two adjoining, small areas of land and buildings i.e. the barns and stables at Church Farm and the Village Hall. These are described in paragraph 5 as being integral with the main fabric of the village. It is therefore, recommended that they are included within the settlement boundary. The suggested revision to the boundary is shown on the attached plan. This is a photocopy of the Council's modification drawing (REC 4.64, dated 26 October 2001) and shows, by means of a red line, the settlement boundary in the vicinity of Church Farm and the Village Hall amended to include the land on which stand the barn and stables and the hall. The proposed boundary is shown extended northwards, to run alongside the north-west face of the barn and stables, linking them with the post and wire fence which encloses a small area of raised ground at the eastern side of the barn and stables and immediately at the rear of the Village Hall. This fence continues south-eastwards to join the rear boundary of Toad Hall which coincides with the settlement boundary shown on the Council's map.

Recommendation

The purpose of a settlement boundary is to show the extent of the area within which additional residential development will be generally permitted (subject to the provision policy HOUS2) rather than defining the physical attributes of a settlement itself (e.g. buildings and boundary walls). The fact that buildings may be excluded from being within a defined settlement boundary does not diminish their importance either in historical or architectural terms. Buildings that are outside of a settlement boundaries are classed as being within the open countryside, and as such policies have been included within the plan to address development in these areas.

Should your client be interested in the development potential for the site, Policy HOUS2 does allow for favourable consideration to be given (other than within areas identified as green wedges), to small scale development which constitutes the "rounding off" at the end of settlement boundaries where it can be shown to be consistent with the provisions of Policy HOUS9 and particularly criterion (1). Small scale is defined at revised paragraph 4.4.45.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation

Contact Mr. Peter Davies

Representor No. 1655

Representation No. 2

Accession No. 2824

Modification No. N047

Representation

This modification proposes a "settlement boundary" for Llandow where none was shown in the deposit UDP, published in 1998. Examination of the proposed boundary highlights some apparent anomalies in the way it has been defined e.g. 1. It excludes a stone barn and stables on land immediately adjoining Church Farm. The Farm, a medieval "hall House", has its origins in the 13th century and is a listed Grade II*. The age of the barn and stables is not recorded but they are shown on the Llandow, First Edition OS map dated 1877. Those buildings have undoubtedly formed an integral part of Church Farm, possibly over several centuries. To exclude them from within the settlement boundary significantly devalues their historical and physical associations with this uniquely important buildings. 2. Similarly, the Village Hall, formerly the Llandow Church in Wales Primary School. This, too, is shown on the First Edition OS Map, and the building has clearly formed an important element of village life since early Victorian times. To exclude it from within the settlement boundary is presumably an unintentional cartographic error. These anomalies are highlighted by the unexpected inclusion of two parcels of land within the proposed settlement boundary, for which there seems to be no obvious justification. These are: First - the triangular area of disused land lying at the foot of the western edge of the railway embankment, just to the west of the underbridge at Ty Draw. This site is on the edge of the settlement; dominated by the high embankment at this point and physically and visually separated from the main fabric of the village. Second - the land immediately to the rear of Great House. There is nothing on the OS map to indicate outlying buildings associated with this dwelling and it is difficult to understand why this particular boundary configuration has been adopted. These observations are made only to underline the logic of including the Church Farm and stables and the Village Hall within the settlement boundary. It is emphasised that no objection is being raised to the inclusion of the triangular site and the land to the rear of the Great House, within the settlement boundary.

Desired Change

The proposed settlement boundary excludes two adjoining, small areas of land and buildings i.e. the barns and stables at Church Farm and the Village Hall. These are described in paragraph 5 as being integral with the main fabric of the village. It is therefore, recommended that they are included within the settlement boundary. The suggested revision to the boundary is shown on the attached plan. This is a photocopy of the Council's modification drawing (REC 4.64, dated 26 October 2001) and shows, by means of a red line, the settlement boundary in the vicinity of Church Farm and the Village Hall amended to include the land on which stand the barn and stables and the Hall. The logic of this amendment is reinforced by confirmation in 1994 (by means of an affidavit sponsored by the Hall's trustees, and other villagers) of the existence of a vehicular right of way leading from Heol y Nant, passing through the farmyard of Church Farm, to the old school yard, which now forms the rear garden of the Village Hall. The line of the right of way is defined on the ground by a change in the nature of the vegetation and also, for part of its length, by a timber post and wire fence. These are clearly indicated on the Council's OS map, referred to above. The right of way extends from the north west corner of the barn, curving north eastwards, then south eastwards to meet the north east corner of the Hall's boundary fence.

Recommendation

The purpose of a settlement boundary is to show the extent of the area within which additional residential development will be generally permitted (subject to the provision Policy HOUS2) rather than defining the physical attributes of a settlement itself (e.g. buildings and boundary walls). The fact that buildings may be excluded from being within a defined settlement boundary does not diminish their importance either in historical or architectural terms. Buildings that are outside of a settlement boundaries are classed as being within the open countryside, and as such policies have been included within the plan to address development in these areas.

Consequently, the Council is of the opinion that the settlement boundary for Llandow is appropriately drawn and should remain unchanged. Should your client be interested in the development potential for the site, Policy HOUS2 does allow for favourable consideration to be given (other than within areas identified as green wedges), to small scale development which constitutes the "rounding off" at the end of settlement boundaries where it can be shown to be consistent with the provisions of Policy

HOUS 9 and particularly criterion (1). Small scale is defined at revised paragraph 4.4.45.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Contact Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668 **Representation No.** 11 **Accession No.** 3090 **Modification No.** E33

Representation

1) Cofton Limited object to the identification of land at Cowbridge as a reserve site in this UDP Plan period. Whilst support is given to the identification of a reserve site to come forward in the event of other sites failing to do so, objection is made to the specific allocation in Cowbridge.

2) Objection is made to any residential allocation of land in Cowbridge due to the fundamental conflict with the sustainable objectives of the Plan. In particular, the objectives of the Plan are to promote and regenerate the Urban Waterfront, and in particular develop in sustainable locations. Cowbridge is not located within a sustainable location and there is no evidence of housing need. Cowbridge is not located on the soon-to-be reopened rail line, and is not served by a sustainable road network. It's relative isolation causes increased reliance on the use of motor cars.

3) It is therefore recommended that any reserve site allocations be made in more strategic and sustainable

Desired Change

Recommendation

The Council considers that the inclusion of the land at the edge of the northern settlement boundary of Cowbridge to be a logical settlement boundary for Cowbridge. The site is not however considered by the Council to be a reserve site, nor has it been allocated for housing within the UDP, but the Council considers it to be necessary to identify the sites potential as a windfall site. This modification is consistent with the Inspector's recommended modification (REC 4.48).

The Council considers the allocation of housing sites elsewhere in Cowbridge appropriate as they allow for a range and choice of housing on brownfield sites, which is consistent with the Council's objectives.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Contact Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668 **Representation No.** 12 **Accession No.** 3091 **Modification No.** E35

Representation

1) Cofton Limited support the addition of the proposed paragraphs, although have made objections in other Representations concerning the precise definition of the settlement boundary at Rhoose.

2) In accordance with the other Representations submitted by Cofton Limited, consequential changes are required to the settlement boundary around Rhoose.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Your support in regard to MOD E35 and the insertion of a new paragraph below 4.4.44, is welcomed. Please refer to the Council's other response to your representations with specific regard to the Rhoose settlement boundary (Rep. No. 1668.25 refers).

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation Contact Mr. T. Davies

Representor No. 1671 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 2934 **Modification No.** N082

Representation

The boundary proposed does not accord with any logical boundaries and has not been drawn on the basis of a thorough assessment. The pump house shown to the north of the settlement has been demolished, and a replacement facility has been built in the adjoining field to the north. The settlement boundary, as currently drawn, divides the land forming part of his curtilage at the side of Mr. Davies house, and excludes land forming part of the established garden of his neighbours living at Sydney House Farm. Whilst the northernmost proposed boundary accurately identifies the end of his garden behind his house, it ignores the fact that the area to the north is part of his neighbours established garden. The settlement boundary identified to the rear of Sydney House Farm is entirely arbitrary, not reflecting any physical feature on the ground and as proposed sub divides their existing curtilage.

Desired Change

Amend settlement boundary to align with the boundary of the field/paddock containing the new pumping station, and thence returning southwards along the highway to join with the boundary previously proposed - see attached

Recommendation

The proposed modification MOD N082 to change the UDP proposals map accepts the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.10) that the residential settlement boundaries be revised to include the residential curtilages of the residential buildings included within them.

The Council does not accept your argument that the revised boundary does not accord with any logical boundaries. A thorough site assessment has taken place and it is clear that the land to the east of Stourbridge House, adjacent to the lane and south of the pump house facility, does not form part of any residential curtilage. Whilst the land to the north of Sydney House Farm does appear to be currently in use as a garden, the planning history reveals that the use is unauthorised and as such the Council does not accept that this land should be included in the residential settlement boundary for Llyswoyner.

For your information, the revised Policy HOUS2 of the UDP allows for small scale 'rounding-off' of the edge of settlement boundaries for additional residential development subject to a set of criteria. Any future planning application received by the local planning authority will be subject to the relevant plan policies that control development in the usual manner, for example HOUS2, HOUS9, ENV25 etc. In particular, Policy HOUS2 does allow for favourable consideration to be given (other than within areas identified as green wedges), to small-scale development which constitutes the "rounding off" of the edge of settlement boundaries where it can be shown to be consistent with the provisions of Policy HOUS9 and particularly Criterion (1).

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundaries

Organisation C/o Agent **Contact** Mr. & Mrs. A. Wright

Representor No. 1683 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 2920 **Modification No.** REC 3.10

Representation

The property Llyswen and its curtilage is a long established feature of this part of Llanblethian. As such and in accordance with 3.10 (MOD N057 - N110) that situation should have been recognised by the inclusion of the property and its curtilage within the settlement boundary.

Desired Change

Further modifications to settlement boundary by including the property Llyswen and its curtilage within the settlement boundary for Cowbridge/Llanblethian.

Recommendation

Recommendation 3.10 of the Inspector's Report proposed a revision of the residential settlement boundaries "to include the residential curtilages of the residential buildings include within them", that is properties that were within the settlement boundary, but whose gardens may have been excluded. In relation to Llyswen, neither this property nor its curtilage was included within the original proposed settlement boundary for Cowbridge and therefore the Inspectors recommendation would not apply. Representations regarding this matter should have been made at the original deposit stage.

Consequently, the Council considers that the modifications made to the Cowbridge settlement boundary have been taken in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation and therefore the Council maintains its decision not to include Llyswen within the Cowbridge settlement boundary.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Cowbridge Local History Society

Contact Mr. A.J.L Alden

Representor No. 13

Representation No. 7

Accession No. 1854

Modification No. D021

Representation

We support Modification D021 and the designation of Special Landscape Areas, and in particular the designation of 1) Lower Thaw Valley 2) Upper Thaw Valley (A detail in Upper Thaw Valley is that the designated area should run from Cross Inn to the Penllyn road junction with the A48 to include Llanfrynach Church and the footpath with coffin stiles from Penllyn to Llanfrynach.)

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation

Contact Mr. & Mrs. D Randolph

Representor No. 19

Representation No. 9

Accession No. 2935

Modification No. N111

Representation

We object to the inclusion of the land shown in red on the attached plan as within the Special Landscape Area. The Special Landscape Area is too widespread and the subject land does not warrant inclusion on landscape grounds. If this objection is not accepted we consider that this matter should be subject to a further Public Inquiry as this designation was not included in the Deposit Draft UDP and the proposal should be subject to scrutiny by an independent Planning Inspector.

Desired Change

The land identified on the attached plan in red should be deleted from the Special Landscape Area.

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal field area of South East Wales and has little of the associated industrial development. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley slopes and ridges. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan

The Dyffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes SLA defines the gentle sloping valleys focussed on the River Waycock and the St.Nicholas and Bonvilston ridge crest and slopes. The SLA is considered important for its quiet rural character, its field patterns and boundaries, its watercourses and woodlands and the visual prominence of the ridges and slopes that form an important backdrop to the main Vale gateway of Culverhouse Cross. Combined with the Ely Valley and Ridge Slopes SLA the designation forms a continuous and broad ribbon that runs from the northern edges of Barry to the M4 and reflects the importance and special character of this part of the Vale of Glamorgan.

The site identified in the representation clearly forms part of the prominent ridge slopes that rise to the west of Wenvoe and continue north and west beyond St.Nicholas. The site is also important in the more local context and forms part of the attractive rural setting of the village of Wenvoe. The Council is therefore of the view that the SLA designations are based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the Dyffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes SLA are logical and well founded. The site is clearly important in landscape terms and its inclusion within the Dyffryn Basin and

Ridge Slopes SLA is more than justified.

The importance of the site was also recognised at the UDP Public Local Inquiry in 1999 / 2000 when the Inspector considered that the land "clearly defines the northern edge of the residential settlement boundary." and that "It forms an integral part of the St.Nicholas and Bonvilston ridge slopes". The Inspector further concluded, "that development of the objection site would result in the unacceptable urbanisation of important open and undeveloped land which forms an integral part of the rural setting of the village and of the openness of the area within which it is situated."

The reasoning behind the proposed exclusion of this site from the designated SLA would seem to be based wholly on the notion of some future development potential rather than being vested in any logical consideration of landscape merit.

The objection to the inclusion of the identified site within this Special Landscape Area is rejected by the Council for the reasons given above.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Barry Town Council **Contact** Mr. Ian Harris

Representor No. 33 **Representation No.** 19 **Accession No.** 1755 **Modification No.** D021

Representation

The reinstatement of Special Landscape Areas into the plan (Policy ENV XXX) is welcomed, in particular the inclusion of area (VI) Duffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes which will, it is hoped, provide protection against unsuitable forms of development in this particularly vulnerable and attractive area of countryside on the northern fringes of the town of Barry.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 25 **Accession No.** 2948 **Modification No.** D021

Representation

The Town Council are fully supportive of the inclusion of the lower Thaw Valley and Upper Thaw Valley much of which is on the floodplain of the River Thaw and is an area of beauty with extensive wildlife including otter populations.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 63 **Accession No.** 2986 **Modification No.** N111

Representation

The Town Council supports the inclusion of this SLA much of which is on the flood plain of the River Thaw and is an area of Beauty with extensive wildlife including populations.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Bellway Estates

Contact Sue Bridge

Representor No. 126

Representation No. 16

Accession No. 1845

Modification No. N111

Representation

Our client objects to Proposed Modification MOD N111 in respect of the boundary of Special Landscape Areas proposed to be included in the UDP, and in particular the inclusion of Darren Farm, Cowbridge in the Upper Thaw Valley SLA. The land at Darren Farm lies to the west of Cowbridge between the A48 (to the north) and the B4270 Llantwit Major Road (to the south). The Thaw Valley has previously been designated a Special Landscape Area in Structure and Local Plans, but this has never included Darren Farm. In fact, the Darren Farm land has never been identified as having any special landscape value. It is demonstrably the case that Darren farm is not part of the landscape character of the Thaw Valley, as confirmed by the Council's Landscape Study "Landscapes Working of the Vale of Glamorgan". The Darren Farm land is defined in that document as part of Character Area 7 Colwinston Lias Plateau. Neither is the Darren Farm land connected with the Thaw Valley in visual terms. "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" shows it as part of Area 28 - Lias Plateau, of only modest intrinsic value. By comparison the Upper Thaw Valley, Area 24, is defined as of high intrinsic value. The boundaries of the proposed SLA appear generally appear to follow road lines. These have the advantage of providing firm and clear boundaries and the A48 is evidently appropriate for this purpose. There is no logic in the Council's proposal to extend the Upper Thaw Valley SLA southwards from the A48 in the area of Darren Farm. Our client proposes that the Upper Thaw Valley SLA boundary should be drawn along the A48, which provides a visually strong and distinct boundary. Such a boundary would accord with the Special Landscape Area boundary in the Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan 1991 - 2011 Deposit Draft (January 1995) and would omit Darren Farm. Our client notes that the Council seeks to justify the definition of the SLA boundary by reference to the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan". The contents of this document have already been carefully noted and no justification is provided for the inclusion of Darren Farm within the Special Landscape Area. If, notwithstanding this Representation, the Council resolve to proceed with this proposal, our client submits that this is a matter which should be in accordance with established guidance be subject to a further Public Inquiry.

Desired Change

Our Client proposes a Further Modification to the Plan so that land at Darren Farm, Cowbridge is omitted from the boundary of Special Landscape Area that may be proposed for inclusion in the UDP.

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale of Glamorgan and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal fields area of South East Wales and has little of the industrial development associated with that era. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan. Where SLA's border areas that have designated residential settlement boundaries i.e. Policy HOUS 2 settlements, the SLA will mirror the boundary of that settlement.

In designating Special Landscape Areas, the Council has in the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" study (LWVG) the benefit of a detailed and holistic landscape assessment that was not available at the time of the ASLV designations. While ASLV's considered merely the visual character of the landscape, the SLA's incorporate the visual, historic, archaeological, and cultural information and seek to ensure that landscapes of local importance are identified for designation.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

In this regard, it is important that the historic town of Cowbridge is considered in relation to its setting within an important multi period historic landscape and a very distinctive landscape valley. To exclude Darren Farm site from the SLA designation would have introduced inconsistencies into the SLA designation methodology that would have resulted in significant parts of the primary landscape feature, the valley sides and ridges, being excluded.

Therefore, while the Council accepts that the Darren Farm site was previously excluded from the ASLV designations that formed part of the Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan 1991 - 2011 Deposit Draft, in purely visual terms, this was justifiable. However, to exclude the site from the more detailed and wide-ranging SLA designation is not.

The landscape assessment of the Darren Farm site within the LWVG Study has been largely supported by the more detailed assessment undertaken by Mr. Andrew Croft of Chris Blandford Associates in his proof of evidence at the Darren Farm Inquiry. In particular, this evidence assessed the significant historical context of the site and illustrated that the site is a major constituent of the setting of a number of designated and undesignated historic sites and monuments including the scheduled Llanblethian Hill fort. CADW are of the same opinion in respect of the northern area of the objection site in that it forms part of the setting of Llanblethian Hill Fort.

The evidence concludes that

"The Site is situated at the heart of a complex multi-period landscape and plays a significant role in that landscape as a rural component linking a number of highly significant heritage assets...The visibility of these assets and the intervisibility between them are characteristics of the local historic environment. These characteristics allow people to appreciate and understand the complex historical story and processes behind the formulation of the local historic environment. The Site's central geographic position in relation to the assets means that it is key to the maintenance and enhancement of the visual and physical connections between the assets and the character of those assets, and subsequently people's ability to appreciate the local historic environment."

The Council is therefore of the view that the SLA designations are based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the Upper and Lower Thaw Valley Special Landscape Area are logical and well founded. Moreover, the Council is of the opinion that the Darren Farm site has been comprehensively considered at the recent S.78 Public Local Inquiry and that the Council's evidence presented to that Inquiry clearly justifies the sites inclusion within the Upper Thaw Valley Special Landscape Area. The exclusion of the land at Darren Farm from the Special Landscape Area is therefore rejected for the reasons detailed above.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Bellway Estates

Contact Sue Bridge

Representor No. 126

Representation No. 17

Accession No. 1846

Modification No. D021

Representation

Our client objects to Proposed Modifications MOD D021 as regards the boundary of the proposed Special Landscape Area for the Upper Thaw Valley, specifically in relation to Darren Farm at Cowbridge. The basis for this objection is set out in full in our Representation in respect of MOD N111.

Desired Change

Our client proposes a Further Modification to Plan so that land at Darren farm, Cowbridge is omitted from the boundary of any Special Landscape Area that may be proposed for inclusion in the UDP.

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale of Glamorgan and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

work within the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal fields area of South East Wales and has little of the industrial development associated with that era. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan. Where SLA's border areas that have designated residential settlement boundaries i.e. Policy HOUS 2 settlements, the SLA will mirror the boundary of that settlement.

In designating Special Landscape Areas, the Council has in the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" study (LWVG) the benefit of a detailed and holistic landscape assessment that was not available at the time of the ASLV designations. While ASLV's considered merely the visual character of the landscape, the SLA's incorporate the visual, historic, archaeological, and cultural information and seek to ensure that landscapes of local importance are identified for designation.

In this regard, it is important that the historic town of Cowbridge is considered in relation to its setting within an important multi period historic landscape and a very distinctive landscape valley. To exclude the Darren Farm site from the SLA designation would have introduced inconsistencies into the SLA designation methodology that would have resulted significant parts of the primary landscape feature, the valley sides and ridges, being excluded.

Therefore, while the Council accepts that the Darren Farm site was previously excluded from the ASLV designations that formed part of the Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan 1991 - 2011 Deposit Draft, in purely visual terms, this was justifiable. However, to exclude the site from the more detailed and wide-ranging SLA designation is not.

The landscape assessment of the Darren Farm site within the LWVG Study has been largely supported by the more detailed assessment undertaken by Mr. Andrew Croft of Chris Blandford Associates in his proof of evidence at the Darren Farm Inquiry. In particular, this evidence assessed the significant historical context of the site and illustrated that the site is a major constituent of the setting of a number of designated and undesignated historic sites and monuments including the scheduled Llanblethian Hill fort. CADW are of the same opinion in respect of the northern area of the objection site in that it forms part of the setting of Llanblethian Hill Fort.

The evidence concludes that

"The Site is situated at the heart of a complex multi-period landscape and plays a significant role in that landscape as a rural component linking a number of highly significant heritage assets...The visibility of these assets and the intervisibility between them are characteristics of the local historic environment. These characteristics allow people to appreciate and understand the complex historical story and processes behind the formulation of the local historic environment. The Site's central geographic position in relation to the assets means that it is key to the maintenance and enhancement of the visual and physical connections between the assets and the character of those assets, and subsequently people's ability to appreciate the local historic environment."

The Council is therefore of the view that the SLA designations are based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the Upper and Lower Thaw Valley Special Landscape Area are logical and well founded. Moreover, the Council is of the opinion that the Darren Farm site has been comprehensively considered at the recent S.78 Public Local Inquiry and that the Council's evidence presented to that Inquiry clearly justifies the sites inclusion within the Upper Thaw Valley Special Landscape Area. The exclusion of the land at Darren Farm from the Special Landscape Area is therefore rejected for the reasons detailed above.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Campaign for Protection of Rural Wales **Contact** Mr. A L J Raum

Representor No. 173 **Representation No.** 34 **Accession No.** 1840 **Modification No.** N111

Representation

(iv) Nant Llancarfan Proposal Map - We have examined Landmap and studied the area and see no need to exclude the area to the west of the Five Mile Lane between Whitton Cross and the Moulton Lane. In fact it is important that it should be included as this omission could attract undesirable development.

Desired Change

(iv) Nant Llancarfan Proposal Map - Modify boundary of area to follow Five Mile Lane (A4226) between Whitton Cross and Moulton Lane as shown in the attached copy.

Recommendation

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal field area of South East Wales and has little of the associated industrial development of that era. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan. It is inevitable that in defining boundaries in this manner that areas of good quality landscape immediately adjacent to the defined area may be excluded.

While acknowledging therefore that the area of land referred to in the representation is attractive and of good quality, it is considered that it is not exceptional within the context of, or directly related to, the Llancaiach valley. While the A4226 is utilised as the eastern boundary to the north and south of the identified area, these boundaries have been defined due to their relationship with the Nant Whitton and River Weycock. The area identified for inclusion is designated as open countryside within the emerging Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan and as such development within this area would be strongly resisted based on Policy ENV 1.

The purpose of the SLA designation is to identify those landscapes which are of particularly high intrinsic value and which require special protection for their own sake as part of the County's landscape resource. They are not intended to be used as a multipurpose designation to protect landscapes for other reasons, such as to prevent urban sprawl and the coalescence of settlements; or to maintain corridors of green space within the urban areas for the purposes of recreation and general amenity. Other designations, such as 'Green Wedge' are more appropriate to serve these functions. In SLAs, greater emphasis should be placed on the appropriateness and sensitivity of development, assessing the effect of development on landscape features, visibility of development and effective integration of development into the landscape with minimum impact. Therefore, if a proposed development is deemed acceptable under other policies within the UDP such as ENV 1, an additional level of protection will be afforded to ensure that the character of the SLA is not harmed or otherwise adversely affected. The Council will consider such issues as use of landform, orientation of buildings, use and enhancement of existing hard and soft landscape features such as trees, hedgerows, woodlands or walls, and use of materials when assessing the impact of a development.

The Council is therefore of the view that the SLA designation for the Nant Llancaiach Special Landscape Area is based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the Nant Llancaiach Special Landscape Area are logical and well founded.

The amendment of the SLA boundary to include the area between Whitton Cross and Moulton, as identified in the representation, does not accord with the accepted methodology and is therefore rejected.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Campaign for Protection of Rural Wales **Contact** Mr. A L J Raun

Representor No. 173 **Representation No.** 35 **Accession No.** 1841 **Modification No.** D021

Representation

This policy is generally supported, but it should be recognised that it may need modification depending on the areas designated as Green Belt. However, attention is drawn to an anomaly in the Proposal Map for (iv) Nant Llancaiach which is described in a submitted objection.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Persimmon Homes (Wales) Ltd.

Contact

Representor No. 192

Representation No. 14

Accession No. 2821

Modification No. D021

Representation

INTRODUCTION

This objection to the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft Proposed Modifications (February 2003) is made on behalf of Persimmon Homes (Wales) Limited in respect of proposed modification numbers MOD D02 1 (Policy ENV XXX Special Landscape Areas) and MOD N 111 (Special Landscape Area designation (Proposals Map)). The objections refer specifically to land to the north of Barry, known as Walters Farm, which is proposed for inclusion within the Duffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes Special Landscape Area (SLA) by the Proposed Modifications.

The objector considers that the land at Walters Farm does not warrant inclusion in the proposed SLA and therefore requires the modification of the SLA boundary to exclude the land from the SLA designation.

This report provides a detailed landscape appraisal of the land at Walters Farm within the context of the proposed Special Landscape Area policy. The location of the site is illustrated on Figure 01 and the land that is the subject of this objection is highlighted in red. The text is supported by the following figures:

Figure 01 Summary Plan

Figure 02 Landscape context

Figure 03 Photographs

Figure 04 Required modification to proposed SLA (vi) boundary.

THE PROPOSED SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS AND LANDMAP ANALYSIS

The Proposed Modifications and the accompanying Statement of Decisions propose the inclusion of a new policy (Policy ENV XXX) on Special Landscape Areas (SLA) and the designation of seven SLAs. Policy ENV XXX states,

"New development within or closely related to the following Special Landscape Areas will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that it would not adversely effect the landscape, character, landscape features or visual amenities of the Special Landscape Area:

- (i) Ely Valley and ridge slopes
- (ii) Lower Thaw Valley
- (iii) Upper Thaw Valley
- (iv) Nant Llancafarn
- (v) Cwrt Yr Ala Basin
- (vi) Duffryn Basin and ridge slopes
- (vii) Castle Upon Alun."

The accompanying text to Policy ENV XXX and the Statement of Decisions refer to the Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan' (LWVG) landscape study. This study is cited as forming the basis for the designation of the seven SLAs. The accompanying text also states that full details of how the SLAs have been defined are provided in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Special Landscape Areas. However, this document has not been published by the Council in conjunction with the Proposed Modifications and is unavailable for public inspection. In the absence of the SPG, the LWVG document is the only publicly available document on the designation of the SLAs. The objection site is directly affected by proposed SLA (vi) the Duffryn Basin and ridge slopes, which currently includes the land at Walters Farm. Proposed SLA (iv) Nant Llancafarn, lies immediately to the west of the land at Walters Farm. Figure 01 illustrates the location of the site, the boundaries of the SLAs and the Landscape Character Areas (LCA) defined in LWVG, using the LANDMAP methodology.

The landscape character areas defined in LWVG for the two proposed SLAs that currently affect the Walters Farm site are summarised below:

SLA (vi) Duffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes

The land at Walters Farm currently lies within the proposed Duffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes SLA.

The SLA is bounded to the west by the A4226 Waycock Road and extends to the existing settlement boundary of Barry to the south. It is largely based on LCA 22: Duffryn Area. The justification given for this character area in LWVG is that it is a "quiet area contained by ridges and focussed on the River Waycock, with a consistent land cover". It is described as a broad gentle sloping valley overlooked by northern edge of Barry, in mixed farmland with hedges, woodland and scattered settlement. The area is given a high value "particularly attached to visual and cultural aspects, but also to historical".

Issues identified in LWVG for the area include encroachment of development onto the steep slopes north of Barry and their high visibility. Volume 1: Main Strategy called for the restriction of development related to the expansion of Barry and recommended consideration of LCD. In the Aspect Studies the area was scored as "outstanding" in the cultural aspect, and "high" in the visual, vegetation and historical aspects. An archaeological landscape characterisation study was recommended and the protection of Duffryn Gardens, the character of its setting and approaches, was considered as important to the character of the Vale of Glamorgan. The boundary of the SLA (vi) has therefore been rationalised to follow the A4226, to include part of LWVG LCA 16 Central Slopes and Valleys, to the west of Duffryn Gardens.

SLA (iv) Nant Llancarfan

SLA (iv) Nant Llancarfan is defined for most of its eastern boundary by the A4226 Waycock Road, and is immediately adjacent to the land at Walters Farm at its southern end. The southern boundary of the SLA is defined by the A4226 Port Road. It mainly comprises LWVG LCA 16 Central Slopes and Valleys and LCA 17 Llancarfan and Lower Waycock Valleys. Similarly to SLA (vi), the rationalisation of the boundary of the SLA to the A4226 means that part of an unrelated LCA, LCA 18 Rhoose Environs, is included within the SLA and close to Walters Farm. An area north of Moulton, defined by the minor roads linking Moulton-Walterston-Whitton Lodge is however omitted from both SLA(iv) and SLA(vi) for reasons that are not apparent, as the landscape here is consistent with the rest of the area (LCA 16).

LCA 17 Llancarfan and Lower Waycock Valleys describes the steep sided narrow valleys that cut through the south facing slopes of limestone ridge and southerly extending ridge "fingers" of LCA 16. The justifications for the LCAs point to the distinctive land form features of the valleys, their attendant distinctive land cover pattern and the "unspoilt rural area" between the valleys with "consistent historical value". LCA 17 scores "outstanding" for its historical and cultural aspects, and in part for its vegetation, and "high" for its visual and part of its vegetation aspects. LCA 16 scores "outstanding" for its cultural aspects and "high" for its historical aspect. Its visual aspect is evaluated as "modest". The main recommendations of LWVG for both LCAs are concerned with restricting development, especially on prominent slopes and ridges, and action to maintain and enhance the important landscape characteristics. LCA 17 is described as a "very important historic landscape intolerant to change".

Summary of SLAs (vi) and (iv)

The Council has not published the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Special Landscape Areas, that is referred to in the Proposed Modifications and the Statement of Decisions and in its absence, the evaluation in LWVG is the only source available for justifying the definition of the SLAs. SLA (vi) largely conforms to LCA 22, incorporating a small part of LCA 16 in order to allow the A4226 to define its western boundary. SLA (iv) includes most of the valleys and intervening ridges described by LCAs 16 and 17, but includes a fringe of an unrelated landscape type on its southern edge, while excluding an important part of the eastern side of LCA 16, described in LWVG as landform defining the eastern boundary of the LCA.

WALTERS FARM LANDSCAPE APPRAISAL

Landscape features and character

The site is located on the north-western edge of the settlement of Barry and extends northwards from the Waycock Cross roundabout where the A4050 joins the A4226 Waycock Road. The landscape character of the site is defined by features both within and adjacent to or beyond the site.

A ridgeline with deciduous woodland, Coed Mawr, provides a strong edge to the north of the site. Similar woodland extends along part of the western boundary, combining with the tall hedgerow along Waycock Road to enclose the site and continuing along the boundary up to Waycock Cross roundabout. The urban area of Barry encloses the site at a higher elevation on the eastern side, with the Highlight Farm development to the north-east and Cwm Talwg to the south-east. The eastern part of the site thus has an urban character and it is also overlooked by the urban area of Barry. In contrast, the western part of the site is rural in character, with deciduous woodland and groups of trees on higher ground forming the edge of the site.

Within the site, the landform is a shallow valley falling from approximately 90m AOD at the north-eastern site boundary to approximately 40m AOD at the western boundary. A stream course runs east-west across the site and near the western boundary it passes through the farmstead of Walters Farm before continuing to the River Waycock. Walters Farm is accessed along a narrow track from the A4050 and contains the only buildings within the site boundary.

The field pattern within the site is defined by hedgerows, which vary from trimmed, dense hedges along the A4050 near Cwm Talwg, to tall sparse hedges along the field boundaries. The fields are agricultural pasture with marshy grassland in some areas along the stream course, and some recent woodland and hedge planting. In total, the site comprises of 10 fields of varying size without any significant groups of trees or blocks of other vegetation.

The eastern part of the site has an "urban fringe" character; this is partly due to the close proximity of urban land uses, but is also apparent in the condition of hedgerows and pasture land. Many of the hedgerows are overgrown and are no longer stock-proof and several areas of pasture have become overgrown with brambles. The western part of the site is also unmanaged but, being further from the urban area of Barry and close to the mature woodland at the Barry College of Further Education, has a more rural character.

Visual amenity

The "Visual envelope" of the site is strongly defined by the rising topography and vegetation to the north-west, which screens the land surface of the site from the A4226 Waycock Road north of the entrance to the College (see Photograph 1). The site is visible from the edge of the urban area of Barry at Highlight Farm and Cwm Talwg (see Photograph 2) because of their relatively high elevation. However, the site is not visible from the wider urban area of Barry. Views of the site are available from the A4226 Port Road (see Photographs 3 and 4) and the public footpath between Green Farm and Cwm-Cidy Farm to the west of Barry. There are no views from further along this footpath at Porthkerry Country Park. Middleton Wood frames the left-hand side of the view, so that the site is viewed in the context of the Barry urban area, rather than the rural area to the north.

Landscape analysis

SLA (vi) is based upon the analysis of landscape character areas provided by the LANDMAP assessment in LWVG. That "broad"2 assessment included the site within LCA 22 Duffryn Area, which is focussed on the valley of the River Waycock, and whose rural character was recommended to be retained.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

However, the detailed landscape appraisal undertaken by the objector shows that landform and a strong block of woodland separate the land at Walters Farm from the Waycock Valley, and that the character of the site is very different from the "quiet area contained by ridges and focussed on the River Waycock" of LCA 22 and the historic landscape of LCA 17. In contrast to the character of LCA 22 and LCA 17, the Walters Farm site is closely related to the existing urban area of Barry, with a largely urban or urban fringe character. Visually, the site is viewed in the context of the Barry urban area, rather than the rural area to the north. The Waycock Valley is defined by the ridgeline that runs along the northern edge of the Walters Farm site and not by the ridgeline to the south along with the A4050 runs (see Figure 02). The topography of the site and the ridgeline to the north-west link the site to the urban area of Barry and provides strong visual and physical separation from the Waycock Valley beyond.

Proposed SLA (vi) is based on LWVG Landscape Character Area 22. The detailed landscape appraisal of the objection site clearly illustrates that the land does not belong in Landscape Character Area 22, and does not form part of the Duffryn basin or the ridge slopes that define it. The land has a largely urban or urban fringe character and is also distinct from the character of the landscape in proposed SLA (iv) immediately to the west. Its inclusion in the proposed SLA is unjustified. Consequently, the SLA boundary should be redrawn to follow the ridgeline to the north-west of the site, omitting the Walters Farm land from the designation.

National planning guidance

In respect of non-statutory designations, national planning guidance, as laid out in paragraph 5.3.1 of Planning Policy Wales, states,

"Non-statutory designations, such as Special Landscape Areas or Sites of Interest for Nature Conservation, should be soundly based on a formal scientific assessment of the nature conservation, landscape or geological value of the site... Local planning authorities should apply these designations to areas of substantive conservation value where there is a good reason to believe that normal planning policies cannot provide the necessary protection."

The detailed landscape appraisal of the objection site indicates that the land at Walters Farm has an urban or urban fringe character and that it is visually linked to the existing urban area of Barry. The objection site cannot therefore be reasonably regarded as being of substantive conservation concern and does not warrant the additional protection that would be afforded by a Special Landscape Area designation. Furthermore, in view of national planning guidance, it is incumbent on the local planning authority to demonstrate why normal planning policies, such as Policy ENV 1 Development in the Countryside, would not provide sufficient protection in this location.

National planning guidance also requires that non-statutory designations should be based on a formal scientific assessment. The LWVG provides a broad assessment of landscape character areas. The accompanying text to proposed new policy ENV XXX maintains that full details of how the SLAs have been defined are available in the SPG on SLAs. However, at the time when the Proposed Modifications were placed on deposit, this document was not in the public domain and consequently, there is no clear rationale for the designation of the detailed SLA boundaries. Furthermore, the inclusion of a new policy on SLAs represents a major addition to the UDP and as such should be subject to public scrutiny. Indeed, this view was held by the Inspector who stated in paragraph 3.5.11 of his report, "Such public scrutiny is essential for major development plan policy and... I am of the opinion that SLA's should be considered as an integral part of the development plan process and not as SPG." Whilst the concept of SLAs was considered at the first public inquiry, the detail and the rationale of the SLA designations has not been subject to sufficient public debate and this is compounded by the fact that the detailed SPG that is referred to by the Council is not available for review in conjunction with the development plan process. It is therefore considered that a second public inquiry on the Proposed Modifications is necessary to ensure that this policy is subject to public scrutiny.

SUMMARY AND REQUIRED MODIFICATION

The detailed landscape appraisal of the objection site indicates that the land at Walters Farm has an urban or urban fringe character and that it is visually linked to the existing urban area of Barry. The objection site cannot therefore be reasonably regarded as being of substantive conservation concern and does not warrant the additional protection that would be afforded by a Special Landscape Area designation.

The boundary of proposed SLA (vi) on the Proposals Map should be redrawn to follow the ridgeline to the north-west of the site as illustrated on Figure 04, omitting the land at Walters Farm land from the designation.

The inclusion of a new policy on SLAs represents a major addition to the UDP and should be subject to public scrutiny at a second public inquiry.

Desired Change

The detailed landscape appraisal of the objection site indicates that the land at Walter Farm has an urban or urban fringe character and that it is visually linked to the existing urban area of Barry. The objection site cannot therefore be reasonably regarded as being of substantive conservation concern and does not warrant the additional protection that would be afforded by a Special Landscape Area designation. The boundary of proposed SLA (vi) on the Proposals Map should be redrawn to follow the ridgeline to the north-west of the site as illustrated on Figure 04, omitting the land at Walters Farm land from the designation. The inclusion of a new policy on SLA's represents a major addition to the UDP and should be subject to public scrutiny at a second public inquiry.

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal field area of South East Wales and has little of the associated industrial development of that era. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan. Where boundaries encounter villages with identified residential settlement boundaries as identified within Policy HOUS 2 of the Unitary Development Plan, the boundaries of the SLA's have been drawn contiguous with these boundaries.

While accepting that the land surrounding Walters Farm is located on the edge of the built up area of Barry, to describe it as urban or urban fringe in character is misleading and illogical. The land is characterised by large woodland blocks and extensive open pasture and is clearly detached from the urban area and rural in character. Within this rural setting, Walters Farm is a small isolated unit surrounded by open fields and woodland. The land slopes away from the high ground ridge slopes along the northern edge of Barry and the A4050 Port Road down towards the main body of the Dyffryn Basin. The A4050 Port Road and the western edge of Highlight Farm provide permanent and easily identifiable boundaries to this section of the SLA. While the linear edge of the high ridge slope along the northern edge of Barry has to a degree been broken by the Highlight Farm development, the land surrounding Walters Farm is clearly directly associated with the main landscape feature of the Dyffryn Basin and its surrounding ridge slopes.

It should be noted that the purpose of the SLA designations is to identify those landscapes which are of particularly high intrinsic value and which require special protection for their own sake as part of the County's landscape resource. They are not intended to be used as a multipurpose designation to protect landscapes for other reasons, such as to prevent urban sprawl and the coalescence of settlements; or to maintain corridors of green space within the urban areas for the purposes of recreation and general amenity. Other designations, such as 'Green Wedge' are more appropriate to serve these functions. Moreover, in SLA's, greater emphasis should be placed on the appropriateness and sensitivity of development, on assessing the effect of development on landscape features, visibility of development and effective integration of development into the landscape with minimum impact. Therefore, if a proposed development is deemed acceptable under other policies within the UDP such as Policy ENV 1, an additional level of protection will be afforded to ensure that the character of the SLA is not harmed or otherwise adversely affected. The Council will consider issues such as landform and orientation of buildings, use and enhancement of existing hard and soft landscape features such as trees and hedgerows, woodlands or walls, and the use of materials when assessing the impact of development.

The reasoning behind the proposed exclusion of land from the designated SLA would seem to be based wholly on a notion of future development potential rather than being vested in any logical consideration of landscape merit and in this regard, it is considered that the issue has been thoroughly considered by the Inspector at the UDP Public Local Inquiry in 1999 / 2000 when the Inspector considered that the land should be designated as a Green Belt. While the Council has dismissed the designation of a Green Belt for the reasons detailed in the Statement of Decisions document (REC 3.20 page 38/39), the Council concurs with the Inspector's assessment of the objection site. The Inspector concluded that "the high visibility of the Highlight Park development emphasises the need to control the northern spread of Barry and development of the objection site would undermine such an approach leading to the further consolidation of this highly visible development." The Inspector further concluded that "Such development would not only be divorced from the main urban area of Barry.." but "would involve a major incursion into an area of open countryside and landscape that ...demands long term protection from development."

The Council is therefore of the view that the SLA designations are based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the Dyffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes Special Landscape Area are logical and well founded. Finally, as the matter of development on the objection site has been fully considered by the Inspector at the UDP Public Local Inquiry the Council considers that there is no justification to hold a Modification Inquiry to debate this matter further.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Persimmon Homes (Wales) Ltd.

Contact

Representor No. 192

Representation No. 15

Accession No. 2822

Modification No. N111

Representation

INTRODUCTION

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

This objection to the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft Proposed Modifications (February 2003) is made on behalf of Persimmon Homes (Wales) Limited in respect of proposed modification numbers MOD D02 1 (Policy ENV XXX Special Landscape Areas) and MOD N 111 (Special Landscape Area designation (Proposals Map)). The objections refer specifically to land to the north of Barry, known as Walters Farm, which is proposed for inclusion within the Duffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes Special Landscape Area (SLA) by the Proposed Modifications.

The objector considers that the land at Walters Farm does not warrant inclusion in the proposed SLA and therefore requires the modification of the SLA boundary to exclude the land from the SLA designation.

This report provides a detailed landscape appraisal of the land at Walters Farm within the context of the proposed Special Landscape Area policy. The location of the site is illustrated on Figure 01 and the land that is the subject of this objection is highlighted in red. The text is supported by the following figures:

Figure 01 Summary Plan
Figure 02 Landscape context
Figure 03 Photographs
Figure 04 Required modification to proposed SLA (vi) boundary.

THE PROPOSED SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS AND LANDMAP ANALYSIS

The Proposed Modifications and the accompanying Statement of Decisions propose the inclusion of a new policy (Policy ENV XXX) on Special Landscape Areas (SLA) and the designation of seven SLAs. Policy ENV XXX states,

"New development within or closely related to the following Special Landscape Areas will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that it would not adversely effect the landscape, character, landscape features or visual amenities of the Special Landscape Area:

- (i) Ely Valley and ridge slopes
- (ii) Lower Thaw Valley
- (iii) Upper Thaw Valley
- (iv) Nant Llancarfan
- (v) Cwrt Yr Ala Basin
- (vi) Duffryn Basin and ridge slopes
- (vii) Castle Upon Alun."

The accompanying text to Policy ENV XXX and the Statement of Decisions refer to the Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan' (LWVG) landscape study. This study is cited as forming the basis for the designation of the seven SLAs. The accompanying text also states that full details of how the SLAs have been defined are provided in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Special Landscape Areas. However, this document has not been published by the Council in conjunction with the Proposed Modifications and is unavailable for public inspection. In the absence of the SPG, the LWVG document is the only publicly available document on the designation of the SLAs. The objection site is directly affected by proposed SLA (vi) the Duffryn Basin and ridge slopes, which currently includes the land at Walters Farm. Proposed SLA (iv) Nant Llancarfan, lies immediately to the west of the land at Walters Farm. Figure 01 illustrates the location of the site, the boundaries of the SLAs and the Landscape Character Areas (LCA) defined in LWVG, using the LANDMAP methodology.

The landscape character areas defined in LWVG for the two proposed SLAs that currently affect the Walters Farm site are summarised below:

SLA (vi) Duffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes

The land at Walters Farm currently lies within the proposed Duffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes SLA.

The SLA is bounded to the west by the A4226 Waycock Road and extends to the existing settlement boundary of Barry to the south. It is largely based on LCA 22: Duffryn Area. The justification given for this character area in LWVG is that it is a "quiet area contained by ridges and focussed on the River Waycock, with a consistent land cover". It is described as a broad gentle sloping valley overlooked by northern edge of Barry, in mixed farmland with hedges, woodland and scattered settlement. The area is given a high value "particularly attached to visual and cultural aspects, but also to historical".

Issues identified in LWVG for the area include encroachment of development onto the steep slopes north of Barry and their high visibility. Volume 1: Main Strategy called for the restriction of development related to the expansion of Barry and recommended consideration of LCD. In the Aspect Studies the area was scored as "outstanding" in the cultural aspect, and "high" in the visual, vegetation and historical aspects. An archaeological landscape characterisation study was recommended and the protection of Duffryn Gardens, the character of its setting and approaches, was considered as important to the character of the Vale of Glamorgan. The boundary of the SLA (vi) has therefore been rationalised to follow the A4226, to include part of LWVG LCA 16 Central Slopes and Valleys, to the west of Duffryn Gardens.

SLA (iv) Nant Llancarfan

SLA (iv) Nant Llancarfan is defined for most of its eastern boundary by the A4226 Waycock Road, and is immediately adjacent to the land at Walters Farm at its southern end. The southern boundary of the SLA is defined by the A4226 Port Road. It mainly comprises LWVG LCA 16 Central Slopes and Valleys and LCA 17 Llancarfan and Lower Waycock Valleys. Similarly to SLA (vi), the rationalisation of the boundary of the SLA to the A4226 means that part of an unrelated LCA, LCA 18 Rhose Environs, is included within the SLA and close to Walters Farm. An area north of Moulton, defined by the minor roads linking Moulton-Walterston-Whitton Lodge is however omitted from both SLA(iv) and SLA(vi) for reasons that are not apparent, as the landscape here is consistent with the rest of the area (LCA 16).

LCA 17 Llanarfarn and Lower Waycock Valleys describes the steep sided narrow valleys that cut through the south facing slopes of limestone ridge and southerly extending ridge "fingers" of LCA 16. The justifications for the LCAs point to the distinctive land form features of the valleys, their attendant distinctive land cover pattern and the "unspoilt rural area" between the valleys with "consistent historical value". LCA 17 scores "outstanding" for its historical and cultural aspects, and in part for its vegetation, and "high" for its visual and part of its vegetation aspects. LCA 16 scores "outstanding" for its cultural aspects and "high" for its historical aspect. Its visual aspect is evaluated as "modest". The main recommendations of LWVG for both LCAs are concerned with restricting development, especially on prominent slopes and ridges, and action to maintain and enhance the important landscape characteristics. LCA 17 is described as a "very important historic landscape intolerant to change".

Summary of SLAs (vi) and (iv)

The Council has not published the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Special Landscape Areas, that is referred to in the Proposed Modifications and the Statement of Decisions and in its absence, the evaluation in LWVG is the only source available for justifying the definition of the SLAs. SLA (vi) largely conforms to LCA 22, incorporating a small part of LCA 16 in order to allow the A4226 to define its western boundary. SLA (iv) includes most of the valleys and intervening ridges described by LCAs 16 and 17, but includes a fringe of an unrelated landscape type on its southern edge, while excluding an important part of the eastern side of LCA 16, described in LWVG as landform defining the eastern boundary of the LCA.

WALTERS FARM LANDSCAPE APPRAISAL

Landscape features and character

The site is located on the north-western edge of the settlement of Barry and extends northwards from the Waycock Cross roundabout where the A4050 joins the A4226 Waycock Road. The landscape character of the site is defined by features both within and adjacent to or beyond the site.

A ridgeline with deciduous woodland, Coed Mawr, provides a strong edge to the north of the site. Similar woodland extends along part of the western boundary, combining with the tall hedgerow along Waycock Road to enclose the site and continuing along the boundary up to Waycock Cross roundabout. The urban area of Barry encloses the site at a higher elevation on the eastern side, with the Highlight Farm development to the north-east and Cwm Talwg to the south-east. The eastern part of the site thus has an urban character and it is also overlooked by the urban area of Barry. In contrast, the western part of the site is rural in character, with deciduous woodland and groups of trees on higher ground forming the edge of the site.

Within the site, the landform is a shallow valley falling from approximately 90m AOD at the north-eastern site boundary to approximately 40m AOD at the western boundary. A stream course runs east-west across the site and near the western boundary it passes through the farmstead of Walters Farm before continuing to the River Waycock. Walters Farm is accessed along a narrow track from the A4050 and contains the only buildings within the site boundary.

The field pattern within the site is defined by hedgerows, which vary from trimmed, dense hedges along the A4050 near Cwm Talwg, to tall sparse hedges along the field boundaries. The fields are agricultural pasture with marshy grassland in some areas along the stream course, and some recent woodland and hedge planting. In total, the site comprises of 10 fields of varying size without any significant groups of trees or blocks of other vegetation.

The eastern part of the site has an "urban fringe" character; this is partly due to the close proximity of urban land uses, but is also apparent in the condition of hedgerows and pasture land. Many of the hedgerows are overgrown and are no longer stock-proof and several areas of pasture have become overgrown with brambles. The western part of the site is also unmanaged but, being further from the urban area of Barry and close to the mature woodland at the Barry College of Further Education, has a more rural character.

Visual amenity

The "Visual envelope" of the site is strongly defined by the rising topography and vegetation to the north-west, which screens the land surface of the site from the A4226 Waycock Road north of the entrance to the College (see Photograph 1). The site is visible from the edge of the urban area of Barry at Highlight Farm and Cwm Talwg (see Photograph 2) because of their relatively high elevation. However, the site is not visible from the wider urban area of Barry. Views of the site are available from the A4226 Port Road (see Photographs 3 and 4) and the public footpath between Green Farm and Cwm-Cidy Farm to the west of Barry. There are no views from further along this footpath at Porthkerry Country Park. Middleton Wood frames the left-hand side of the view, so that the site is viewed in the context of the Barry urban area, rather than the rural area to the north.

Landscape analysis

SLA (vi) is based upon the analysis of landscape character areas provided by the LANDMAP assessment in LWVG. That "broad"2 assessment included the site within LCA 22 Duffryn Area, which is focussed on the valley of the River Waycock, and whose rural character was recommended to be retained.

However, the detailed landscape appraisal undertaken by the objector shows that landform and a strong block of woodland separate the land at Walters Farm from the Waycock Valley, and that the character of the site is very different from the "quiet area contained by ridges and focussed on the River Waycock" of LCA 22 and the historic landscape of LCA 17. In contrast to the character of LCA 22 and LCA 17, the Walters Farm site is closely related to the existing urban area of Barry, with a largely urban or urban fringe character. Visually, the site is viewed in the context of the Barry urban area, rather than the rural area to the north. The Waycock Valley is defined by the ridgeline that runs along the northern edge of the Walters Farm site and not by the ridgeline to the south along with the A4050 runs (see Figure 02). The topography of the site and the ridgeline to the north-west link the site to the urban area of Barry and provides strong visual and physical separation from the Waycock Valley beyond.

Proposed SLA (vi) is based on LWVG Landscape Character Area 22. The detailed landscape appraisal of the objection site clearly illustrates that the land does not belong in Landscape Character Area 22, and does not form part of the Duffryn basin or the ridge slopes that define it. The land has a largely urban or urban fringe character and is also distinct from the character of the landscape in proposed SLA (iv) immediately to the west. Its inclusion in the proposed SLA is unjustified. Consequently, the SLA boundary should be redrawn to follow the ridgeline to the north-west of the site, omitting the Walters Farm land from the designation.

National planning guidance

In respect of non-statutory designations, national planning guidance, as laid out in paragraph 5.3. 1 of Planning Policy Wales, states,

"Non-statutory designations, such as Special Landscape Areas or Sites of Interest for Nature Conservation, should be soundly based on a formal scientific assessment of the nature conservation, landscape or geological value of the site... Local planning authorities should apply these designations to areas of substantive conservation value where there is a good reason to believe that normal planning policies cannot provide the necessary protection."

The detailed landscape appraisal of the objection site indicates that the land at Walters Farm has an urban or urban fringe character and that it is visually linked to the existing urban area of Barry. The objection site cannot therefore be reasonably regarded as being of substantive conservation concern and does not warrant the additional protection that would be afforded by a Special Landscape Area designation. Furthermore, in view of national planning guidance, it is incumbent on the local planning authority to demonstrate why normal planning policies, such as Policy ENV 1 Development in the Countryside, would not provide sufficient protection in this location.

National planning guidance also requires that non-statutory designations should be based on a formal scientific assessment. The LWVG provides a broad assessment of landscape character areas. The accompanying text to proposed new policy ENV XXX maintains that full details of how the SLAs have been defined are available in the SPG on SLAs. However, at the time when the Proposed Modifications were placed on deposit, this document was not in the public domain and consequently, there is no clear rationale for the designation of the detailed SLA boundaries. Furthermore, the inclusion of a new policy on SLAs represents a major addition to the UDP and as such should be subject to public scrutiny. Indeed, this view was held by the Inspector who stated in paragraph 3.5. 11 of his report, "Such public scrutiny is essential for major development plan policy and... I am of the opinion that SLA's should be considered as an integral part of the development plan process and not as SPG." Whilst the concept of SLAs was considered at the first public inquiry, the detail and the rationale of the SLA designations has not been subject to sufficient public debate and this is compounded by the fact that the detailed SPG that is referred to by the Council is not available for review in conjunction with the development plan process. It is therefore considered that a second public inquiry on the Proposed Modifications is necessary to ensure that this policy is subject to public scrutiny.

SUMMARY AND REQUIRED MODIFICATION

The detailed landscape appraisal of the objection site indicates that the land at Walters Farm has an urban or urban fringe character and that it is visually linked to the existing urban area of Barry. The objection site cannot therefore be reasonably regarded as being of substantive conservation concern and does not warrant the additional protection that would be afforded by a Special Landscape Area designation.

The boundary of proposed SLA (vi) on the Proposals Map should be redrawn to follow the ridgeline to the north-west of the site as illustrated on Figure 04, omitting the land at Walters Farm land from the designation.

The inclusion of a new policy on SLAs represents a major addition to the UDP and should be subject to public scrutiny at a second public inquiry.

Desired Change

The detailed landscape appraisal of the objection site indicates that the land at Walter Farm has an urban or urban fringe character and that it is visually linked to the existing urban area of Barry. The objection site cannot therefore be reasonably regarded as being of substantive conservation concern and does not warrant the additional protection that would be afforded by a Special Landscape Area designation. The boundary of proposed SLA (vi) on the Proposals Map should be redrawn to follow the ridgeline to the north-west of the site as illustrated on Figure 04, omitting the land at Walters Farm land from the designation. The inclusion of a new policy on SLA's represents a major addition to the UDP and should be subject to public scrutiny at a second public inquiry.

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal field area of South East Wales and has little of the associated industrial development of that era. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan. Where boundaries encounter villages with identified residential settlement boundaries as identified within Policy HOUS 2 of the Unitary Development Plan, the boundaries of the SLA's have been drawn contiguous with these boundaries.

While accepting that the land surrounding Walters Farm is located on the edge of the built up area of Barry, to describe it as urban or urban fringe in character is misleading and illogical. The land is characterised by large woodland blocks and extensive open pasture and is clearly detached from the urban area and rural in character. Within this rural setting, Walters Farm is a small isolated unit surrounded by open fields and woodland. The land slopes away from the high ground ridge slopes along the northern edge of Barry and the A4050 Port Road down towards the main body of the Dyffryn Basin. The A4050 Port Road and the western edge of Highlight Farm provide permanent and easily identifiable boundaries to this section of the SLA. While the linear edge of the high ridge slope along the northern edge of Barry has to a degree been broken by the Highlight Farm development, the land surrounding Walters Farm is clearly directly associated with the main landscape feature of the Dyffryn Basin and its surrounding ridge slopes.

It should be noted that the purpose of the SLA designations is to identify those landscapes which are of particularly high intrinsic value and which require special protection for their own sake as part of the County's landscape resource. They are not intended to be used as a multipurpose designation to protect landscapes for other reasons, such as to prevent urban sprawl and the coalescence of settlements; or to maintain corridors of green space within the urban areas for the purposes of recreation and general amenity. Other designations, such as 'Green Wedge' are more appropriate to serve these functions. Moreover, in SLA's, greater emphasis should be placed on the appropriateness and sensitivity of development, on assessing the effect of development on landscape features, visibility of development and effective integration of development into the landscape with minimum impact. Therefore, if a proposed development is deemed acceptable under other policies within the UDP such as Policy ENV 1, an additional level of protection will be afforded to ensure that the character of the SLA is not harmed or otherwise adversely affected. The Council will consider issues such as landform and orientation of buildings, use and enhancement of existing hard and soft landscape features such as trees and hedgerows, woodlands or walls, and the use of materials when assessing the impact of development.

The reasoning behind the proposed exclusion of land from the designated SLA would seem to be based wholly on a notion of future development potential rather than being vested in any logical consideration of landscape merit and in this regard, it is considered that the issue has been thoroughly considered by the Inspector at the UDP Public Local Inquiry in 1999 / 2000 when the Inspector considered that the land should be designated as a Green Belt. While the Council has dismissed the designation of a Green Belt for the reasons detailed in the Statement of Decisions document (REC 3.20 page 38/39), the Council concurs with the Inspector's assessment of the objection site. The Inspector concluded that "the high visibility of the Highlight Park development emphasises the need to control the northern spread of Barry and development of the objection site would undermine such an approach leading to the further consolidation of this highly visible development." The Inspector further concluded that "Such development would not only be divorced from the main urban area of Barry.." but "would involve a major incursion into an area of open countryside and landscape that ...demands long term protection from development."

The Council is therefore of the view that the SLA designations are based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the Dyffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes Special Landscape Area are logical and well founded. Finally, as the matter of development on the objection site has been fully considered by the Inspector at the UDP Public Local Inquiry the Council considers that there is no justification to hold a Modification Inquiry to debate this matter further.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation	Contact	Lt.Col. R L Traherne	
Representor No. 210	Representation No. 12	Accession No. 2827	Modification No. N111

Representation

The Council proposes to designate a series of Special Landscape Areas, including the Duffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes SLA. For the most part, the boundary of the SLA has been drawn so that it excludes settlements that lie on its edge, for example, St Nicholas, Wenvoe and the development to the north of Port Road, Barry. That practice should be adopted also in relation to The Downs, which is a relatively large settlement on the northern edge of the proposed SLA. Moreover, in the case of The Downs (which is not a conservation area and comprises largely of modern development), the appearance of the settlement is not such that it merits inclusion in a Special Landscape Area.

Desired Change

Amend the boundary of the Duffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes SLA so that it excludes the settlement at The Downs. In that vicinity, an appropriate boundary would be the existing public highway which separates the settlement from the adjoining common land.

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal field area of South East Wales and has little of the associated industrial development. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing main highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan.

It is inevitable that in defining boundaries in this manner, individual buildings, sites or other less attractive areas may be included within the scope of the SLA. This however does not diminish the importance of the SLA itself nor necessitate the removal of these areas or sites from the designation.

The Dyffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes SLA defines the gentle sloping valleys focussed on the River Waycock and the St.Nicholas and Bonvilston ridge crest and slopes that form an important backcloth to the main gateway into the Vale of Glamorgan at Culverhouse Cross. Combined with the Ely Valley and Ridge Slopes SLA the designation forms a continuous and broad ribbon that runs from the northern edges of Barry to the M4 and reflects the importance and special character of this part of the Vale of Glamorgan. Where the boundary encounters villages with identified residential settlement boundaries as identified within Policy HOUS 2 of the Unitary Development Plan, these boundaries have been used as to define the boundary of the SLA.

The A48 forms an easily identifiable and logical boundary to the two SLA's running along the limestone ridge crest that separates the river valleys of the Ely to the north and the Waycock to the south. To exclude the area around the small settlement of the Downs to the north of Dyffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes SLA would therefore be inconsistent with the approach adopted by the Council in designating SLA's. In the view of the Council, it would arbitrarily remove an area from what is an otherwise logical boundary.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Land Division, Welsh Development Agency **Contact** Mike Cuddy

Representor No. 232 **Representation No.** 21 **Accession No.** 2831 **Modification No.** N111

Representation

The Council proposes to designate a series of Special Landscape Areas, including the Lower Thaw Valley. That proposed SLA covers an extensive area of land, including land which lies immediately to the east of RAF St.Athan and the settlements of Eglwys Brewis and St.Athan. The area proposed for designation includes land which is unsuitable for inclusion in the SLA by virtue of: It containing military structures It being urban land adjoining the existing built up area in which the urban fringe influence is very pronounced It being land which is in use as a golf course.

Desired Change

Amend the boundary of the SLA in the vicinity of Eglwys Brewis/St.Athan to exclude the area shown on the attached plan.

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal field area of South East Wales and has little of the associated industrial development of that era. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan.

It is inevitable that in defining boundaries in this manner, individual buildings, sites or other less attractive areas such as urban fringe, may be included within the scope of the SLA. This however does not diminish the importance of the SLA itself nor necessitate the removal of these areas or sites from the designation.

The reasoning behind the proposed exclusion of land from the designated SLA would seem to be based wholly on some notion of future development potential rather than being vested in any logical consideration of landscape merit. The Lower Thaw Valley SLA has been defined to reflect the prominent landscape feature of the area, the Thaw Valley and its environs and the land identified is clearly associated with this landscape feature.

It is the Council's view that while the identified area lies adjacent to a housing development, to describe it, as urban fringe is misleading and incorrect. RAF St.Athan and its associated developments can only be considered as development within the countryside and any extension of that development would be contrary to current planning policy.

To amend the SLA as suggested to exclude the identified area would introduce the use of natural features such as field boundaries, woodland edges or contours that do not provide either an easily identifiable boundary on the ground nor a guaranteed permanent edge. While the boundaries of the SLA in the vicinity of Eglwys Brewis/St.Athan sensibly follow what are well-defined and logical boundaries such as highways and the edges of settlements, the representation suggests the use of clearly arbitrary boundaries that add little to the integrity of the defined area.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 91

Accession No. 2858

Modification No. D021

Representation

CCW objects to this policy as currently drafted. SLA's are all in the open countryside and must be considered in conjunction with policy ENV 1. They should be subject to the same or more stringent development constraints than other areas of open countryside. Recommend the addition of the following wording at the start of the policy.

Desired Change

CCW recommend the addition of the following wording at the start of the policy "Where development is acceptable under ENV 1"

Recommendation

"Unitary Development Plans are intended to provide a firm basis for rational and consistent decisions on planning applications and appeals." Planning Policy Wales 2002.

The policies within a UDP are not meant to be taken in isolation but together, are intended to give developers and the public certainty about the type of development that will be permitted at any given location. Where development is deemed acceptable in principle, other policies within the Plan may seek to define and control how that development may take place and what constraints if any, will be imposed to ensure that it does not impinge on surrounding land uses or users. The Council is therefore of the view that this philosophy is inherent in the production of any UDP and moreover, the current draft of the SLA SPG includes the following text at paragraph 5.7.

"This policy aims to ensure that if a development is deemed acceptable under other policies within the UDP, such as Policy ENV 1, an additional level of protection will be afforded to ensure that the character of a Special Landscape Area is not harmed or otherwise adversely affected."

SPG is non statutory guidance which supports policies and proposals contained within Unitary Development Plans. Guidance contained in paragraphs 2.12 to 2.16 of Unitary Development Plans Wales (2001) is clear that guidance contained in SPG is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Llandow Community Council

Contact Mrs. Jean Fairclough

Representor No. 246

Representation No. 21

Accession No. 1888

Modification No. N111

Representation

Modification N111 includes the 'Darren Farm' site, that was recommended by the Inspector for residential development, within the Special Landscape Area of the Upper Thaw Valley. We consider that benefits of developing this site for housing are such that the Darren Farm site should be included in policy HOUS 1. The reasons that we would like to see the 'Darren Farm' site developed are: - the Inspector concluded that additional growth should be provided in Cowbridge or Llantwit Major to help relieve the development pressure caused by the growth of employment at the Vale Business Park and the Llandow Trading Estate and that this would not harm the strategy of the Plan of concentrating major development along the waterfront strip. He concluded that Cowbridge was preferable to Llantwit Major for this growth because it already has a small country town character with good public transport links, it has a high demand for housing, such a development would be sustainable and development at Cowbridge would help it to retain its service function in the rural Vale. Furthermore, he recommended that the Darren Farm site could fulfil this need. The Darren Farm development would also bring substantial environmental and safety benefits to Cowbridge and Llysworney through the provision of a new link road between the A48 and the B4270. The Council agreed a statement at the UDP inquiry that this development would: bring environmental and safety benefits to Llysworney; remove 15% of traffic from Cowbridge town centre; improve road safety on the Cowbridge bypass. The link road would bring economic benefits to the Western Vale by improving access to the 2 employment sites adjacent to the B4270 (Vale Business Park and the Llandow Trading Estate). There is potential for economic growth but existing and future business is hindered by poor access to these sites. An alternative Llysworney by-pass is most unlikely to materialise as evidenced by the fact that one has been promised for the last 30 years but funding has never been found. Realistically, funding is most likely to become available for a road solution through a financial contribution linked with a private development such as Darren farm. The alternative of a large development at Llysworney would harm the village character of Llysworney and would be an unsustainable development because of the lack of facilities and services there. In conclusion we consider that the Darren Farm site should be excluded from the Upper Thaw Valley Special Landscape Area because its inclusion would prejudice a development that have huge benefits for the Western Vale.

Desired Change

DELETE THE DARREN FARM SITE FROM THE UPPER THAW VALLEY CONSERVATION AREA ON THE PROPOSALS MAP.

Recommendation

As the Darren Farm site is not within a Conservation Area, the desired change suggested by Llandow Community Council cannot be considered by the Council.

Notwithstanding this, the Darren Farm site has been included within the Upper and Lower Thaw Valley Special Landscape Area following the Vale of Glamorgan Council's comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale of Glamorgan and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal fields area of South East Wales and has little of the industrial development associated with that era. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan. Where SLA's border areas that have designated residential settlement boundaries i.e. Policy HOUS 2 settlements, the SLA will mirror the boundary of that settlement.

In designating Special Landscape Areas, the Council has in the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" study (LWVG) the benefit of a detailed and holistic landscape assessment that was not available at the time of the ASLV designations. While ASLV's considered merely the visual character of the landscape, the SLA's incorporate the visual, historic, archaeological, and cultural information and seek to ensure that landscapes of local importance are identified for designation.

In this regard, it is important that the historic town of Cowbridge is considered in relation to its setting within an important multi period historic landscape and a very distinctive landscape valley. To exclude the Darren Farm site from the SLA designation would have introduced inconsistencies into the SLA designation methodology that would have resulted significant parts of the primary landscape feature, the valley sides and ridges, being excluded.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Therefore, while the Council accepts that the Darren Farm site was previously excluded from the ASLV designations that formed part of the Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan 1991 - 2011 Deposit Draft, in purely visual terms, this was justifiable. However, to exclude the site from the more detailed and wide-ranging SLA designation is not.

The landscape assessment of the Darren Farm site within the LWVG Study has been largely supported by the more detailed assessment undertaken by Mr. Andrew Croft of Chris Blandford Associates in his proof of evidence at the Darren Farm Inquiry. In particular, this evidence assessed the significant historical context of the site and illustrated that the site is a major constituent of the setting of a number of designated and undesignated historic sites and monuments including the scheduled Llanblethian Hill fort. CADW are of the same opinion in respect of the northern area of the objection site in that it forms part of the setting of Llanblethian Hill Fort.

The evidence concludes that

"The Site is situated at the heart of a complex multi-period landscape and plays a significant role in that landscape as a rural component linking a number of highly significant heritage assets...The visibility of these assets and the intervisibility between them are characteristics of the local historic environment. These characteristics allow people to appreciate and understand the complex historical story and processes behind the formulation of the local historic environment. The Site's central geographic position in relation to the assets means that it is key to the maintenance and enhancement of the visual and physical connections between the assets and the character of those assets, and subsequently people's ability to appreciate the local historic environment."

The Council is therefore of the view that the SLA designations are based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the Upper and Lower Thaw Valley Special Landscape Area are logical and well founded. Moreover, the Council is of the opinion that the Darren Farm site has been comprehensively considered at the recent S.78 Public Local Inquiry and that the Council's evidence presented to that Inquiry clearly justifies the sites inclusion within the Upper Thaw Valley Special Landscape Area. The exclusion of the land at Darren Farm from the Special Landscape Area is therefore rejected for the reasons detailed above.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation

Contact Mr. C Lakin

Representor No. 284

Representation No. 3

Accession No. 2921

Modification No. N111

Representation

The boundaries of the Special Landscape Area in the vicinity of our clients property at Highlight Farm have been too widely drawn as they include the residual area of land at Highlight Farm., which is virtually divorced from the large area of agricultural land lying further to the north by the existing golf course. This land and the representation land itself should not be included in the Special Landscape Area.

Desired Change

Remove Special Landscape Area designation from residual area of Highlight Farm and adjacent golf course.

Recommendation

The boundary of the Special Landscape Area (SLA) for the Dyffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes has, in the vicinity of Highlight Farm been drawn contiguous with the residential settlement boundary for Barry. The representation therefore is incorrect in its assessment of the SLA in that the SLA does not include Highlight Farm.

Notwithstanding the above, the purpose of the SLA designation is to identify those landscapes which are of particularly high intrinsic value and which require special protection for their own sake as part of the County's landscape resource. They are not intended to be used as a multipurpose designation to protect landscapes for other reasons, such as to prevent urban sprawl and the coalescence of settlements; or to maintain corridors of green space within the urban areas for the purposes of recreation and general amenity. Other designations, such as 'Green Wedge' are more appropriate to serve these functions. In SLAs, greater emphasis should be placed on the appropriateness and sensitivity of development, assessing the effect of development on landscape features, visibility of development and effective integration of development into the landscape with minimum impact. Therefore, if a proposed development is deemed acceptable under other policies within the UDP such as Policy ENV 1, an additional level of protection will be afforded to ensure that the character of the SLA is not harmed or otherwise adversely affected. The Council will consider such issues as use of landform, orientation of buildings, use and enhancement of existing hard and soft landscape features such as trees, hedgerows, woodlands or walls, and use of materials when assessing the impact of a development.

The Council is therefore of the view that the SLA designations are based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the Duffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes Special Landscape Area are logical and well founded.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation

Contact Mr. C Lakin

Representor No. 284

Representation No. 4

Accession No. 2922

Modification No. D021

Representation

The boundaries of the Special Landscape Area in the vicinity of our clients property at Highlight Farm have been too widely drawn as they include the residual area of land at Highlight Farm., which is virtually divorced from the large area of agricultural land lying further to the north by the existing golf course. This land and the representation land itself should not be included in the Special Landscape Area.

Desired Change

Remove Special Landscape Area designation from residual area of Highlight Farm and adjacent golf course.

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The boundary of the Special Landscape Area (SLA) for the Dyffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes has, in the vicinity of Highlight Farm been drawn contiguous with the residential settlement boundary for Barry. The representation therefore is incorrect in its assessment of the SLA in that the SLA does not include Highlight Farm.

Notwithstanding the above, the purpose of the SLA designation is to identify those landscapes which are of particularly high intrinsic value and which require special protection for their own sake as part of the County's landscape resource. They are not intended to be used as a multipurpose designation to protect landscapes for other reasons, such as to prevent urban sprawl and the coalescence of settlements; or to maintain corridors of green space within the urban areas for the purposes of recreation and general amenity. Other designations, such as 'Green Wedge' are more appropriate to serve these functions. In SLAs, greater emphasis should be placed on the appropriateness and sensitivity of development, assessing the effect of development on landscape features, visibility of development and effective integration of development into the landscape with minimum impact. Therefore, if a proposed development is deemed acceptable under other policies within the UDP such as Policy ENV 1, an additional level of protection will be afforded to ensure that the character of the SLA is not harmed or otherwise adversely affected. The Council will consider such issues as use of landform, orientation of buildings, use and enhancement of existing hard and soft landscape features such as trees, hedgerows, woodlands or walls, and use of materials when assessing the impact of a development.

The Council is therefore of the view that the SLA designations are based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the Duffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes Special Landscape Area are logical and well founded.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Minimix Ltd.

Contact

Representor No. 333

Representation No. 3

Accession No. 2923

Modification No. D021

Representation

The inclusion of the three working quarries is inconsistent with the designation of the Castle Upon Alun Special Landscape Area. The area should either be deleted, or the boundaries revised to exclude the existing quarries and their areas of reserves.

Desired Change

Delete Castle Upon Alun Special Landscape Area or at the very least re-define the boundaries to exclude working quarries and their areas of reserves.

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal field area of South East Wales and has little of the associated industrial development. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides, ridges and slopes. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan.

It is inevitable that in defining boundaries in this manner, individual buildings, sites or smaller less attractive areas such as quarries may be included within the scope of the SLA. This however does not diminish the importance of the SLA itself. The "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" study, assessed the area as outstanding in visual terms and the Castle upon Alun SLA has been defined to reflect the visual prominence and important local character of the elevated carboniferous limestone outcrop.

The Council is therefore of the view that the Castle upon Alun SLA designation is based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the area are logical and well founded. While accepting the presence of the working quarries within the SLA it is considered that their effect on the visual landscape is barely discernible and does not detract from the overall visual quality and character of the area.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Minimix Ltd.

Contact

Representor No. 333

Representation No. 4

Accession No. 2924

Modification No. N111

Representation

The inclusion of the three working quarries is inconsistent with the designation of the Castle Upon Alun Special Landscape area. The area should be deleted, or the boundaries revised to exclude the existing quarries and their areas of reserves.

Desired Change

Delete the Castle Upon Alun Special Landscape Area or at the very least re-define the boundaries to exclude the working quarries and their areas of reserves.

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal field area of South East Wales and has little of the associated industrial development. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides, ridges and slopes. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan.

It is inevitable that in defining boundaries in this manner, individual buildings, sites or smaller less attractive areas such as quarries may be included within the scope of the SLA. This however does not diminish the importance of the SLA itself. The "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" study, assessed the area as outstanding in visual terms and the Castle upon

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Alun SLA has been defined to reflect the visual prominence and important local character of the elevated carboniferous limestone outcrop.

The Council is therefore of the view that the Castle upon Alun SLA designation is based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the area are logical and well founded. While accepting the presence of the working quarries within the SLA it is considered that their effect on the visual landscape is barely discernible and does not detract from the overall visual quality and character of the area.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Minimix Ltd.

Contact

Representor No. 333

Representation No. 5

Accession No. 2939

Modification No. D021

Representation

(1)The wording of the policy is too imprecise, seeking, as it does to apply not only to areas within the estates, but also to ones "closely related to". (2) The inclusion within the Castle Upon Alun SLA of three working quarries is inconsistent with the terms of the policy. (3) The word "unacceptably" should be introduced before the word

Desired Change

(1) Delete the words "closely related to" from the policy. (2) Qualify impact assessment by introducing the word "unacceptably" before the word "adversely".

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

In defining Special Landscape Areas, the Council has sought to identify those landscapes which are of particularly high intrinsic value and which require special protection for their own sake as part of the County's landscape resource. In SLAs, greater emphasis should be placed on the appropriateness and sensitivity of development, assessing the effect of development on landscape features, visibility of development and effective integration of development into the landscape with minimum impact. Therefore, if a proposed development is deemed acceptable under other policies within the Plan such as Policy ENV 1, an additional level of protection will be afforded to ensure that the character of the SLA is not harmed or otherwise adversely affected. It is clear that when considering landscape, inappropriate development can have a visual impact over a far wider area than just its immediate environs and that the special character or "feel" of a location can thus be adversely affected. The Council will consider such issues as use of landform, orientation of buildings, use and enhancement of existing hard and soft landscape features such as trees, hedgerows, woodlands or walls, and use of materials when assessing the impact of a development.

The Council is therefore of the view that it is appropriate to include the wording "closely related to" within the policy to prevent the special character of an area from being diminished by inappropriate development closely related to the SLA.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has recently undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal field area of South East Wales and has little of the associated industrial development of that era. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides, ridges and slopes. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan. It is inevitable that in defining boundaries in this manner, individual buildings, sites or smaller less attractive areas such as quarries may be included within the scope of the SLA. This however does not diminish the importance of the SLA itself. The "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" study, assessed the area as outstanding in visual terms and the Castle upon Alun SLA has been defined to reflect the visual prominence and important local character of the elevated carboniferous limestone outcrop.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

The Council is therefore of the view that the Castle upon Alun SLA designation is based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the area are logical and well founded. While accepting the presence of the working quarries within the SLA it is considered that their effect on the visual landscape is barely discernible and does not detract from the overall visual quality and character of the area.

The introduction of the word "unacceptably" before the word "adversely" in addition to being a double negative, would imply that some level of adverse effect would be acceptable. The policy as worded seeks to ensure that for development that is deemed acceptable under other policies within the Unitary Development Plan, an additional level of protection will be afforded to ensure that the character of a Special Landscape Area is not harmed or otherwise adversely affected. The Council is of the view that this change is not in keeping with the objectives of the policy and is therefore rejected.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Anstee Trustees

Contact

Representor No. 342

Representation No. 4

Accession No. 2937

Modification No. N111

Representation

We object to the inclusion of the land shown in red on the attached plan as within the Special Landscape Area. The Special Landscape Area is too widespread and the subject land does not warrant inclusion on landscape grounds. If this objection is not accepted we consider that this matter should be subject to a further Public Inquiry as this designation was not included in the Deposit Draft UDP and the proposal should be subject to scrutiny by an independent Planning Inspector.

Desired Change

The land identified on the attached plan in red should be deleted from the Special Landscape Area.

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal field area of South East Wales and has little of the associated industrial development. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan.

The Dyffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes SLA is considered important for its quiet rural character, its field patterns and boundaries, its water courses and woodlands and the visual prominence of its ridges and slopes that form an important visual backdrop to the main Vale gateway at Culverhouse Cross.

The site identified in the representation lies on the eastern edge of the SLA on the southern extremity of the village of Wenvoe. The A4050 Port Road forms the eastern boundary of the SLA and the representation site and the northern boundary is defined by the residential settlement boundary for Wenvoe. The site consists primarily of open fields however, a garden centre and a small number of houses occupy the southernmost section of the identified site. It is inevitable that in utilising highways to define SLA's that individual buildings, sites or smaller, less attractive areas may be included within the scope of the SLA. Notwithstanding this minor detractor, the openness of the majority of the site and the rising ground to the woodland ridge to the west represents an important green backdrop to the village of Wenvoe and justifies the areas inclusion within the SLA.

The importance of the site was also recognised at the UDP Public Local Inquiry in 1999 / 2000 when the Inspector considered that, "the site clearly lies in an area where I consider the openness of the countryside should be protected from development." The Inspector continued and stated that contrary to the objector's view that development of the site would comprise a modest

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

housing allocation that would increase the range and choice of available sites, in his view, "it would represent a significant and unacceptable extension of the urban area of Wenvoe into open countryside." Finally, the Inspector concluded, "development of the objection site would result in the unacceptable urbanisation of important open and undeveloped land that forms an integral part of the openness of the countryside within which it is situated."

The purpose of the SLA designation is to identify those landscapes which are of particularly high intrinsic value and which require special protection for their own sake as part of the County's landscape resource. In SLAs, greater emphasis should be placed on the appropriateness and sensitivity of development, assessing the effect of development on landscape features, visibility of development and effective integration of development into the landscape with minimum impact. Therefore, if a proposed development is deemed acceptable under other policies within the UDP such as Policy ENV 1, an additional level of protection will be afforded to ensure that the character of the SLA is not harmed or otherwise adversely affected. The Council will consider such issues as use of landform, orientation of buildings, use and enhancement of existing hard and soft landscape features such as trees, hedgerows, woodlands or walls, and use of materials when assessing the impact of a development.

The Council is therefore of the view that the SLA designations are based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the Duffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes SLA are logical and well founded. Further, the Council considers that landscape issues have been given due consideration at the UDP Public Local Inquiry in 1999 / 2000 and therefore there is no justification to hold a Modification Inquiry to debate the matter further.

The Council for the reasons given above rejects the objection to the inclusion of the identified site within this Special Landscape Area as well as the call for a further Public Inquiry. In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Barry College

Contact

Representor No. 350

Representation No. 5

Accession No. 2933

Modification No. D021

Representation

The College Annex site occupies a fringe location on the edge of the urban area of Barry, and may, subject to further progress on the Airport Access Link Road, become physically divorced from the major part of the proposed Landscape Area.

Desired Change

Deletion of Special Landscape Area zoning from Barry College Annex Site, and other adjacent urban fringe land. Boundary of SLA to be revised to align with route previously proposed for the Airport Link Road.

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal field area of South East Wales and has little of the associated industrial development of that era. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan.

In defining SLA boundaries, the Council has only taken account of current circumstances. While the Airport Access Road is a committed scheme of the Council, its implementation is dependent upon numerous factors and to date, no definitive line has been agreed. To define a boundary along an arbitrary line that may materialise in the future would detract from the objectives of the policy and would in the view of the Council be illogical.

The purpose of the SLA designation is to identify those landscapes which are of particularly high intrinsic value and which require special protection for their own sake as part of the County's landscape resource. They are not intended to be used as a

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

multipurpose designation to protect landscapes for other reasons, such as to prevent urban sprawl and the coalescence of settlements; or to maintain corridors of green space within the urban areas for the purposes of recreation and general amenity. Other designations, such as 'Green Wedge' are more appropriate to serve these functions. In SLAs, greater emphasis should be placed on the appropriateness and sensitivity of development, assessing the effect of development on landscape features, visibility of development and effective integration of development into the landscape with minimum impact. Therefore, if a proposed development is deemed acceptable under other policies within the UDP such as ENV 1, an additional level of protection will be afforded to ensure that the character of the SLA is not harmed or otherwise adversely affected. The Council will consider such issues as use of landform, orientation of buildings, use and enhancement of existing hard and soft landscape features such as trees, hedgerows, woodlands or walls, and use of materials when assessing the impact of a development.

The Council is therefore of the view that the SLA designations are based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the Duffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes Special Landscape Area are logical and well founded.

The amendment of the SLA boundary to exclude the Barry College Annex site and the realignment of the boundary to conform to a generic boundary line does not accord with the accepted methodology and is therefore rejected.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Cowbridge and Llanblethian Residents Group **Contact** Dr. C.A. Pearce

Representor No. 378 **Representation No.** 4 **Accession No.** 1642 **Modification No.** D021

Representation

This representation is in support of MOD D021 because the Council now has the benefit of a Comprehensive Landscape Study of the vale of Glamorgan utilising LANDMAP methodology of landscape assessment enabling "Special Landscape Areas" to be defined and designated. The Vale of Glamorgan contains seven such "Special Landscape Areas" which need strict control of development to protect their special landscape character. We especially support the inclusion of special landscape areas (iii) "Upper Thaw Valley" and (ii) "Lower Thaw Valley", which include the landscapes surrounding Cowbridge and Llanblethian and their rural settings, which are important critical and sensitive characteristics of these two historic settlements.

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation **Contact** Mr. & Mrs. Ann & John Cann

Representor No. 570 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 1821 **Modification No.** N111

Representation

MOD N111-Special Landscape Areas- The specific exclusion of a significant part of the hamlets of Walterston and Moulton from the Nant Llancafarn Special Landscape Area is extremely strange. We can think of no rational reason or justification for it. In the case of Walterston the boundary shown splits the hamlet in two, excluding two 16th Century houses, both listed buildings, and the surrounding landscape. In planning terms there can be no advantage in this strange exclusion of a small area in the middle of the combined Llancafarn and Dyffryn Areas. Anywhere within the excluded area is very "closely related to the Llancafarn and Dyffryn Special Landscape Areas" and hence the same planning restraints will apply. The exclusion makes no sense, and must be surely an accidental error.

Desired Change

MOD N111 Special Landscape Areas-The boundary of the Llancafarn Special Landscape Area to be changed so that it continues uninterrupted along the A4226 (Weycock Road/Five Mile Lane) from Whitton Cross (the turning to Walterston) to the turning to Moulton, thus including all of the Walterston and Moulton hamlets. This will make the East boundary run along the A4226 all the way from the A48 to Weycock Cross, just as the Dyffryn boundary does on the other side of the A4226. There will no longer be a strange small arbitrary exclusion zone in the middle of the otherwise coherent, and contiguous Landscape Areas of Llancafarn and Dyffryn. (See attached copy of map).

Recommendation

The Vale of Glamorgan Council notes and accepts the amendments proposed by Mr. & Mrs. Cann in respect on the Nant Llancafarn Special Landscape Area (SLA) and has amended the eastern boundary of the SLA to accord with the A4226 Five

Mile Lane. This amendment is illustrated on the revised plan XXX.

CHANGE AS DESCRIBED

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Contact Non Watkin Evans

Representor No. 595 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 1859 **Modification No.** N111

Representation

MOD N111 SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS. I have examined Landmap and studied the area and see no reason why the area to the west of the Five Mile Lane between Whitton Cross and Moulton Lane is excluded.

Desired Change

MOD N111 SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS. Modify the boundary of area to follow the Five Mile Lane (A4226) between Whitton Cross and Moulton Lane as shown in the attached copy of the map. There are two listed buildings in this area - Walterston. Trewalter Farm. Walterston Fach.

Recommendation

The Vale of Glamorgan Council notes and accepts the amendments proposed by Mr. & Mrs. Cann in respect on the Nant Llancarfan Special Landscape Area (SLA) and has amended the eastern boundary of the SLA to accord with the A4226 Five Mile Lane. This amendment is illustrated on the revised plan XXX.

CHANGE AS DESCRIBED

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation Contact L McDonald

Representor No. 1642 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 2989 **Modification No.** D021

Representation

1. We act on behalf of Mr. L. McDonald and are instructed to submit representations to The Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996 - 2011: Proposed Changes to the Proposed Modifications to the Deposit Draft 1998. 2. The representations concern specific policy designation affecting the Listed Buildings, other buildings, and land situated at Brynwell Farm, Leckwith, in the Cwrt yr Ala Basin. An appropriate small scale courtyard residential development including returning Listed Buildings back into use would help to satisfy part of the council's housing needs for an additional, 6,079 dwellings between 1998 - 2011. 3. The buildings and land are identified on the attached plans. Access to the courtyard is gained from the Public Highway that joins the B4267 Leckwith Road. 4. A courtyard residential development is sought with all new and existing properties being accessed from the existing courtyard zone, and other independent existing properties as indicated being refurbished or rebuilt. The new properties would reflect the character and design of the Listed Buildings, and when sold, the capital received would be utilised to renovate and convert the Listed buildings. 5. The site is in a hollow, free of all flood plains, and cannot be overlooked or viewed from the intended Special Landscape Area. 6. All development would have the highest regard to the characteristics and features of the surrounding landscape, and will be designed to minimise any impact upon the landscape. 7. Hard and soft landscaping including trees, hedges, walls and ponds for aquatic life will be made good and/or introduced or constructed. 8. POLICY ENV 1 - DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE applies to this proposal because the proposal would be approved by POLICY ENV 7 - SMALL SCALE RURAL CONVERSIONS which states "Proposals which involve small scale conversions of rural buildings to new uses will be permitted if all of the following criteria are met:- Where the building is of architectural or historic value, the proposed conversion retains those architectural or historic features present in the building. The building is structurally sound and the conversion can be achieved without substantial reconstruction of the external walls, or extension to the building. Conversion work can be undertaken without unacceptably altering the appearance and rural character of the building. Amenity space can be provided within the curtilage of the site without undue incursion into the rural landscape. Vehicular access is available. Satisfactory parking provision can be made within the curtilage of the site. The proposal is not incompatible with activities carried out on adjoining land. Utility and infrastructure services can be provided without unacceptable visual intrusion and without detriment to the environment. The proposal would preserve or enhance the architectural or historic quality of a Listed Building or its setting." 9. POLICY ENV 15 - PROTECTION OF BUILT AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT further approves this proposal as the policy seeks to protect Listed Buildings, and any renovations or extensions to the adjacent barns would have to be carried out sensitively and in the historic character of the main building. 10. POLICY HOUS 10 - CONVERSION OF LARGE DWELLINGS further approves this proposal as the policy allows the conversion of large dwellings into small self-contained units providing the scale and form of proposed development is in keeping with surrounding uses; there is no unacceptable effect on the amenity and character of existing or neighbouring environments, and that car parking and amenity space is provided. 11. The site is of adequate size to accommodate all the development without causing detrimental impact to the privacy and amenity of dwellings and occupiers nearby; and will have full regards to site aspects, noise minimisation, ergonomics, energy conservation and extendibility. This proposal will:- (i) Respect and enhance the local environment. (ii) Be of a suitable design appropriate to its location, and will utilise materials appropriate to the character of the area. (iii) Avoid the loss of important features, which contribute to the quality of the local environment. (iv) Incorporate hard and soft landscaping as an integral part of the design. (v) Have no

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

unacceptable impact on local amenity in terms of visual impact, privacy, disturbance and loss of light. (vi) Retain, enhance and/or create open spaces, public views, skyline, and other landscape features. (vii) Be designed so as to ensure maximum use is made of natural daylight and solar energy, within buildings, in gardens and amenity space subject to the parameters set by other policies in this plan.

This is achieved by:- a) Strategically planning the development. b) Minimising its visual impact. c) Using a suitable design for its location and environment utilising traditional materials already used in the area. d) Utilising the physical character and topography of the site, including all natural features. e) Creating visual, amenity and recreational areas, with the landscaped areas being designed to cater for the safe and efficient movement of less able people. f) Providing access including provision of visibility splays, turning areas and parking space standards. g) Landscaping the development and constructing a large shallow pond to act as a feature and surface water attenuation to assist in surface water drainage. h) Encouraging waterfowl, amphibians and other aquatic life. i) Mature trees, hedgerows and existing landscape features will be retained to create a high amenity and mature appearance that will enhance the beauty and desirability of the area.

Desired Change

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal field area of South East Wales and has little of the associated industrial development of that era. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan. It is inevitable that in defining boundaries in this manner, individual buildings, sites or smaller, less attractive areas may be included within the scope of the SLA.

Brynwell Farm is clearly part of the main basin that is the focus of the Cwrt-Yr-Ala SLA and cannot be considered to detract from the overall character of the designated area.

The purpose of the SLA designation is to identify those landscapes which are of particularly high intrinsic value and which require special protection for their own sake as part of the County's landscape resource. They are not intended to be used as a multipurpose designation to protect landscapes for other reasons, such as to prevent urban sprawl and the coalescence of settlements; or to maintain corridors of green space within the urban areas for the purposes of recreation and general amenity. Other designations, such as 'Green Wedge' are more appropriate to serve these functions. In SLAs, greater emphasis should be placed on the appropriateness and sensitivity of development, assessing the effect of development on landscape features, visibility of development and effective integration of development into the landscape with minimum impact.

Therefore, if a proposed development is deemed acceptable under other policies within the UDP such as Policy ENV 1, an additional level of protection will be afforded to ensure that the character of the SLA is not harmed or otherwise adversely affected. The objection received details numerous policies that, along with Policy ENV XXX - SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS would be used to assess the appropriateness of any development application received by the Council. The Council will consider such issues as use of landform, orientation of buildings, use and enhancement of existing hard and soft landscape features such as trees, hedgerows, woodlands or walls, and use of materials when assessing the impact of a development.

The Council is therefore of the view that the SLA designations are based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the Duffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes SLA are logical and well founded. The objection to Policy ENV XXX - SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS, and in particular to the Cwrt Yr Ala Basin SLA designation and the inclusion of the Brynwell Farm site within that designation is therefore rejected by the Council for the reasons given above.

The assessment of the suitability of a site against UDP policies as detailed in the representation is a matter more appropriately considered when a planning application has been submitted to the Council. The Council considers therefore that the inclusion within the representation of references to Policies ENV 1, ENV 7, ENV 15 and HOUS 10 is inappropriate in this stage of the UDP process and does not form an acceptable representation into the modification process.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation c/o Agent

Contact Mr. Roy Alison

Representor No. 1669 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 2936 **Modification No.** N111

Representation

We object to the inclusion of the land shown red on the attached plan as within the Special Landscape Area. The Special Landscape Area is too widespread and the subject land does not warrant inclusion on landscape grounds. If this objection is not accepted we consider that this matter should be subject to a further Public Inquiry as this designation was not included in the Deposit Draft UDP and the proposal should be subject to scrutiny by an independent Planning Inspector.

Desired Change

The land identified on the attached plan in red should be deleted from the Special Landscape Area.

Recommendation

The cover report provides detailed information on the Council's decision not to hold a Public Local Inquiry into this issue. A copy of the relevant extract from the cover report is attached.

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" Study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal field area of South East Wales and has little of the associated industrial development of that era. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that coincide with the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan. It is inevitable that in defining boundaries in this manner, individual buildings, sites or smaller, less attractive areas may be included within the scope of the SLA.

The Dyffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes SLA is considered important for its quiet rural character, its field patterns and boundaries, its water courses and woodlands and the visual prominence of its ridges and slopes that form an important visual backdrop to the main Vale gateway at Culverhouse Cross.

The site identified in the representation lies on the eastern edge of the SLA to the north of the Wenvoe Castle Golf Club. The site is bounded by the primary eastern boundary of the SLA, the A4050 Port Road. More importantly, the significance of a large proportion of the site has already been recognised by its inclusion in the Wenvoe Castle entry of the Glamorgan Register of Landscapes, Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales.

The purpose of the SLA designation is to identify those landscapes which are of particularly high intrinsic value and which require special protection for their own sake as part of the County's landscape resource. Clearly the entry in the Register of Landscapes, Parks and gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales supports this.

The Council considers therefore that the SLA designations are based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the Dyffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes SLA are logical and well founded. The Council for the reasons given above rejects the objection to the inclusion of the identified site within the Dyffryn Basin and Ridge Slopes Special Landscape Area.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Special Landscape Areas

Organisation

Contact Mr. L McDonald

Representor No. 1670 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 2938 **Modification No.** N111

Representation

The Special Landscape Area has been too widely drawn, and the site at Brynwell Farm does not warrant inclusion in the wider area. The site is well contained and does not contribute materially to the wider area.

Desired Change

The site of Brynwell Farm and its immediate environs should be excluded from the Cwrt-Yr-Ala Special Landscape area, and boundary of the area should be revised on the basis of further detail assessment.

Recommendation

The Vale of Glamorgan Council has undertaken a comprehensive landscape study utilising the Countryside Council for Wales LANDMAP assessment methodology. Entitled "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan", this four volume document identified 33 Landscape Character Areas within the Vale and provided design guidance and an action programme for landscape improvements. The LANDMAP methodology recognises that landscape is not simply a matter of scenic or visual quality, but that factors such as ecology, history and culture have a bearing upon the way landscape is perceived and valued. It is important that subsequent SLA designation incorporates this holistic approach. The methodology is recognised by the Welsh Assembly Government in Planning Policy Wales 2002, an "important information resource upon which local planning authorities can draw in making the landscape assessments needed to inform local policy, guidance and decision making".

In his assessment of objections into the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan Deposit Draft 1998 (as amended), the Inspector considered that in line with draft regional guidance, Special Landscape Areas (SLA) should be defined within the Vale of Glamorgan (Inspector's recommendation REC 3.17 refers). In defining the SLA's, the Council has drawn on the detailed work within the "Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan" study that identified the Landscape Character Areas.

The Vale of Glamorgan lies outside the coal field area of South East Wales and has little of the associated industrial development of that era. In defining SLA's for the Vale of Glamorgan the boundaries are therefore likely to be extensive and will cover whole landscape features such as valley bottoms or valley sides. As boundaries need to be obvious, enduring and easily identifiable, the use of contours or field boundaries has generally been avoided and instead, where possible, boundaries have been drawn that conform to the existing highway network of the Vale of Glamorgan. It is inevitable that in defining boundaries in this manner, individual building, sites or smaller, less attractive areas may be included within the generality of the SLA.

Brynwell Farm is clearly part of the main basin that is the focus of the Cwrt-Yr-Ala SLA and cannot be considered to detract from the overall character of the designated area.

The purpose of the SLA designation is to identify those landscapes which are of particularly high intrinsic value and which require special protection for their own sake as part of the County's landscape resource. They are not intended to be used as a multipurpose designation to protect landscapes for other reasons, such as to prevent urban sprawl and the coalescence of settlements; or to maintain corridors of green space within the urban areas for the purposes of recreation and general amenity. Other designations, such as 'Green Wedge' are more appropriate to serve these functions.

In SLA's, greater emphasis should be placed on the appropriateness and sensitivity of development, on assessing the effect of development on landscape features, visibility of development and effective integration of development into the landscape with minimum impact. Therefore, if a proposed development is deemed acceptable under other policies within the UDP such as Policy ENV 1, an additional level of protection will be afforded to ensure that the character of the SLA is not harmed or otherwise adversely affected. The Council will consider such issues as use of landform, orientation of buildings, use and enhancement of existing hard and soft landscape features such as trees, hedgerows, woodlands or walls, and use of materials when assessing the impact of a development.

The Council considers therefore that the SLA designations are based on a sound methodology and a detailed landscape assessment and that the extent and boundaries of the Cwrt Yr Ala basin Special Landscape Area are logical and well defined.

The objection to the extent of the Cwrt Yr Ala Basin SLA designation, the inclusion of the Brynwell Farm site and the request for a further detailed assessment is therefore rejected by the Council.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

**ST ATHAN
NON ALLOCATION OF HOUSING**

Issue: St Athan non-allocation for housing

Organisation Contact Mr. John James
Representor No. 268 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 1777 **Modification No.** N035

Representation

MOD N035 does not include the garden of Malt Barn Cottage for which full planning consent was given in July 1999 Refs.: 99/0382/BR, 98/0097/LBC and 98/00785/FUL. And 22.10.1998 Ref. 98/00785/FUL para 2 mentions specifically site planned and location plan drawing No 2060/8A which includes the boundary of the garden of Malt Barn Cottage.

Desired Change

In order to remedy the contradiction in planning detail, the change I wish to see made is that the whole of the garden of Malt Barn Cottage (as per drawing No 2060/8A part of planning consent Ref. 98/00785/FUL) be included in Modification N035 to the Unitary Plan.

Recommendation

The Vale of Glamorgan Council notes and accepts the amendment proposed by Mr. John James and has amended the residential settlement boundary for St.Athan accordingly.

CHANGE AS DESCRIBED

Issue: St Athan non allocation for housing

Organisation Contact Mr. G Thomas
Representor No. 353 **Representation No.** 3 **Accession No.** 2917 **Modification No.**

Representation

Since the preparation of the Deposit Draft of the Unitary Development Plan and the preparation of the Inspectors Report, there has been a change in local circumstances with proposals having been announced for the basing of additional military personnel at St.Athan, and also the upgrading and expansion of facilities at the St.Athan Air base. Consequently, the allocated site under Policy H1 (17) St Johns Well should be maintained whilst further consideration is given to the changed circumstances.

Desired Change

Recommendation

The Inspector's recommendation to exclude the St Johns Well site for housing was based on the sites closed proximity to the St Athan Airfield, which is subjected to "considerable intermittent noise" and that there was no evidence to illustrate that the sewage and drainage problems affecting the site could be satisfactorily and economically overcome.

Consequently, the change in circumstances you refer to, do not address the above issues as they relate to the site and therefore the Council considers that the proposed modification should be maintained in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: St Athan non allocation for housing

Organisation GLYN W JONES BUILDERS **Contact** MR GLYNN WATTS Jones
Representor No. 621 **Representation No.** 1 **Accession No.** 1900 **Modification No.** E25

Representation

The Planning grounds for the present objection are as follows:-
The St. John's Well site was allocated for residential use, in the Vale of Glamorgan UDP Deposit Draft 1998, as well as in the following development plans: Rural Vale Local Plan (approved 1989), Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan Consultation Draft 1993, Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan Deposit Draft 1995 (approved for development control purposes in 1996), also the South Glamorgan Structure Plan (Alternative No 1) identifies St. Athan as a Village where in filling and rounding off of the existing built up areas would be permitted. Other planning issues on which the modification was based: loss of Countryside, noise issues, and uncertainty due to sewage/drainage problems, will be discussed later. Last but not least, the present planning issue is the imminent development of the RAF camp in St. Athan, together with the WDA plans for the development of the adjacent

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

sites for business, and new employment locations.

In support of his decision, the Inspector recommended deletion of this site, based on the following criteria:

He firstly noted that the site was not within the Strategy area of the plan, which now seeks to concentrate development opportunities in the Waterfront areas from Penarth to Rhoose. It is true, that the site in St. Athan, is not located in that waterfront strip, but it is also true that it is near a big employer, and future business developments. Inflexible adherence to this strategy, will negate opportunities in other locations where the circumstances for balance housing and employment growth exist. This is particularly relevant at St. Athan.

The inspector noted that there are sewage and drainage problems in the area, although there were no objections made by the Highways department, to an outline application considered and refused in 1995. Should a public inquiry be called for, we will discuss the circumstances of that application, and a recent one lodged in September 2001, concerning sewerage and drainage issues. Suffice to say for now, that there are drainage solutions for this site (on-site underground treatment plant, and reed bed outfall, until connection to sewer is possible), also Welsh Water/Hyder informs that the public sewage system in the St. Athan area, will be up-graded by 2006. Any development proposed on the site would be conditioned to start after the sewer up-grading takes place. That time scale will allow development to take place well within the plan period.

The inspector then compounds his conclusion saying that he is not convinced by the Council's approach to this site (the Council recommended until then, the residential use of the site), as he feels that although considered to be a logical "rounding off" of the village, it would constitute a larger scale extension into an area of open countryside than would normally be acceptable under the policies of the Plan. He also mentions the proximity of the RAF airfield, and the considerable intermittent noise originated.

As we can see, the Inspector again refers to the Strategy Plan (as if no other areas in the Vale should be developed), and the problem of noise. This latter is also present in the existing houses near the site, and in all other recent residential permissions in St. Athan, approved by the Council. With regards to this issue, noise readings would show that these would be within the limits accepted, in residential locations. Further measures can be taken (double or triple glazing, etc.), to minimise these issues. Although the Inspector was not convinced that the site is suitable for allocation for housing, the neighbours letters received in the most recent outline application (in 2001), confirmed that the noise is restricted to day time hours, and none is generated by night. They also confirmed that the noise is very intermittent, and this does not unduly bother them. The inspector repeats, in his final conclusion, that although he has taken into account the planning history of the site, he considers that the overriding need, is that proposals made in the plan do not compromise its overall strategy. Here again, the Inspector may be thinking in the Barry/Penarth waterfront.

The Council, in accepting the views expressed by the Inspector, says that if the residential allocation were to be maintained, it would result in loss of Countryside, noise issues, and uncertainty due to sewage/drainage problems. The Council therefore dismisses all previous planning legislation, all reasonable solutions to the sewage/drainage problems, and assessment of the noise issues, and relevant solutions available. All this brings the result of the Council's causing uncertainty in its policies, and disregard of suitable locations for residential sites. The St. John's Well site, although not within the area of strategic development, nevertheless deserves a more positive planning judgement, as it is near to a centre of developing employment, is an in filling and rounding off of the village, it would maintain the individual character of St. Athan, will improve the local area by providing additional public recreation facilities, would be a practical and to scale development, and will provide increased density (as requested by present planning guidance), and in keeping with its surroundings.

Planning Policy Context.

National level guidance is found in Planning Policy Wales March 2002, Planning Guidance (Wales) UDP dated May 1996, Technical Advice Note 11 (Noise), and Circular 3/99 (W.O. 10/99) on non mains drainage. The main issues arising from this guidance are:

PPW – Section 2 refers to new development in rural areas which should be located in those settlements which have readily good accessibility by non-car modes, when compared to rural areas as a whole. Development in the countryside should be located adjoining settlements where it can be best accommodated in terms of infrastructure, access and habitat and landscape conservation. Minor extensions to existing settlements may be acceptable.

PPW – Section 3 on development plans states that UDP should give developers and the public certainty about the type of development that will be permitted at a given location.

PPW – Section 3 also states that phasing of development may be justified when related to physical infrastructure or the adequacy of other services which may indicate that a particular site cannot be released for development until a particular stage in the planning period.

PPW – Section 9 on the requirement for and location of new housing development. In deciding which sites to allocate for housing, consideration should be given to the location and accessibility of potential development sites to jobs, shops, and services by modes other than the car; capacity of existing or potential infrastructure – which includes water and sewerage.

PPW – Section 9 states that minor extensions to groups of dwellings may be acceptable, but much depends on the character of the surroundings, pattern of development in the area, and accessibility to main towns and villages.

PPW – Section 12 on the provision of infrastructure and services states that development in sewered areas must connect to the main sewer. If this is not feasible, non mains drainage schemes may be acceptable subject to the provisions of Circular 3/99.

PG(W) UDP on the need to ensure that development plans have a clear and concise statement of an authority's policies and proposals for the development and other use of land. Each policy should be clear and succinct and easily understood.

TAN 11 – on noise assessment of sensitive receptors including residential development. Annex B refers specifically to military aerodromes.

C3/99 – on non-mains sewerage. In particular Annex A on the assessment of such proposals.

Strategic and Local Policy

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

South Glamorgan Structure Plan Alteration No1 – Approved 1989

The South Glamorgan Structure Plan identifies St. Athan as a village where in filling and rounding off of the existing built up area would be permitted (Policy H9 [Document 12]. A replacement Structure Plan was proposed for the former South Glamorgan County Council and a revised copy was published in February 1995 within this document. There are no policies that refer to the in filling or rounding off of existing built up areas in the rural vale. The plan, however, was never adopted.

Rural Vale Local Plan – Approved 1989

The Rural Vale Local Plan was approved for development control purposes in 1989. St. Athan, is identified as a village where in filling and rounding off could take place, as it is considered to contain sufficient community facilities to absorb limited housing development (Policy H1) [Document 13]. The St. John's Well site (5.16 ha) is specially allocated for housing in this local plan under Policy H2. In the supporting text at paragraph 2.18 it states that the adjacent RAF Station creates the effect of a much larger urban concentration at St. Athan, in terms of the size of the built area and related land uses.

Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan Consultation Draft 1993

The site [12.75 acres] was again allocated for residential development (Policy HOUS 1) in this development plan. It was similarly recognised that St. Athan is unique, due to its location adjacent to the RAF Station, which creates an effect of a much larger urban concentration.

Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan Deposit Draft 1993 (Approved for development Control Purposes 1996)

The residential allocation of the site is maintained in the Deposit Draft, but the site area has been reduced from 12.75 acres to 3.7 acres due to representations submitted to the Consultation Draft. (Document 14). Reference is made at paragraph 3.6.17 to the hydraulic overloading of the public sewerage system in St. Athan. Due to this it is highlighted that Welsh Water may object to any development proposal on this site until necessary improvements have been completed. It is suggested that any development should possibly consider requisitioning Welsh Water to provide foul sewerage facilities for the site.

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan – Deposit Draft 1998

The UDP when adopted will supersede the Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan. Strategic Policy 3 identifies that there will be a need for 5,800 houses in the period 1996-2011. It states at Criteria 5 that land will be made available for additional dwellings at minor sites (less than 2 ha) identified in the plan [Document 15]. In part 2 of the UDP St. Athan is identified as a rural settlement that could accommodate in filling and rounding off. The allocation of residential development on the 3.7-acre site at St. John's Well is maintained (Policy HOUS 1.17). In the supporting text (paragraph 4.4.39) reference is again made to the problem of hydraulic overloading at the public sewerage system at St. Athan. It is, therefore, suggested that Welsh Water is requisitioned to provide foul sewerage facilities for the site. It is also noted that the Environment Agency has advised that a Greenfield run-off restriction may be required for the site. Other policies of relevance include Policy ENV1 – "Development in The Countryside" which restricts development in the countryside unless it is essential for agricultural, forestry, mining, utilities, infrastructure, recreational use, and conversion of existing buildings. Policy ENV1 allows for infrastructure and appropriate recreational use within the area defined as open countryside. With reference to utilities Part 2 of the UDP refers to community and utilities surfaces and states at paragraph 11.4.99 in relation to public sewers treatment/trunk sewers, that proposed development may necessitate improvements to existing public sewerage systems and it is expected that developers will either utilise the requisition of procedure for the provision of facilities from Dwr Cymru – Welsh Water or carry out the necessary improvements as part of each development.

Proposed changes January 1999 and further proposed changes April 1999

No changes were proposed to Policy HOUS1 or ENV1.

Issues

Housing Allocation

The St. John's Well site is a long standing housing allocation that the Council wants to modify. The previous plans mentioned before, along with the South Glamorgan Structure Plan, also identified St. Athan as a village where in filling and rounding off of the existing built up area will be permitted. In addition, the site's allocation for housing meets national local criteria for housing development. The Inspector recommended that the site be deleted from the plan (REC 4.28) based on the grounds that it would constitute a large scale extension of the village.

A most important argument in support of this site's residential allocation, is the employment opportunities in close proximity to the site, and St. Athan in general. As said before, it is in the news and public knowledge that these employment opportunities will increase in the immediate future, due to the proposed expansion of the DARA base at RAF St. Athan, with the construction of the new £ 77m of a super-hangar which will secure the future of a 2,500 strong work force. This in turn will free up space for the construction of the WDA's Aerospace Centre of Excellence, for which the planning consent could be secured latter this year. All these new business and employment developments, will increase the demand for residential allocations in this area. We would point out that these facts, post-date the Inspector's Report.

Noise

The site's location in the proximity to the RAF Airfield at St. Athan was raised by the Inspector as a reason why the site should be deleted from the plan due to the noise emitted from the airfield. The issue has not prevented the Council in the past from granting consent for residential development in this area (Llantwit Gardens, St. David's Crescent and Higher End), nor it has created an unacceptable environment for existing residents since St. Athan remains a popular place to live. Letters from residents confirm the quiet environment they generally enjoy. Furthermore the issue of noise from RAF St. Athan should have

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

been taken into account when the site was allocated in successive development plans and in the systematic environmental appraisal of the UDP. At present, there is an application for residential development in St. Athan, in Ringwood Crescent, inside the RAF camp, at which not even the MOD is objecting, concerning the noise issue.

Foul Drainage

Circular 3/99 on Non-main Sewerage Systems and Policy Advice on "Development in Sewered Areas" allow for interim arrangements to be considered where a connection to an appropriate sewer is not feasible. Welsh Water has reported that it has a programme for up-grading the foul sewers in this area, by the year 2006.

Final paragraph to item 5 in the representation form:

The St. John's Well site, because of its history of positive Planning Policies that sustained its residential allocation for many years, and its location adjacent to centres of present and future increased employment, deserves a more thoughtful verdict. Issues of existing uncertainty concerning drainage and noise, are technically capable of being resolved, if the Council would be mindful to revise its modification, and faithfully continue to allocate the site for residential use, even with more reason now, in consideration of the increase in demand for residential allocation in St. Athan, due to the imminent creation of sources of employment, and new jobs in this village.

Desired Change

For the above reasons, we request the following changes be made to the proposed modifications, to overcome our objection: That Site 17: St. John's Well, St. Athan, be re-allocated for residential use, Policy HOUS 1.

Recommendation

The Inspector considered the allocation of site HOUS1 (7) at St. John's Well, St. Athan would lead to a loss of countryside, and the "buffer" which it provides between the residential core of the village and the Airfield. Consequently, on this basis the Inspector concluded that this site should not be allocated for housing. The Council concurred with the Inspector's assessment and reasoning for the non-allocation of HOUS1 (7) at St. John's Well, on the basis that it would result in the loss of countryside, and subsequent noise issues generated by the loss of the buffer between the village and the airfield.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: St Athan non-allocation for housing

Organisation	GLYN W JONES BUILDERS	Contact	MR GLYNN WATTS Jones
Representor No.	621	Representation No.	2
Accession No.	1901	Modification No.	E11

Representation

The Planning grounds for the present objection are as follows:

The St. John's Well site was allocated for residential use, in the Vale of Glamorgan UDP Deposit Draft 1998, as well as in the following development plans: Rural Vale Local Plan (approved 1989), Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan Consultation Draft 1993, Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan Deposit Draft 1995 (approved for development control purposes in 1996), also the South Glamorgan Structure Plan (Alternative No 1) identifies St. Athan as a Village where infilling and rounding off of the existing built up areas would be permitted. Other planning issues on which the modification was based: loss of Countryside, noise issues, and uncertainty due to sewage/drainage problems, will be discussed later. Last but not least, the present planning issue is the imminent development of the RAF camp in St. Athan, together with the WDA plans for the development of the adjacent sites for business, and new employment locations.

In support of his decision, the Inspector recommended deletion of this site, based on the following criteria:

He firstly noted that the site was not within the Strategy area of the plan, which now seeks to concentrate development opportunities in the Waterfront areas from Penarth to Rhose. It is true, that the site in St. Athan, is not located in that waterfront strip, but it is also true that it is near a big employer, and future business developments. Inflexible adherence to this strategy, will negate opportunities in other locations where the circumstances for balance housing and employment growth exist. This is particularly relevant at St. Athan.

The inspector noted that there are sewage and drainage problems in the area, although there were no objections made by the Highways department, to an outline application considered and refused in 1995. Should a public inquiry be called for, we will discuss the circumstances of that application, and a recent one lodged in September 2001, concerning sewerage and drainage issues. Suffice to say for now, that there are drainage solutions for this site (on-site underground treatment plant, and reed bed outfall, until connection to sewer is possible), also Welsh Water/Hydr informs that the public sewage system in the St. Athan area, will be up-graded by 2006. Any development proposed on the site would be conditioned to start after the sewer up-grading takes place. That time scale will allow development to take place well within the plan period.

The inspector then compounds his conclusion saying that he is not convinced by the Council's approach to this site (the Council recommended until then, the residential use of the site), as he feels that although considered to be a logical "rounding off" of the village, it would constitute a larger scale extension into an area of open countryside than would normally be

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

acceptable under the policies of the Plan. He also mentions the proximity of the RAF airfield, and the considerable intermittent noise originated.

As we can see, the Inspector again refers to the Strategy Plan (as if no other areas in the Vale should be developed), and the problem of noise. This latter is also present in the existing houses near the site, and in all other recent residential permissions in St. Athan, approved by the Council. With regards to this issue, noise readings would show that these would be within the limits accepted, in residential locations. Further measures can be taken (double or triple glazing, etc.), to minimise these issues. Although the Inspector was not convinced that the site is suitable for allocation for housing, the neighbours letters received in the most recent outline application (in 2001), confirmed that the noise is restricted to day time hours, and none is generated by night. They also confirmed that the noise is very intermittent, and this does not unduly bother them.

The inspector repeats, in his final conclusion, that although he has taken into account the planning history of the site, he considers that the overriding need, is that proposals made in the plan do not compromise its overall strategy. Here again, the Inspector may be thinking in the Barry/Penarth waterfront.

The Council, in accepting the views expressed by the Inspector, says that if the residential allocation were to be maintained, it would result in loss of Countryside, noise issues, and uncertainty due to sewage/drainage problems. The Council therefore dismisses all previous planning legislation, all reasonable solutions to the sewage/drainage problems, and assessment of the noise issues, and relevant solutions available. All this brings the result of the Council's causing uncertainty in its policies, and disregard of suitable locations for residential sites. The St. John's Well site, although not within the area of strategic development, nevertheless deserves a more positive planning judgement, as it is near to a centre of developing employment, is an infilling and rounding off of the village, it would maintain the individual character of St. Athan, will improve the local area by providing additional public recreation facilities, would be a practical an to scale development, and will provide increased density (as requested by present planning guidance), and in keeping with its surroundings.

Planning Policy Context.

National level guidance is found in Planning Policy Wales March 2002, Planning Guidance (Wales) UDP dated May 1996, Technical Advice Note 11 (Noise), and Circular 3/99 (W.O. 10/99) on non mains drainage. The main issues arising from this guidance are:

PPW – Section 2 refers to new development in rural areas which should be located in those settlements which have readily good accessibility by non-car modes, when compared to rural areas as a whole. Development in the countryside should be located adjoining settlements where it can be best accommodated in terms of infrastructure, access and habitat and landscape conservation. Minor extensions to existing settlements may be acceptable.

PPW – Section 3 on development plans states that UDP should give developers and the public certainty about the type of development that will be permitted at a given location.

PPW – Section 3 also states that phasing of development may be justified when related to physical infrastructure or the adequacy of other services which may indicate that a particular site cannot be released for development until a particular stage in the planning period.

PPW – Section 9 on the requirement for and location of new housing development. In deciding which sites to allocate for housing, consideration should be given to the location and accessibility of potential development sites to jobs, shops, and services by modes other than the car; capacity of existing or potential infrastructure – which includes water and sewerage.

PPW – Section 9 states that minor extensions to groups of dwellings may be acceptable, but much depends on the character of the surroundings, pattern of development in the area, and accessibility to main towns and villages.

PPW – Section 12 on the provision of infrastructure and services states that development in sewered areas must connect to the main sewer. If this is not feasible, non mains drainage schemes may be acceptable subject to the provisions of Circular 3/99.

PG(W) UDP on the need to ensure that development plans have a clear and concise statement of an authority's policies and proposals for the development and other use of land. Each policy should be clear and succinct and easily understood.

TAN 11 – on noise assessment of sensitive receptors including residential development. Annex B refers specifically to military aerodromes.

C3/99 – on non-mains sewerage. In particular Annex A on the assessment of such proposals.

Strategic and Local Policy

South Glamorgan Structure Plan Alteration No1 – Approved 1989

The South Glamorgan Structure Plan identifies St. Athan as a village where infilling and rounding off of the existing built up area would be permitted (Policy H9 [Document 12]. A replacement Structure Plan was proposed for the former South Glamorgan County Council and a revised copy was published in February 1995 within this document. There are no policies that refer to the infilling or rounding off of existing built up areas in the rural vale. The plan, however, was never adopted.

Rural Vale Local Plan – Approved 1989

The Rural Vale Local Plan was approved for development control purposes in 1989. St. Athan, is identified as a village where infilling and rounding off could take place, as it is considered to contain sufficient community facilities to absorb limited housing development (Policy H1) [Document 13]. The St. John's Well site (5.16 ha) is specially allocated for housing in this local plan under Policy H2. In the supporting text at paragraph 2.18 it states that the adjacent RAF Station creates the effect of a much larger urban concentration at St. Athan, in terms of the size of the built area and related land uses.

Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan Consultation Draft 1993

The site [12.75 acres] was again allocated for residential development (Policy HOUS 1) in this development plan. It was similarly recognised that St. Athan is unique, due to its location adjacent to the RAF Station, which creates an effect of a much larger urban concentration.

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan Deposit Draft 1993 (Approved for development Control Purposes 1996)

The residential allocation of the site is maintained in the Deposit Draft, but the site area has been reduced from 12.75 acres to 3.7 acres due to representations submitted to the Consultation Draft. (Document 14). Reference is made at paragraph 3.6.17 to the hydraulic overloading of the public sewerage system in St. Athan. Due to this it is highlighted that Welsh Water may object to any development proposal on this site until necessary improvements have been completed. It is suggested that any development should possibly consider requisitioning Welsh Water to provide foul sewerage facilities for the site.

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan – Deposit Draft 1998

The UDP when adopted will supersede the Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan. Strategic Policy 3 identifies that there will be a need for 5,800 houses in the period 1996-2011. It states at Criteria 5 that land will be made available for additional dwellings at minor sites (less than 2 ha) identified in the plan [Document 15]. In part 2 of the UDP St. Athan is identified as a rural settlement that could accommodate infilling and rounding off. The allocation of residential development on the 3.7 acre site at St. John's Well is maintained (Policy HOUS 1.17). In the supporting text (paragraph 4.4.39) reference is again made to the problem of hydraulic overloading at the public sewerage system at St. Athan. It is, therefore, suggested that Welsh Water is requisitioned to provide foul sewerage facilities for the site. It is also noted that the Environment Agency has advised that a Greenfield run-off restriction may be Required for the site. Other policies of relevance include Policy ENV1 – "Development in The Countryside" which restricts development in the countryside unless it is essential for agricultural, forestry, mining, utilities, infrastructure, recreational use, and conversion of existing buildings. Policy ENV1 allows for infrastructure and appropriate recreational use within the area defined as open countryside. With reference to utilities Part 2 of the UDP refers to community and utilities surfaces and states at paragraph The Inspector considered the allocation of site HOUS1 (7) at St. John's Well, St Athan would lead to a loss of 11.4.99 in relation to public sewers treatment/trunk sewers, that proposed development may necessitate improvements to existing public sewerage systems and it is expected that developers will either utilise the requisition of procedure for the provision of facilities from Dwr Cymru – Welsh Water or carry out the necessary improvements as part of each development.

Proposed changes January 1999 and further proposed changes April 1999

No changes were proposed to Policy HOUS1 or ENV1.

Issues

Housing Allocation

The St. John's Well site is a long standing housing allocation that the Council wants to modify. The previous plans mentioned before, along with the South Glamorgan Structure Plan, also identified St. Athan as a village where infilling and rounding off of the existing built up area will be permitted. In addition, the site's allocation for housing meets national local criteria for housing development. The Inspector recommended that the site be deleted from the plan (REC 4.28) based on the grounds that it would constitute a large scale extension of the village. A most important argument in support of this site's residential allocation, is the employment opportunities in close proximity to the site, and St. Athan in general. As said before, it is in the news and public knowledge that these employment opportunities will increase in the immediate future, due to the proposed expansion of the DARA base at RAF St. Athan, with the construction of the new £ 77m of a super-hangar which will secure the future of a 2,500 strong work force. This in turn will free up space for the construction of the WDA's Aerospace Centre of Excellence, for which the planning consent could be secured latter this year. All these new business and employment developments, will increase the demand for residential allocations in this area. We would point out that these facts, post-date the Inspector's Report.

Noise

The site's location in the proximity to the RAF Airfield at St. Athan was raised by the Inspector as a reason why the site should be deleted from the plan due to the noise emitted from the airfield. The issue has not prevented the Council in the past from granting consent for residential development in this area (Llantwit Gardens, St. David's Crescent and Higher End), nor it has created an unacceptable environment for existing residents since St. Athan remains a popular place to live. Letters from residents confirm the quiet environment they generally enjoy. Furthermore the issue of noise from RAF St. Athan should have been taken into account when the site was allocated in successive development plans and in the systematic environmental appraisal of the UDP. At present, there is an application for residential development in St. Athan, in Ringwood Crescent, inside the RAF camp, at which not even the MOD is objecting, concerning the noise issue.

Foul Drainage

Circular 3/99 on Non-main Sewerage Systems and Policy Advice on "Development in Sewered Areas" allow for interim arrangements to be considered where a connection to an appropriate sewer is not feasible. Welsh Water has reported that it has a programme for up-grading the foul sewers in this area, by the year 2006.

Final paragraph to item 5 in the representation form:

The St. John's Well site, because of its history of positive Planning Policies that sustained its residential allocation for many years, and its location adjacent to centres of present and future increased employment, deserves a more thoughtful verdict. Issues of existing uncertainty concerning drainage and noise, are technically capable of being resolved, if the Council would be mindful to revise its modification, and faithfully continue to allocate the site for residential use, even with more reason now, in consideration of the increase in demand for residential allocation in St. Athan, due to the imminent creation of sources of employment, and new jobs in this village.

Desired Change

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

For the above reasons, we request the following changes be made to the proposed modifications, to overcome our objection:
That Site 17: St. John's Well, St. Athan, be re-allocated for residential use, Policy HOUS 1.

Recommendation

The Inspector considered the allocation of site HOUS1 (7) at St. John's Well, St. Athan would lead to a loss of countryside, and the "buffer" which it provides between the residential core of the village and the Airfield. Consequently, on this basis the Inspector concluded that this site should not be allocated for housing. The Council concurred with the Inspector's assessment and reasoning for the non-allocation of HOUS1 (7) at St. John's Well, on the basis that it would result in the loss of countryside, and subsequent noise issues generated by the loss of the buffer between the village and the airfield.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT

Issue: Strategic Environment

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 22 **Accession No.** 2945 **Modification No.** D005

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Strategic Environment

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 95 **Accession No.** 2862 **Modification No.** C001

Representation

Paragraph 2.1.3 is inaccurate as is currently worded. Amend to read as follows.

Desired Change

The Vale has 22 Sites of Special Scientific Interest totaling 850 hectares, 2 Local Nature Reserves, 7 Wildlife Trust Reserves, incorporating 12 miles of the Glamorgan Heritage Coast stretching from Ogmere by Sea to West Aberthaw. This stretch of coastline includes the Dunraven Bay candidate Special Area of Conservation. The Severn Estuary around Penarth is a Site of Special Scientific Interest, Wetland of International Importance (RAMSAR), Special Protection Area (SPA) and possible Special Area of Conservation (space).

Recommendation

AGREED. The Council accepts your recommendation that Paragraph 2.1.3 (MOD C001) be amended to read:

The natural environment of the Vale of Glamorgan is a rich mix of undulating farm land, valley basins, woodland and unspoilt coastline. A testimony to the richness and diversity of the natural environment of the Vale of Glamorgan is the presence of a number of protective designations. The Vale has twenty two Sites of Special Scientific Interest totalling some 850 hectares, two Local Nature Reserves, seven Wildlife Trust Reserves incorporating twelve miles of the Glamorgan Heritage Coast stretching from Ogmere-By-Sea to West Aberthaw. This stretch of coastline includes the Dunraven Bay candidate Special Area of Conservation. The Severn Estuary around Penarth is a Site of Special Scientific Interest, Wetland of International Importance (RAMSAR), Special Protection Area (SPA) and possible Special Area of Conservation (pSAC).

Issue: Strategic Environment

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 122 **Accession No.** 2889 **Modification No.** D002

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Strategic Environment

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 125 **Accession No.** 2892 **Modification No.** B001

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Strategic Environment

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 139 **Accession No.** 2906 **Modification No.** D060

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Strategic Environment

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 140 **Accession No.** 2907 **Modification No.** D059

Representation

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Strategic Environment

Organisation Environment Agency **Contact** Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247 **Representation No.** 90 **Accession No.** 3119 **Modification No.** B001

Representation

The Agency supports the inclusion of criterion iv, which will improve the quality of the environment by including sustainable development.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed. However, it should be noted that this representation is not duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

Issue: Strategic Environment

Organisation Environment Agency

Contact Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247

Representation No. 95

Accession No. 3124

Modification No. D059

Representation

The Agency supports the protection afforded to the environment in this policy.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed. However, it should be noted that this representation is not duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

Issue: Strategic Environment

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales

Contact Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643

Representation No. 15

Accession No. 3004

Modification No. D059

Representation

WTSWW support this modification.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Strategic Environment

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales

Contact Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643

Representation No. 16

Accession No. 3005

Modification No. D060

Representation

WTSWW support this modification.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

**STRATEGIC TRANSPORT
&
TRANSPORT SCHEMES**

Issue: Strategic Transport

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 41 **Accession No.** 2964 **Modification No.** G010

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Strategic Transport

Organisation Dinas Powys Community Council **Contact**

Representor No. 262 **Representation No.** 7 **Accession No.** 2812 **Modification No.** G010

Representation

Support

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Strategic Transport

Organisation Dinas Powys Community Council **Contact**

Representor No. 262 **Representation No.** 8 **Accession No.** 2813 **Modification No.** G005

Representation

Support

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Strategic Transport

Organisation Dinas Powys Community Council **Contact**

Representor No. 262 **Representation No.** 9 **Accession No.** 2814 **Modification No.** G004

Representation

Support

Desired Change

None

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Strategic Transport

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 18

Accession No. 3032

Modification No. B006

Representation

Fails to modify the policy to accord with Planning Policy Wales 2000. Failure to include justification for suitably modified policy in section 2.4. Fails to say (again) that the strategic road proposals are essential for the development proposals in the plan.

Desired Change

Rewrite to take on board PPW 5.8.6.2 Insert justification of the policy.

Recommendation

THIS REPRESENTATION WAS WITHDRAWN

Issue: Strategic Transport

Organisation Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd.

Contact Mr. Tom Lambshead

Representor No. 1647

Representation No. 1

Accession No. 2789

Modification No. G006

Representation

Network Rail note and would support this proposed modification which recognises that a new station can play a part in the wider regeneration of the area with a particular synergy with retail development. However, we would point out that any new station would be commercially, technically and operationally viable and have the support of the relevant Train Operating Company(ies).

Desired Change

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Strategic Transport

Organisation Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd.

Contact Mr. Tom Lambshead

Representor No. 1647

Representation No. 2

Accession No. 2790

Modification No. G009

Representation

Network Rail note and support this policy which adds certainty in respect of the manner in which applications for freight development will be assessed. This is in line with government guidance in PPG13: 'Transport' which advises local authorities to support movement of rail freight by rail within development plans.

Desired Change

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Strategic Transport

Organisation

Contact Cofton Limited

Representor No. 1668

Representation No. 15

Accession No. 3094

Modification No. G010

Representation

1) Cofton Limited expresses broad support for the addition of this policy and its commitment to the protection and provision of bus operations. In particular, Cofton are committed to improving public transport links at Rhoose and the new rail station. In accordance with the wider proposals at the western expansion and elsewhere in Rhoose, the provision of a 200 space Park-and-Ride facility is expected to make a valuable contribution to public transport infrastructure in the Vale of Glamorgan. The Park-and-Ride facility will help serve the Cardiff International Airport and further help serve the new rail station interchange.

2) Cofton Limited are committed to making the rail station a success and making the facility more accessible to the public both in terms of using the facilities at Rhoose Point/Western Expansion and improving access to the airport.

3) Cofton Limited recognise that the proposals are in a constant state of flux, and look forward to discussing the various strategic options with officers in due course.

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Llysworney By Pass/Cowbridge Link

Organisation Bellway Estates

Contact Sue Bridge

Representor No. 126

Representation No. 18

Accession No. 1847

Modification No.

Representation

Our client objects to the failure of the Council to modify Policy TRAN 2 in accord with the Recommendation 04.45 of the UDP Inspector's Report. The Statement of Decisions that accompanies the Proposed Modifications does not set out good reasons as to why Recommendation 04.45 should not be accepted by the Council. The comparison of the Link Road and the Council's preference for the Llysworney Bypass is very much a false premise, as there is no realistic prospect of the Council being able to secure the funding necessary to construct the Llysworney Bypass within the Plan period. The benefits of the Link Road in terms of providing an alternative route for through traffic both in Cowbridge and Llysworney must therefore be seen as substantial when compared with the existing situation. Additional work undertaken by our Client since the UDP Inquiry in 1998 has highlighted that traffic conditions in Cowbridge and Llysworney have not improved and, as can be expected with traffic growth generally, the situation has deteriorated; having a detrimental effect on the environmental amenity of the town and the village. The severe problems of traffic at Llysworney and the un-likelihood of the Bypass being provided was such that the UDP Inspector considered the provision of the Link Road (in association with residential development at Darren Farm) to be wholly appropriate. Given that there has been no material change in circumstances to suggest that the Inspector's Recommendation is no longer valid, the Council's preference to retain the Llysworney Bypass in Policy TRAN 2 is plainly incorrect.

Desired Change

Our Client proposes the further modification of the Plan so as to identify the Link Road constructed in association with residential development at Darren Farm in Policy TRAN 2 as opposed to the Llysworney Bypass in accord with Recommendation 04.45 of the UDP Inspector's Report.

Recommendation

The Council is satisfied that it can adequately provide for the housing needs of the Vale of Glamorgan through the sites identified in the proposed modifications.

The reason for the rejection of the Inspectors recommendations 4.4.4, 4.45 and 6.07 is fully outlined in the Council's Statement of Decisions.

In the view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Llysworney By Pass/Cowbridge Link

Organisation Llysworney Community Association

Contact Janette Shaw

Representor No. 166

Representation No. 2

Accession No. 2431

Modification No. F024

Representation

The Llysworney Community Association in accordance with its representations to the Draft UDP 1998 (11.05.98), considers that further development of land at the Vale Business Park / Llandow Trading Estate should not be permitted without adequate transport infrastructure being provided to remove heavy commercial traffic through the village of Llysworney. Accordingly it is in support of any satisfactory road construction option which will achieve this end, either a village bypass or other network improvement (a link between the A48 and B4270 is referred to in the plan modifications).

Desired Change

The plan modifications, as now worded contain ambiguities both referring to a Llysworney Bypass and link road between the A48 and B4270. The change sought in the plan is removal of this ambiguity and identification of a clear-programmed sequence of steps (including route identification and how the scheme will be financed) which will result in delivery of a road solution, within the plan period of the UDP. To alleviate the unacceptable level of heavy goods traffic in, and the environmental damage to, the village - both present and future.

Recommendation

The construction of the Llysworney Bypass and link road between the A48 and B4270 is strongly supported by the Council, and funding for this route shall be sought from the Welsh Assembly Government, through its annual Transport Grant. As this is pursued through the Council's Local Transport Plan and annual bid for Transport Grant funding. Because the Issue: of creating uncertainty and planning blight, it would be unwise to include a land take for the scheme whilst no detailed design of the scheme has been finalised. Consequently, the Council considers that the reference to the bypass is appropriate, as this policy will allow land will to be protected when the land take is known.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

Issue: Supplementary Planning Guidance

Organisation Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council **Contact** Andrew Davies

Representor No. 52 **Representation No.** 53 **Accession No.** 2976 **Modification No.** M005

Representation

The Town Council supports the Proposed Modification.

Desired Change

None.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

Issue: Supplementary Planning Guidance

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales **Contact** Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 93 **Accession No.** 2860 **Modification No.** M005

Representation

CCW support the intention of the Council to prepare further Supplementary Planning Guidance with respect to Nature Conservation although, would highlight that.

Desired Change

Local authorities should adopt Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Recommendation

Support is welcomed.

The Council will fully incorporate the Local Biodiversity Action Plan within the Nature Conservation Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Issue: Supplementary Planning Guidance

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales **Contact** Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643 **Representation No.** 38 **Accession No.** 3027 **Modification No.** M005

Representation

WTSSWW support the intention of the Vale Council to prepare further Supplementary Planning Guidance with respect to Nature Conservation although we would highlight the fact that Planning Policy Wales 2002 states that "local authorities should adopt Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) as supplementary planning guidance".

Desired Change

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

Issue: Supplementary Planning Guidance

Organisation **Contact** Mr. Richard Smith

Representor No. 1648 **Representation No.** 3 **Accession No.** 2801 **Modification No.** M005

Representation

MOD M005 states that the Council intends to prepare further supplementary planning guidance (SPG) in respect of nature conservation. I support this modification in principle but request that more detail is included.

Desired Change

I request that the following documents are specifically included in brackets following "nature conservation", listed as a topic the Council intends to prepare further SPG in respect of, under M005, Appendix 8: A Nature Conservation Strategy for the Vale of Glamorgan: The Vale of Glamorgan Local Biodiversity Action Plan. I.e. to appear as: Nature Conservation (A Nature Conservation Strategy for the Vale of Glamorgan; the Vale of Glamorgan Local Biodiversity Action Plan).

Recommendation

Support is welcomed. The SPG list, as written in the text of APP8 of the Proposed Modifications document, is that which the Council is committed to - to date (this is inclusive of those SPG's that have been produced, and those that are to be produced). However, the content of these SPG's will be subject to extensive public consultation and may therefore change. The Council cannot commit to exhaustive lists, as issues may be subject to change.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Issue: Waste Management

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact Mr. Andrew Peterken

Representor No. 237

Representation No. 86

Accession No. 2853

Modification No. K010

Representation

CCW object to the amendment as currently worded and we recommend the addition of a third criterion. Provided there is no adverse effect on protected species or features of ecological, geological, archaeological and landscape interest.

Desired Change

CCW recommend the addition of a third criterion. 3) Provided there is no adverse effect on protected species or features of ecological, geological, archaeological and landscape interest.

Recommendation

References to protected species, ecological features geological, archaeological and landscape interests are addressed within the Policy WAST1, and cross referenced in the proposed modified paragraph 10.4.7. On this basis the council considers it unnecessary to replicate this criteria within Policy WAST2.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Waste Management

Organisation Welsh Assembly Government

Contact Mrs. Elaine Ancrum

Representor No. 244

Representation No. 43

Accession No. 2841

Modification No.

Representation

The Plan should include additional information about the proposed waste management arrangements in the Vale of Glamorgan during the interim period prior to the review of the waste planning policies.

Desired Change

Reference should be included to information now available in : Strategic Waste Management Assessment 2002 Wales (environment Agency); South East Wales Regional Waste Assessment January 2003; Vale of Glamorgan's Waste Management Strategy; This information should relate to all waste streams and not just household waste.

Recommendation

AGREED

The further proposed modifications are made in order to provide clarification on the criteria by which proposals for waste management facilities shall be assessed and in accordance with the Welsh Assembly Government's policy clarification on Waste issued to local planning authorities on 28th May 2004

The Council will amend the paragraph the following paragraphs as follows:

10.1 INTRODUCTION

10.1.1 The creation of waste is an inevitable consequence of industrial, commercial and domestic activities, and its management has a critical part to play in moving towards sustainable development, in terms of both reducing our demands on scarce resources, and of minimising the environmental impact of its treatment or disposal. Everyone must play a part in this, either through its minimisation, reuse, recycling, or by treating or disposing of it safely and without harm to the environment.

10.1.2 The Council has the responsibility for the management, collection and disposal of waste and has a duty to prepare a Municipal Waste Management Strategy for the Vale. It is the role of the Unitary Development Plan to provide the land use policy framework for implementing this strategy within the context of National and Regional guidance for waste management.

10.2 EUROPEAN LEGISLATION

10.2.1 United Kingdom waste policy has been increasingly influenced by European Union (EU) legislation since the publication of the Directive on Waste 75/442/EEC, as amended by 91/156/EEC and 91/692/EEC. When drawing up plans, local planning authorities must have regard to the objectives of Article 3 (the need to minimise waste and to encourage recycling and energy recovery). Article 4 (the need to protect the environment and humans from potentially polluting development) and Article 5 (the need to set up an integrated network of disposal installations to facilitate self-sufficiency in accordance with the Proximity Principle) of the Directive. The Landfill Directive 1999/31/EEC is another significant element of EU legislation. It came into force in July 1999 and is now incorporated into UK legislation. The Directive seeks to impose stringent operational and technical

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

requirements on the landfilling of waste and will have far reaching implications for waste management planning. These implications include:

- The banning of co-disposal and requirements for sites to elect to operate as hazardous, non-hazardous or inert. Current information suggests that across the UK the number of sites licensed to accept waste will drop drastically from 2004 and;
- There will be the requirement for waste to be pre-treated prior to landfill from 2004 which will mean a need for more pre-treatment facilities;
- The banning of liquids and tyres is likely to result in a need for new facilities; and
- Fewer landfills or existing landfills will last longer.

10.2.2 A key element of EU policy that has become central to the UK's national waste strategy is the development of a waste management hierarchy. This prioritises waste management options with the overall aim of achieving a move up the hierarchy. The hierarchy is split into 4 categories in the following order: -

Reduction - by using technology which requires less material in products and less waste in manufacturing and produces longer-lasting products with lower pollution potential.

Reuse - e.g. returnable bottles.

Recovery - e.g. re-cycling, composting.

Disposal - by incineration without energy recovery or by landfill.

10.3 NATIONAL PLANNING GUIDANCE

10.3.1 Planning Policy Wales 2002 emphasises that Government's general policy towards waste management, based on the waste management hierarchy, and reminds planning authorities that in determining applications, they are obliged by the EC Directives, to ensure that waste is recovered or disposed of without:

- harming the environment;
- endangering human health or causing a nuisance through noise;
- adversely affecting the countryside or places of special interest, and
- to establish an adequate network of waste disposal installations (para. 14.2).

10.3.2 It also draws attention to the wider legislative context of waste management and the Government's "Wise about Waste" Strategy 2002 when preparing development plans. The aim of the Strategy is to encourage a move away from an over-reliance on landfill to more sustainable waste management techniques such as recycling and composting, where the following targets have been set:

- by 2005, achieve a reduction in waste produced equivalent to at least 5% of the 1998 arisings figure;
- by 2010, achieve a reduction in waste produced equivalent to at least 10% of the 1998 arisings figure.
- Minimum recycling and composting targets for each local authority to deliver:
- by 2003/04 achieve at least 15% recycling/composting of municipal waste with a minimum of 5% composting (with only compost derived from source segregated materials counting) and 5% recycling;
- by 2006/07 achieve at least 25% recycling/composting of municipal waste with a minimum of 10% composting (with only compost derived from source segregated materials counting) and 10% recycling;
- by 2009/10 and beyond achieve at least 40% recycling/composting with a minimum of 15% composting (with only compost derived from source segregated materials counting) and 15% recycling.

10.3.3 Technical Advice Note (TAN) 21 Waste (2001) also provides advice on how the land use planning system should contribute to sustainable waste resource management as well as advice to Local Authorities on their requirements in respect of various European Directives on waste from the European Commission. It emphasises the importance of regional self-sufficiency and the "proximity principle", under which waste should be handled close to the point at which it is generated.

10.4 REGIONAL WASTE PLAN

10.4.1 One of the key requirements of TAN 21 is for local authorities in Wales to establish joint arrangements, on a regional basis, for determining the facilities that are likely to be required for the future management of all waste arisings. This has taken the form of a South East Wales Regional Waste Technical Group which has produced, in conjunction with the WAG, the South East Wales Regional Plan (November 2003). This Strategy seeks to ensure that the South East Wales Region is, as far as possible, self-sufficient in dealing with its waste arising and has adopted the following strategy:

- Aim to achieve the 2020 Landfill Directive targets by 2013
- Achieve this principally through the maximising of recycling and composting
- Deal with residual waste by Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT)
- Choose between either sending the residual waste from MBT to landfill or using it as Refuse Derived Fuel
- Limit the amount of landfill waste to that which cannot be dealt with acceptably in any other way

10.4.2 Both the Welsh Assembly Government's "Wise about Waste" Strategy and the South East Regional Waste Plan have informed the Council's Municipal Waste Management Strategy (Consultation Draft Feb 2004), which establishes how the Council will meet various waste reduction and recycling targets established in these documents. Similarly, the aim of the policies and proposals contained within this Plan is to facilitate the development of waste management facilities that meet the Council's requirements both locally and regionally.

10.6 POLICIES AND PROPOSALS

10.6.1 THE PROVISION OF NEW SITES FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

10.6.2 To ensure that the Council contributes successfully towards the targets set by the South East Regional Waste Plan, a study was undertaken to review the options available to the Council for the provision of such infrastructure. This considered the use of existing or future facilities in adjacent authorities and development of individual elements of infrastructure at different locations within the Vale of Glamorgan. This study concluded that the preferred approach is to develop a single 'Waste Resource Park' facility. The preferred location has been identified as being an area of land on the Atlantic Trading Estate incorporating a range of handling and treatment elements, as follows:

- Provision of a Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) to receive, handle and bulk up recyclable materials diverted at the kerbside and received at a Household Waste and Recycling Centre (HWRC) and 'Bring Sites'.
- Development of an 'in-vessel' composting facility for the treatment of kerbside segregated organic materials (including green waste and organic kitchen wastes).
- Provision of facilities (workshops) for the local reuse and reprocessing of materials segregated from the municipal waste stream.
- Provision of a Household Waste and Recycling Centre to replace the existing civic amenity site in Sully.
- Provision of a waste transfer facility for residual waste (i.e. materials that are not segregated for recycling or composting).

(Further details of the anticipated capacity of this facility is contained in the Council's Municipal Waste Strategy)

10.6.3 LANDFILL SITES

10.6.4 The effectiveness of the Landfill Directive, landfill tax and other factors promoting a movement up the waste hierarchy by reducing the amount of waste going to landfill will only become apparent over time. A key element of the Council's waste strategy is the need to divert more waste from landfill by limiting the amount of land available for landfill and by encouraging options higher up the waste hierarchy. However, even waste which has been treated has a residual element that needs to be disposed of and so there will still be a need for waste to be disposed by landfill for the foreseeable future. Consequently, with no landfill capacity available within the Vale of Glamorgan, nor any proposals for new sites it will be necessary for the Council to continue its current arrangement of sharing such facilities in other authorities. The Council will however, continue to contribute in the future work of the South East Wales Regional Waste Technical Group in identifying regional facilities for the sustainable management of residual waste.

WASTXXX: PROVISION OF WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES

PROPOSALS FOR THE PROVISION WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES FOR THE HANDLING, TREATMENT AND TRANSFER OF WASTE WILL BE PERMITTED WHERE THEY ARE LOCATED ON:

- i) EXISTING WASTE SITES,
- ii) EXISTING AND ALLOCATED B2 AND B8 EMPLOYMENT SITES;
- iii) WITHIN OPERATIONAL MINERAL WORKING SITES;
- iv) IN THE CASE OF GREEN WASTE COMPOSTING AND MANAGEMENT ON LAND WITHIN, OR ADJACENT TO FARM BUILDING COMPLEXES.

PROPOSALS WILL BE CONSIDERED HAVING REGARD TO CRITERIA LISTED IN POLICY WAST 1.

10.7.1 Facilities for the sorting, processing and treatment of waste normally involve industrial type activities and can generate large numbers of heavy goods vehicle movements. Because of their industrial nature they are most suited to locations within specified industrial areas or at existing mineral or waste sites or on sites which are being reclaimed to a beneficial use. Scrap yards are also included in this category of waste handling and again these are best suited to locations within industrial areas.

10.7.2 Similarly, because of the potential nuisances, particularly from odour, that can arise from composting, such sites should generally be located away from residential and other sensitive land-uses which means that they may need to be located on industrial sites or suitable rural locations. The type and amount of development will need to be controlled. Sites associated within farm building complexes may be appropriate for green waste composting particularly if they can help to diversify the rural economy.

10.7.3 Consequently, Policy WASTXXX identifies those locations that the Council consider to be best suited for accommodating future waste management facilities and anticipates that these will allow for a range of waste management facilities that will assist in meeting its requirements set by the South East Regional Waste Plan.

10.7.4 When considering proposals for any kind of waste management facility, including: treatment / disposal facilities, landfill sites, transfer stations, household waste sites, special waste treatment / disposal facilities, civic amenity and recreation sites, foreshore or derelict land reclamation, there will be two main factors to be taken into account. Firstly, the proposal must be evaluated in terms of its contribution towards the South East Regional Waste Plan and the Council's Municipal Waste Management Strategy, demonstrating that the proposal represents the best practicable environmental option, taking account of the principles of proximity and the waste hierarchy. In addition however, it is important to provide guidance to developers concerning the consideration of applications and the criteria that will be applied to them. These are set out in the following Policy: -

WAST1 – CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES

SUBJECT TO THE PROVISION OF POLICY WASTXXX PROPOSALS FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES WILL BE PERMITTED IF THE PROPOSAL:

- (i) CONFORMS WITH THE PRINCIPLE OF THE WASTE HIERARCHY (REDUCTION, RE-USE, RECOVERY AND SAFE DISPOSAL); THE "PROXIMITY PRINCIPLE"; THE PRINCIPLE OF REGIONAL SELF SUFFICIENCY; THE OBJECTIVE OF WASTE AVOIDANCE, REDUCTION AND DISPOSAL; THE SETTING OF TARGETS FOR REDUCTION AND MODES OF DISPOSAL;
- (ii) DOES NOT UNACCEPTABLY AFFECT RESIDENTIAL AMENITY OR POSE A THREAT TO PUBLIC HEALTH;
- (iii) DOES NOT UNACCEPTABLY AFFECT THE QUALITY OR QUANTITY OF WATER RESOURCES (BOTH SURFACE AND GROUNDWATER);
- (iv) HAS REGARD TO THE ADEQUACY OF THE HIGHWAY NETWORK AND THE NEED TO MINIMISE THE DEMAND ON THE TRANSPORT NETWORK;
- (v) DOES NOT UNACCEPTABLY CONFLICT WITH THE INTERESTS OF AGRICULTURE, NATURE CONSERVATION, AREAS OF ECOLOGICAL, WILDLIFE OR ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE OR FEATURES OF GEOLOGICAL OR GEOMORPHOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE OR LANDSCAPE PROTECTION POLICIES;
- (vi) HAS A HIGH STANDARD OF LAYOUT, LANDSCAPING AND DESIGN;
- (vii) PROVIDES ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE AFTER TREATMENT AND FUTURE USE OF THE SITE WHICH ARE TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY; AND
- (viii) IS NOT AT AN UNACCEPTABLE RISK OF FLOODING, INCLUDING TIDAL INUNDATION, OR DOES NOT INCREASE THE RISK OF FLOODING ELSEWHERE.

Issue: Waste Management

Organisation Welsh Assembly Government

Contact Mrs. Elaine Ancrum

Representor No. 244

Representation No. 44

Accession No. 2842

Modification No.

Representation

Some references have been added to update the deposit UDP Waste Management Chapter but these are not comprehensive. The plan should refer to the Wales Waste Strategy "Wise about Waste" (June 2002) and TAN 21 Waste.

Desired Change

Amend accordingly

Recommendation

AGREED

The further proposed modifications are made in order to provide clarification on the criteria by which proposals for waste management facilities shall be assessed and in accordance with the Welsh Assembly Government's policy clarification on Waste issued to local planning authorities on 28th May 2004

The Council will amend the paragraph the following paragraphs as follows:

10.1 INTRODUCTION

10.1.1 The creation of waste is an inevitable consequence of industrial, commercial and domestic activities, and its management has a critical part to play in moving towards sustainable development, in terms of both reducing our demands on scarce resources, and of minimising the environmental impact of its treatment or disposal. Everyone must play a part in this, either through its minimisation, reuse, recycling, or by treating or disposing of it safely and without harm to the environment.

10.1.2 The Council has the responsibility for the management, collection and disposal of waste and has a duty to prepare a Municipal Waste Management Strategy for the Vale. It is the role of the Unitary Development Plan to provide the land use policy framework for implementing this strategy within the context of National and Regional guidance for waste management.

10.2 EUROPEAN LEGISLATION

10.2.1 United Kingdom waste policy has been increasingly influenced by European Union (EU) legislation since the publication of the Directive on Waste 75/442/EEC, as amended by 91/156/EEC and 91/692/EEC. When drawing up plans, local planning authorities must have regard to the objectives of Article 3 (the need to minimise waste and to encourage recycling and energy recovery). Article 4 (the need to protect the environment and humans from potentially polluting development) and Article 5 (the need to set up an integrated network of disposal installations to facilitate self-sufficiency in accordance with the Proximity Principle) of the Directive. The Landfill Directive 1999/31/EEC is another significant element of EU legislation. It came into force in July 1999 and is now incorporated into UK legislation. The Directive seeks to impose stringent operational and technical requirements on the landfilling of waste and will have far reaching implications for waste management planning. These implications include:

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

- The banning of co-disposal and requirements for sites to elect to operate as hazardous, non-hazardous or inert. Current information suggests that across the UK the number of sites licensed to accept waste will drop drastically from 2004 and;
- There will be the requirement for waste to be pre-treated prior to landfill from 2004 which will mean a need for more pre-treatment facilities;
- The banning of liquids and tyres is likely to result in a need for new facilities; and
- Fewer landfills or existing landfills will last longer.

10.2.2 A key element of EU policy that has become central to the UK's national waste strategy is the development of a waste management hierarchy. This prioritises waste management options with the overall aim of achieving a move up the hierarchy. The hierarchy is split into 4 categories in the following order: -

Reduction - by using technology which requires less material in products and less waste in manufacturing and produces longer-lasting products with lower pollution potential.

Reuse - e.g. returnable bottles.

Recovery - e.g. re-cycling, composting.

Disposal - by incineration without energy recovery or by landfill.

10.3 NATIONAL PLANNING GUIDANCE

10.3.1 Planning Policy Wales 2002 emphasises that Government's general policy towards waste management, based on the waste management hierarchy, and reminds planning authorities that in determining applications, they are obliged by the EC Directives, to ensure that waste is recovered or disposed of without:

- harming the environment;
- endangering human health or causing a nuisance through noise;
- adversely affecting the countryside or places of special interest, and
- to establish an adequate network of waste disposal installations (para. 14.2).

10.3.2 It also draws attention to the wider legislative context of waste management and the Government's 'Wise about Waste' Strategy 2002 when preparing development plans. The aim of the Strategy is to encourage a move away from an over-reliance on landfill to more sustainable waste management techniques such as recycling and composting, where the following targets have been set:

- by 2005, achieve a reduction in waste produced equivalent to at least 5% of the 1998 arisings figure;
- by 2010, achieve a reduction in waste produced equivalent to at least 10% of the 1998 arisings figure.
- Minimum recycling and composting targets for each local authority to deliver:
- by 2003/04 achieve at least 15% recycling/composting of municipal waste with a minimum of 5% composting (with only compost derived from source segregated materials counting) and 5% recycling;
- by 2006/07 achieve at least 25% recycling/composting of municipal waste with a minimum of 10% composting (with only compost derived from source segregated materials counting) and 10% recycling;
- by 2009/10 and beyond achieve at least 40% recycling/composting with a minimum of 15% composting (with only compost derived from source segregated materials counting) and 15% recycling.

10.3.3 Technical Advice Note (TAN) 21 Waste (2001) also provides advice on how the land use planning system should contribute to sustainable waste resource management as well as advice to Local Authorities on their requirements in respect of various European Directives on waste from the European Commission. It emphasises the importance of regional self-sufficiency and the "proximity principle", under which waste should be handled close to the point at which it is generated.

10.4 REGIONAL WASTE PLAN

10.4.1 One of the key requirements of TAN 21 is for local authorities in Wales to establish joint arrangements, on a regional basis, for determining the facilities that are likely to be required for the future management of all waste arisings. This has taken the form of a South East Wales Regional Waste Technical Group which has produced, in conjunction with the WAG, the South East Wales Regional Plan (November 2003). This Strategy seeks to ensure that the South East Wales Region is, as far as possible, self-sufficient in dealing with its waste arising and has adopted the following strategy:

- Aim to achieve the 2020 Landfill Directive targets by 2013
- Achieve this principally through the maximising of recycling and composting
- Deal with residual waste by Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT)
- Choose between either sending the residual waste from MBT to landfill or using it as Refuse Derived Fuel
- Limit the amount of landfill waste to that which cannot be dealt with acceptably in any other way

10.4.2 Both the Welsh Assembly Government's "Wise about Waste" Strategy and the South East Regional Waste Plan have informed the Council's Municipal Waste Management Strategy (Consultation Draft Feb 2004), which establishes how the Council will meet various waste reduction and recycling targets established in these documents. Similarly, the aim of the policies and proposals contained within this Plan is to facilitate the development of waste management facilities that meet the Council's requirements both locally and regionally.

10.6 POLICIES AND PROPOSALS

10.6.1 THE PROVISION OF NEW SITES FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

10.6.2 To ensure that the Council contributes successfully towards the targets set by the South East Regional Waste Plan, a study was undertaken to review the options available to the Council for the provision of such infrastructure. This considered the use of existing or future facilities in adjacent authorities and development of individual elements of infrastructure at different

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003

locations within the Vale of Glamorgan. This study concluded that the preferred approach is to develop a single 'Waste Resource Park' facility. The preferred location has been identified as being an area of land on the Atlantic Trading Estate incorporating a range of handling and treatment elements, as follows:

- Provision of a Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) to receive, handle and bulk up recyclable materials diverted at the kerbside and received at a Household Waste and Recycling Centre (HWRC) and 'Bring Sites'.
- Development of an 'in-vessel' composting facility for the treatment of kerbside segregated organic materials (including green waste and organic kitchen wastes).
- Provision of facilities (workshops) for the local reuse and reprocessing of materials segregated from the municipal waste stream.
- Provision of a Household Waste and Recycling Centre to replace the existing civic amenity site in Sully.
- Provision of a waste transfer facility for residual waste (i.e. materials that are not segregated for recycling or composting).

(Further details of the anticipated capacity of this facility is contained in the Council's Municipal Waste Strategy)

10.6.3 LANDFILL SITES

10.6.4 The effectiveness of the Landfill Directive, landfill tax and other factors promoting a movement up the waste hierarchy by reducing the amount of waste going to landfill will only become apparent over time. A key element of the Council's waste strategy is the need to divert more waste from landfill by limiting the amount of land available for landfill and by encouraging options higher up the waste hierarchy. However, even waste which has been treated has a residual element that needs to be disposed of and so there will still be a need for waste to be disposed by landfill for the foreseeable future. Consequently, with no landfill capacity available within the Vale of Glamorgan, nor any proposals for new sites it will be necessary for the Council to continue its current arrangement of sharing such facilities in other authorities. The Council will however, continue to contribute in the future work of the South East Wales Regional Waste Technical Group in identifying regional facilities for the sustainable management of residual waste.

WASTXXX: PROVISION OF WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES

PROPOSALS FOR THE PROVISION WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES FOR THE HANDLING, TREATMENT AND TRANSFER OF WASTE WILL BE PERMITTED WHERE THEY ARE LOCATED ON:

- v) EXISTING WASTE SITES,
- vi) EXISTING AND ALLOCATED B2 AND B8 EMPLOYMENT SITES;
- vii) WITHIN OPERATIONAL MINERAL WORKING SITES;
- viii) IN THE CASE OF GREEN WASTE COMPOSTING AND MANAGEMENT ON LAND WITHIN, OR ADJACENT TO FARM BUILDING COMPLEXES.

PROPOSALS WILL BE CONSIDERED HAVING REGARD TO CRITERIA LISTED IN POLICY WAST 1.

10.7.1 Facilities for the sorting, processing and treatment of waste normally involve industrial type activities and can generate large numbers of heavy goods vehicle movements. Because of their industrial nature they are most suited to locations within specified industrial areas or at existing mineral or waste sites or on sites which are being reclaimed to a beneficial use. Scrap yards are also included in this category of waste handling and again these are best suited to locations within industrial areas.

10.7.2 Similarly, because of the potential nuisances, particularly from odour, that can arise from composting, such sites should generally be located away from residential and other sensitive land-uses which means that they may need to be located on industrial sites or suitable rural locations. The type and amount of development will need to be controlled. Sites associated within farm building complexes may be appropriate for green waste composting particularly if they can help to diversify the rural economy.

10.7.3 Consequently, Policy WASTXXX identifies those locations that the Council consider to be best suited for accommodating future waste management facilities and anticipates that these will allow for a range of waste management facilities that will assist in meeting its requirements set by the South East Regional Waste Plan.

10.7.4 When considering proposals for any kind of waste management facility, including: treatment / disposal facilities, landfill sites, transfer stations, household waste sites, special waste treatment / disposal facilities, civic amenity and recreation sites, foreshore or derelict land reclamation, there will be two main factors to be taken into account. Firstly, the proposal must be evaluated in terms of its contribution towards the South East Regional Waste Plan and the Council's Municipal Waste Management Strategy, demonstrating that the proposal represents the best practicable environmental option, taking account of the principles of proximity and the waste hierarchy. In addition however, it is important to provide guidance to developers concerning the consideration of applications and the criteria that will be applied to them. These are set out in the following Policy: -

WAST1 – CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES

SUBJECT TO THE PROVISION OF POLICY WASTXXX PROPOSALS FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES WILL BE PERMITTED IF THE PROPOSAL:

- (ix) CONFORMS WITH THE PRINCIPLE OF THE WASTE HIERARCHY (REDUCTION, RE-USE, RECOVERY AND SAFE DISPOSAL); THE "PROXIMITY PRINCIPLE"; THE PRINCIPLE OF

- REGIONAL SELF SUFFICIENCY; THE OBJECTIVE OF WASTE AVOIDANCE, REDUCTION AND DISPOSAL; THE SETTING OF TARGETS FOR REDUCTION AND MODES OF DISPOSAL;
- (x) DOES NOT UNACCEPTABLY AFFECT RESIDENTIAL AMENITY OR POSE A THREAT TO PUBLIC HEALTH;
 - (xi) DOES NOT UNACCEPTABLY AFFECT THE QUALITY OR QUANTITY OF WATER RESOURCES (BOTH SURFACE AND GROUNDWATER);
 - (xii) HAS REGARD TO THE ADEQUACY OF THE HIGHWAY NETWORK AND THE NEED TO MINIMISE THE DEMAND ON THE TRANSPORT NETWORK;
 - (xiii) DOES NOT UNACCEPTABLY CONFLICT WITH THE INTERESTS OF AGRICULTURE, NATURE CONSERVATION, AREAS OF ECOLOGICAL, WILDLIFE OR ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE OR FEATURES OF GEOLOGICAL OR GEOMORPHOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE OR LANDSCAPE PROTECTION POLICIES;
 - (xiv) HAS A HIGH STANDARD OF LAYOUT, LANDSCAPING AND DESIGN;
 - (xv) PROVIDES ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE AFTER TREATMENT AND FUTURE USE OF THE SITE WHICH ARE TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY; AND
 - (xvi) IS NOT AT AN UNACCEPTABLE RISK OF FLOODING, INCLUDING TIDAL INUNDATION, OR DOES NOT INCREASE THE RISK OF FLOODING ELSEWHERE.

Issue: Waste Management

Organisation Environment Agency **Contact** Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247 **Representation No.** 108 **Accession No.** 3137 **Modification No.** K004

Representation

The information contained within the bracket is now out of date. It should now read 'now superseded by the National Waste Strategy for Wales "Wise about Waste, June 2002". The text goes on to talk about 'regional self sufficiency being defined by the EA through the Strategic Waste Management Assessments'. This is not correct. Regional self sufficiency will be defined within the Regional Waste Plans produced by the LPA Regional Waste Groups and not the Strategic Waste Management Assessments, which is a collation of waste strategies.

Desired Change

The text should read as follows:

'Now superseded by the National Waste Strategy for Wales "Wise about Waste, June 2002".'

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Waste Management

Organisation Environment Agency **Contact** Anthony Wilkes

Representor No. 247 **Representation No.** 109 **Accession No.** 3138 **Modification No.** K010

Representation

This Policy should include reference to paragraph 7 of the Waste Management Licensing Regulations which development of this nature will need to comply with. Please note that the requirements may change, as the Waste Management Regulations will be reviewed in due course.

Desired Change

Policy to be cross-referenced to paragraph 7 of the Waste Management Licensing Regulations.

Recommendation

This representation has not been duly made as it did not arrive before 12 noon on Tuesday 1st April 2003 at the Vale of Glamorgan Council offices as specified in the relevant notice posted by the Council in accordance with the Town and Country

Planning (Development Plan) (Amendment) Regulations 1997.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Waste Management

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 24

Accession No. 3038

Modification No. K009

Representation

It should say that the Sully Hospital incinerator is quite inappropriately sited in the coastal zone, since the hospital closed, and that the Council will seek to close it down by taking a firm attitude to all contravention's of license conditions and to its lack of an environmental impact assessment.

Desired Change

It should say that the Sully Hospital incinerator is quite inappropriately sited in the coastal zone, since the hospital closed, and that the Council will seek to close it down by taking a firm attitude to all contravention's of license conditions and to its lack of an environmental impact assessment.

Recommendation

The incineration of clinical waste at Sully Hospital is currently carried out under requisite conditions imposed on the 1992 planning permission and the waste management license granted by the Environment Agency, as stated in the Inspector's report on the objections on the Draft Deposit Unitary Development Plan. Consequently, responsibility for addressing contravention's to the license is a matter for the Environment Agency, and is not a land use issue that falls within the remit of the Unitary Development Plan. As to the closure of the incinerator at Sully Hospital, the Inspector concluded that it would be both "impracticable and unreasonable" for the Council to seek its closure without identifying a suitable replacement (Inspectors Report paragraph 10.3.4). Therefore the proposed modification has been made in line with the Inspector's recommendation and is maintained by the Council.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Waste Management

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 25

Accession No. 3039

Modification No. K007

Representation

Object to K007 because it advocates on-site containment without setting down any principles - just the policy that gave us a toxic waste dump in the old graving dock at very high cost and a liability for future generations. We propose its deletion, to be consistent with sustainable development

Desired Change

We propose its deletion to be consistent with sustainable development.

Recommendation

Paragraph 10.4.4 as currently worded states that "only in certain cases on-site containment may be appropriate subject to regulatory control", and therefore does not advocate on site containment on all sites. Additionally, the paragraph states the where the Council does consider on site containment to be appropriate, regard will be given to the Environment Agency's policy guidance, noting "Policy and Practice for the Protection of Groundwater". Therefore, on this basis the Council considers your objection to the wording of the paragraph to advocate on site containment without setting down any principles to be unfounded, and deems it unnecessary to modify the paragraph further.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to the modification.

NO CHANGE.

Issue: Waste Management

*Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011
The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Proposed Modifications February 2003*

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 26

Accession No. 3040

Modification No. K004

Representation

Object to MOD K004, p.185 as out of date, since the Wales Waste Strategy came in. The wording is silly/vague and the excuse that other bodies must decide policy is unacceptable. We require additions: to place incineration at the bottom of the hierarchy for use in the Vale; to cover the VoG record and effort on Recycling, and refer to the VoG statutory Recycling plan; to cover removal of toxic and putrescible matter from household and commercial waste; to promote waste minimisation, recycling and composting; to favour landfilling of stabilised residual waste over other forms of final disposal.

Desired Change

Object to MOD K004 p. 185 as out of date, since the Wales Waste Strategy came in. The wording is silly/vague and the excuse that other bodies must decide policy is unacceptable. We require additions; to place incineration at the bottom of the hierarchy for use in the Vale; to cover the VoG record and effort on Recycling, and refer to the VoG statutory Recycling plan; to cover removal of toxic and putrescible matter from household and commercial waste; to promote waste minimisation, recycling and composting; to favour landfilling of stabilised residual waste over other forms of final disposal.

Recommendation

The proposed modification to paragraph 10.2.3 acknowledges the need to review this part of the plan to include any factual updates as and when any new guidance relating to waste is issued by the WAG. A consultation draft of the South East Wales Regional Waste Plan has also been produced, and once finalised the Council proposes to incorporate any policies that relate to the management of waste within the Vale of Glamorgan, as part of a review of the plan.

With regard to placing incineration at the bottom of the waste hierarchy, the Council's hierarchy (page 154 of the Deposit Draft UDP) is considered by the Council to manage waste in the most sustainable manner, in that it seeks to recover energy from waste, over disposal only when re-use, recycling and composting is not considered appropriate.

Matters concerning the Council's record and effort on recycling, the removal of toxic waste and putrescible matter from household waste are non land use issues and therefore are better addressed with the Council's waste management strategy. However, the recommendation that UDP's should promote waste minimisation over other forms of disposal is promoted elsewhere in the plan, notably under policy WAST1 as proposed modified, and therefore the Council considers it unnecessary to reproduce this within paragraph 10.2.3.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Waste Management

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 27

Accession No. 3041

Modification No. K001

Representation

Object to MOD K001 p. 183 Because it envisages increasing waste from the VoG for disposal: does not meet policy on minimising waste; does not include adequate measures to increase recycling; does not include measures to meet the landfill directive on putrescible fractions; does not meet the proximity principle, by catering for most waste within the Vale. The Council waste management strategy is out of date and does not meet the Wales Waste Strategy, so cannot be taken as the sole or even the main basis for planning. The whole waste strategy must be changed to accord with the Waste Framework Directive and the Welsh TAN on Waste, to establish the appropriate facilities for waste collection and management.

Desired Change

Object to MOD K001 p. 183 Because it envisages increasing waste from the VoG for disposal: does not meet policy on minimising waste; does not include adequate measures to increase recycling; does not include measures to meet the landfill directive on putrescible fractions; does not meet the proximity principle, by catering for most waste within the Vale. The Council waste management strategy is out of date and does not meet the Wales Waste Strategy, so cannot be taken as the sole or even the main basis for planning. The whole waste strategy must be changed to accord with the Waste Framework Directive and the Welsh TAN on Waste, to establish the appropriate facilities for waste collection and management.

Recommendation

All the above objections were considered by the Inspector (REC 10.1 – 10.3) and the Council's Proposed Modification to this proposed change has therefore been made in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations. In particular, the Council has stated within the proposed modification to undertake an early review of this chapter whereby the objections you have expressed will be fully addressed in line with the Inspector's recommendations.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Waste Management

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 56

Accession No. 3070

Modification No. H008

Representation

We require an addition on the provision of recycling banks. This is particularly necessary in view of the failure at the new Morrisons store.

Desired Change

We require an addition on the provision of recycling banks. This is particularly necessary in view of the failure at the new Morrisons store.

Recommendation

The Council considers that the objection raised in respect of the inclusion of a reference to the provision of waste recycling facilities within Policy SHOP4 is not duly made as the objection seeks to widen the scope of the policy by adding additional criteria rather than objecting to the proposed modification.

In view of the above no changes are proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Waste Management

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact Mr. Keith Stockdale

Representor No. 376

Representation No. 57

Accession No. 3071

Modification No. D056

Representation

Add to (iii) after WASTE MANAGEMENT "including separation of recyclable and compostable materials". Add to (viii) HAS REGARD to "high standards of " ENERGY EFFICIENCY...

Desired Change

Add to (iii) after WASTE MANAGEMENT "including separation of recyclable and compostable materials". Add to (viii) HAS REGARD to "high standards of " ENERGY EFFICIENCY...

Recommendation

The Council considers that the reference to waste management facilities in criteria (iii) of Policy ENV25 to encompass all forms of recycling, including composting.

With regard to energy efficiency, standards of efficiency are controlled through Building Control regulations, and do not fall within the remit of the UDP. Therefore the Council considers it to be inappropriate to include a reference to "high standards", as the UDP does not have the statutory authority to control standards of energy efficiency nor to set what it may consider to be a high standard.

In view of the above no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Waste Management

Organisation The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales

Contact Mr. Derek Moore OBE

Representor No. 1643

Representation No. 34

Accession No. 3023

Modification No. K010

Representation

WTSWW object to the amendment as currently worded for 157, and we recommend the addition of a third criterion: iii) provided there is no adverse effect on protected species or features of ecological geological, archaeological and landscape interest.

Desired Change

WTSWW object to the amendment as currently worded for 157, and we recommend the addition of a third criterion: iii) provided there is no adverse effect on protected species or features of ecological geological, archaeological and landscape interest.

Recommendation

References to protected species; ecological features geological, archaeological and landscape interests are addressed within the policy WAST1, and cross referenced in the proposed modified paragraph 10.4.7. On this basis the council considers it unnecessary to replicate this criteria within policy WAST2.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this modification.

NO CHANGE

AGRICULTURAL LAND

Issue: Agricultural Land

Organisation	Friends of the Earth Barry	Contact	
Representor No.	376	Representation No.	58
		Accession No.	7
		Modification No.	FMOD D017

Representation

The phrase OVERRIDING NEED lacks clarity; unlike PPW 2.8.1 this policy does not indicate what criteria and considerations come into play.

Desired Change

To meet our objection

Add after OVERRIDING NEED

Taking into account that these grades of farmland should be preserved as a finite resource for the future and the emerging EU Directive on Soil Strategy.

Recommendation

Policy ENV2 is consistent with Planning Policy Wales 2002 (paragraph 2.8.1 refers) and clearly indicates what criteria and considerations are relevant i.e. land that has a statutory landscape, nature conservation, historic or archaeological designation. The supporting text to this policy currently states that the best and most versatile land i.e. grades 1, 2 and 3a will be protected as a national resource for the future.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this Further Modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Agricultural Land

Organisation	Michaelston with Leckwith Community Council	Contact	
Representor No.	2240	Representation No.	1
		Accession No.	3
		Modification No.	FMOD D017

Representation

Michaelston-Le-Pi with Leckwith Community Council fully supports the following:

"THE BEST AND MOST VERSATILE AGRICULTURAL LAND (GRADES 1,2 AND 3A) WILL BE PROTECTED FROM IRREVERSIBLE DEVELOPMENT, SAVE WHERE OVERRIDING NEED CAN BE DEMONSTRATED. NON AGRICULTURAL LAND OR LAND OF A LOWER QUALITY SHOULD BE USED WHEN DEVELOPMENT IS PROPOSED, UNLESS SUCH LAND HAS A STATUTORY LANDSCAPE, NATURE CONSERVATION, HISTORIC OR ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESIGNATIONS, WHICH OUTWEIGHS AGRICULTURAL CONSIDERATIONS"

Desired Change

No Change Required

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

DEVELOPED COAST

Issue: Developed Coast

Organisation Barry Town Council

Contact

Representor No. 33

Representation No.

23

Accession No. 2

Modification No. FPM N001

Representation

Support

Desired Change

No change required

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

ENVIRONMENT

Issue: Environment

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact

Representor No. 376

Representation No.

60

Accession No. 9

Modification No. FMOD D44

Representation

FMOD D044 paragraph 3.4.42

We object that in practice the Council ignores other wildlife expertise and evidence than that from the Countryside Council for Wales. CCW has too easily approved developments as at Cog Moors, because of limited resources and being unwilling to give time at a public inquiry. Also, when it has been government policy, as in Cardiff Bay development, CCW has failed to argue for the wildlife interest. The Aarhus Convention, the Directive that will implement it and UK policy give the public the right to be consulted.

Desired Change

To meet our objection

Add after Country Council for Wales:

and wildlife interest groups or specialists or the wider public.

Recommendation

The Countryside Council for Wales is the Government's statutory adviser on sustaining natural beauty, wildlife and the opportunity for outdoor enjoyment in Wales and its inshore waters. In addition to ensuring and enhancing the survival of species and their habitats and protecting geological features and landscapes, their work includes the provision of advice to Government, local authorities and others to help them make well-informed decisions on matters, which affect the environment.

As a statutory consultee detailed in Article 10 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure Order 1995), the Countryside Council for Wales is formally consulted by the Vale of Glamorgan Council on planning applications and issues that are likely to impact on the environment, species or habitats within the Vale of Glamorgan.

The Aarhus Convention links environmental rights and human rights. It acknowledges that we owe an obligation to future generations and establishes that sustainable development can be achieved only through the involvement of all stakeholders. While the Countryside Council for Wales is the Council's statutory consultee on such matters, where relevant, the Council also consults with non-statutory organisations, specialist bodies and interested parties for advice and guidance on specific applications. Notwithstanding this, the Council will invariably be guided by the advice it receives from its statutory advisor.

Concerns over the role and effectiveness of the Countryside Council for Wales in providing advice and representing concerns are not considered to be an issue that is relevant to the Unitary Development Plan process. All such concerns should be expressed directly to the Countryside Council for Wales.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this Further Modification.

NO CHANGE

PROTECTED SPECIES

Issue: Protected Species

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry **Contact**
Representor No. 376 **Representation No.** 59 **Accession No.** 8 **Modification No.** FMOD D040

Representation

Reword Policy ENVXXX-PROTECTED SPECIES

We object to subsections (i) and (ii) as consistent with the Habitats Directive and UK Regulations in respect of protected species; the use of wording "exceptional circumstances" adds uncertainty in that it differs from the wording in the Directive; the subsection fail to specify that procedures have to be followed which involve WAG and EC decisions before permission can be given.

Desired Change

To meet our objections rewrite policy accordingly

Recommendation

In assessing any application likely to cause harm or threaten the continued viability of a protected species, the Council will be guided by advice received from the Countryside Council for Wales, its statutory nature conservation advisor. Where relevant, the Council will also consider advice and information provided by other non-statutory organisations and specialist bodies. When assessing applications the Council is obliged to pay due regard to all relevant International and National legislation.

In assessing this representation, the Council would advise that the policy wording for Policy ENV XXX - PROTECTED SPECIES was amended in accordance with modifications proposed by the Countryside Council for Wales.

The policy is not restricted to species afforded protection by the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994, but has been developed to encompass all relevant legislation that affords protection to species.

Notwithstanding the above, the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 allows for the granting of planning permission for new development works, which, if implemented, would contravene the protection afforded to European protected species. Any such departure, or derogation, would only be granted subject to the satisfaction of the following tests. That:

There is "no satisfactory alternative"

The proposal would "not be detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range

The proposal is "in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment".

The Council is of the view that sufficient guidance on the procedures to be followed is provided within the relevant legislation referred to and that no additional guidance is required within the Unitary Development Plan.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this Further Modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Protected Species

Organisation Michaelston with Leckwith Community Council **Contact**
Representor No. 2240 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 4 **Modification No.** FMOD D040

Representation

MOD D040 ENVXXX- Protected Species

Michaelston-Le-Pit with Leckwith Community Council fully supports the following:

"PERMISSION WILL ONLY BE GIVEN FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT WOULD CAUSE HARM TO OR THREATEN THE

CONTINUED VIABILITY OF A PROTECTED SPECIES IF IT CAN BE CLEARLY DEMONSTRATED THAT:

1. THERE ARE EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT JUSTIFY THE PROPOSAL
2. THERE IS NO SATISFACTORY ALTERNATIVE; AND
3. EFFECTIVE MITIGATION MEASURES ARE PROVIDED BY THE DEVELOPER

Desired Change

No Change Required

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

Issue: Protected Species

Organisation Michaelston with Leckwith Community Council

Contact

Representor No. 2240 **Representation No.** 3 **Accession No.** 5 **Modification No.** FMOD D044

Representation

Michaelston-Le-Pit with Leckwith Community Council fully supports the following: MOD D044 Paragraph 3.4.42:

"The presence of a species protected by Legislation, such as the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c) Regulations 1994 the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or the Protection of Badgers Act 1992, is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. When evaluating any development proposal which, if carried out would likely to result in harm to a protected species or its habitat, the Council will be guided by advice received from the Countryside Council for Wales. Applicants will also be advised to conform with any statutory species protection that may affect the site concerned."

Desired Change

No Change Required

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

SAND & GRAVEL RESOURCES

Issue: Sand & Gravel Resources

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 146 **Accession No.** 13 **Modification No.** FMOD J009

Representation

Upon inspection of the proposed areas for protection of potential sand and gravel resources, we have identified two sites of significant conservation interest within, and a number adjacent to the proposed safeguarded areas. In the event that any of these areas were brought forward for extraction we would be concerned at the possible effects on these areas of conservation interest.

I have included a set of maps, which show the approximate boundaries of the sites we are interested in.

It may also be worth noting that the land outlined in red on the accompanying map at the southern end of SG11 is owned by the National Trust.

We do not object to the safeguarding of these reserves per se, although we feel it is important to highlight these areas of conservation interest as early as possible in order to inform any future decisions. We also understand that some of these sites are recognised as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCS) by your Authority.

Desired Change

No change required

Recommendation

Your comments with regard to the sites of significant conservation interest within and adjacent to the potential sand and gravel resource areas are noted. Minerals Planning Policy Wales acknowledges that in some areas, suitable resources may not be appropriate for extraction because of environmental / natural heritage designations or the need for protection of existing or future amenity. Therefore, the Council would consult the Countryside Council for Wales and give full consideration to environmental issues in the assessment of any subsequent planning application.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this Further Modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Sand & Gravel Resources

Organisation Countryside Council for Wales

Contact

Representor No. 237 **Representation No.** 147 **Accession No.** 14 **Modification No.** FMOD N120

Representation

Upon inspection of the proposed areas for protection of potential sand and gravel resources, we have identified two sites of significant conservation interest within, and a number adjacent to the proposed safeguarded areas. In the event that any of these areas were brought forward for extraction we would be concerned at the possible effects on these areas of conservation interest.

I have included a set of maps, which show the approximate boundaries of the sites we are interested in.

It may also be worth noting that the land outlined in red on the accompanying map at the southern end of SG11 is owned by the National Trust.

We do not object to the safeguarding of these reserves per se, although we feel it is important to highlight these areas of conservation interest as early as possible in order to inform any future decisions. We also understand that some of these sites are recognised as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCS) by your Authority.

Desired Change

No change required

Recommendation

Your comments with regard to the sites of significant conservation interest within and adjacent to the potential sand and

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan

The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Further Proposed Modifications October 2004

gravel resource areas are noted. Minerals Planning Policy Wales acknowledges that in some areas, suitable resources may not be appropriate for extraction because of environmental / natural heritage designations or the need for protection of

existing or future amenity. Therefore, the Council would consult the Countryside Council for Wales and give full consideration to environmental issues in the assessment of any subsequent planning application.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this Further Modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Sand & Gravel Resources

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact

Representor No. 376 **Representation No.** 61 **Accession No.** 10 **Modification No.** FMOD J012

Representation

FMOD J012...sand and limestone resources

Object to addition of "Wenvoe"

The Council has failed to review landbanks for limestone and the need for new allocations, as required by MPPG and MTAN1. The UDP and supporting documents do not provide a verified assessment of reserves and current rate use at Wenvoe, nor any reason why this usage should continue.

On sand and gravel the proposed para is a biased account and does not include thinking on reducing unsustainable exploitation of resources. It does not recognise the Vale's other sources of aggregate (C&D waste, flyash) that the Council has done nothing to utilise. It does not fit with sustainable development promises of the UDP.

Desired Change

Delete Wenvoe

Add to 9.4.11 after... no adequate replacement resources

However there is unexploited potential to utilise waste management aggregate, especially the flyash from Aberthaw power station and construction/demolition waste, which will cut down on need for marine sand. Similarly, eco-cements which much reduced CO2 that are also becoming available, including from the Neath Glazetek project, will cut down demand for fresh aggregate. A third contributing change would be a move towards timber-framed buildings as more sustainable than concrete. In view of the future threat to sand deposits in the Vale, the Council will pursue these three alternatives to current uses of sand. The Welsh policy is investigating the suitability of switching dredging to deeper water in the lower Severn estuary, which could meet a reduced need for building.

Recommendation

Paragraph 49 of Minerals Planning Policy (Wales) Minerals Technical Advice Note (Wales) Aggregates (MTAN1) states that "a minimum 10 year landbank of crushed rock and minimum 7 year landbank of sand and gravel should therefore be maintained during the entire plan period of each development plan. [...] Where landbanks already provide for more than 20 years of aggregates extraction, new allocations in development plans will not be necessary."

The site to the south of Wenvoe at Cwm Slade was considered in detail by the Inspector in his report on the objections to the UDP. He concluded that the extension to the Wenvoe Quarry would allow for the continued production for this important quarry and recommended its inclusion in Policy MIN 2. The Inspector also considered the plan strategy for the supply of minerals and concluded that the "plan carefully assesses the current mineral supply and demand situation for the plan period." The Deposit Draft of the Unitary Development Plan included a full assessment of the, then current mineral supply and demand situation in the Vale of Glamorgan; this assessment was considered by the Inspector. It is therefore not correct to say that the Local Planning Authority has failed to review landbanks for limestone and the need for new allocations. Such a consideration was an important element of work undertaken prior to the publication of the Deposit Draft version of the UDP in 1998.

In addition the Local Planning Authority undertakes an annual monitoring programme on all minerals and related activity in the Vale of Glamorgan. This is presented to the Council's Planning Committee in the form of a detailed report on an annual basis and includes information on specific sites as well as trends in supply and demand and the use of secondary and recycled material. Such an appraisal allows for an annual review of mineral activity in the local context. The Local Planning Authority has therefore fulfilled the requirements of MTAN1 in that the Unitary Development Plan does contain an

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan

The Council's Responses to Representations Made to the Further Proposed Modifications October 2004
assessment of the landbank requirements for the Vale of Glamorgan.

In addition annual reports ensure that the local context is regularly monitored and reviewed.

Finally, the objection is not to Policy MIN2 but is an objection to supporting background information inserted into the plan for clarity and completeness in the form of a factual update. Both the Inspector and the Council have previously considered the appropriateness of the inclusion of land to the south of Wenvoe Quarry at Cwm Slade in Policy MIN2 with such inclusion having been accepted.

Your comments in terms of other sources of aggregates (construction and demolition waste, flyash etc.) are inaccurate. UDP Policy MIN 8 relates to proposals for the use of secondary materials such as construction and demolition waste and flyash. Although not strictly relevant to the UDP process, it is worth noting that construction and demolition waste re-cycling is currently taking place at Barry Docks, Pant Quarry and Longlands Quarry and the Council has recently approved flyash re-cycling at Aberthaw Power station.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this Further Modification.

NO CHANGE

SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES

Issue: Settlement Boundary (Treoos)

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact

Representor No. 376 **Representation No.** 63 **Accession No.** 12 **Modification No.** FMOD N118

Representation

MAP MODIFICATIONS Settlement Boundaries

FMOD N118 Treoos

Reason for Objection

Large area of fields included in the settlement/development at Ty Deri

Desired Change

Delete this area

Recommendation

The proposed modification FMOD N118 to amend the UDP proposals map accepts the Inspector's recommendation (REC 3.10 refers) that the residential settlement boundaries should be revised to include the residential curtilage of the residential buildings included within them. The Inspector concluded in his report that logical residential settlement boundaries around settlements that are considered as being outside a countryside designation, should include the land which is being used for residential purposes within such settlements."

The Council considers that FMOD N118 should be maintained as it revises the Treoos settlement boundary to include the entire garden curtilage of the existing property known as Ty Deri and is therefore in accordance with the Inspectors recommendation. The revised settlement boundary represents a logical line around the existing garden currently in residential use.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this Further Modification.

NO CHANGE

Issue: Settlement Boundary

Organisation Pudge, Mr. and Mrs. P.B

Contact

Representor No. 1654 **Representation No.** 3 **Accession No.** 1 **Modification No.** FMOD N118

Representation

I am supporting that all of our garden is now within the unitary boundary. Basically all the ground has been kept as a garden for at least 16 years.

Desired Change

No Change Required

Recommendation

Support is welcomed

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Issue: Waste Management

Organisation Friends of the Earth Barry

Contact

Representor No. 376

Representation No.

62

Accession No. 11

Modification No. FMOD K001

Representation

FMOD K001

Reason for Objection- it is wrong of 10.1.1 to set the UDP's waste policies as subordinate to the Municipal Waste Management Strategy.

Desired Change

To meet our objection

The section needs to describe the purpose(s) accurately, including to cover all types of waste arising in the County; to serve as a waste plan in the meaning of the Waste Framework Directive, to facilitate the delivery of the waste management objectives in Wise about Waste (waste strategy for wales), to meet obligations under UK and European Legislation.

In 10.1.1 add that the reduction and avoidance of hazardous waste is particularly important and requires separate collection and special treatment.

Recommendation

Paragraph 10.1.2 states that "it is the role of the Unitary Development Plan to provide the land use policy framework for implementing this strategy [The Council's Municipal Waste Strategy]..." thus recognising that the UDP is integral to the implementation of the Council's Municipal Waste Management Strategy.

Elsewhere within the waste chapter, references are made to the European Directive on Waste and the Welsh Assembly

Government's National Waste Strategy 'Wise About Waste', with paragraph 10.4.2 indicating that both the UDP and the Council's Municipal Waste Management Strategy have been informed by the Welsh Assembly Governments National Waste Strategy, which itself has been drafted in accordance with European Legislation on Waste. Therefore it is considered that further references to these would result in unnecessary repetition.

Finally, the inclusion of a specific reference to the collection and handling of hazardous waste in paragraph 10.1.1 is considered unnecessary, as this is a general introduction to the chapter. Additionally, the paragraph refers to " minimisation, reuses recycling, or by treating or disposing of it safely without harm to the environment", thus encapsulating all types of waste, including hazardous waste.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this Further Modification.

NO CHANGE

WENVOE QUARRY

Issue: Wenvoe Quarry

Organisation Mr. Max Wallis **Contact**

Representor No. 374 **Representation No.** 2 **Accession No.** 15 **Modification No.** FMOD J012

Representation

Objection to the addition of Wenvoe to para 9.4.8

Reason: addition may be accurate or may not be accurate in respect of reserves at Wenvoe quarry, but it's not acceptable to put this in the UDP without verified figures in the public domain. I contest the 'need' to continue to exploit these reserves at the current rate and note that working at the quarry has for years started around 7am, earlier than permitted, and the Council took no action when this was pointed out.

Desired Change

Inserting "Wenvoe" is also false, because in the context it implies that "Reserves for up to a total of 20 years production at current levels at (Wenvoe) site are identified in Policy MIN 2 as suitable for immediate release."

The falsity lies in that MIN 2 identifies reserves in a separate site across the other side of the open valley. It would effectively create a separate quarry. The Council has been wrong to accept RMC's application for working as an extension. Apart from the spatial separation, the application involves a separate stone crushing plant, separate run-off and discharge arrangements and has a separate after use plan.

The first thing to decide is that it's a separate site. This is clearly true for the current proposal and is readily arguable even if the access to it were via an underground tunnel as one-time envisaged.

Desired Changes to overcome the objection - delete Wenvoe in 9.4.8

Recommendation

The amendment to paragraph 9.4.8 is a factual update to the Plan.

Paragraph 49 of Minerals Planning Policy (Wales) Minerals Technical Advice Note (Wales) Aggregates (MTAN1) states that "a minimum 10 year landbank of crushed rock and minimum 7 year landbank of sand and gravel should therefore be maintained during the entire plan period of each development plan. [...] Where landbanks already provide for more than 20 years of aggregates extraction, new allocations in development plans will not be necessary."

The site to the south of Wenvoe at Cwm Slade was considered in detail by the Inspector in his report on the objections to the UDP. He concluded that the extension to the Wenvoe Quarry would allow for the continued production for this important quarry and recommended its inclusion in Policy MIN 2. The Inspector also considered the plan strategy for the supply of minerals and concluded that the "plan carefully assesses the current mineral supply and demand situation for the plan period."

The Deposit Draft of the Unitary Development Plan included a full assessment of the, then current mineral supply and demand situation in the Vale of Glamorgan; this assessment was considered by the Inspector.

Finally, the objection is not to Policy MIN2 but is an objection to supporting background information inserted into the plan for clarity and completeness in the form of a factual update. Both the Inspector and the Council have previously considered the appropriateness of the inclusion of land to the south of Wenvoe Quarry at Cwm Slade in Policy MIN2 with such inclusion having been accepted.

All your comments relating to operational matters at the quarry and the details relating to the current application for planning permission are matters that are not relevant to the UDP process.

In view of the above, no change is proposed to this Further Modification.

NO CHANGE

LIST OF REPRESENTORS
BY ISSUE

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Affordable Housing	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	37	2960
Affordable Housing	Mrs Elaine Ancrum	Welsh Assembly Government	244	39	2837
Affordable Housing	Mrs Elaine Ancrum	Welsh Assembly Government	244	40	2838
Affordable Housing	Mrs. Jean Fairclough	Llandow Community Council	246	24	1891
Affordable Housing	Ryan Bowen	Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru	293	23	2779
Agricultural Land	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	24	2947
Agricultural Land	Mike Cuddy	Land Division, Welsh Development Agency	232	18	2828
Agricultural Land	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	121	2888
Agricultural Land	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	49	3063
Agricultural Land	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	3	2992
Agricultural Land	Cofton Limited		1668	5	3084
Archaeology	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	23	2946
Archaeology	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	29	2952
Archaeology	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	30	2953
Archaeology		Dinas Powys Community Council	262	12	2817
Built Environment	Mr A.J.L Alden	Cowbridge Local History Society	13	6	1853
Built Environment	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	27	2950
Built Environment	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	28	2951
Built Environment	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	31	2954
Built Environment	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	32	2955
Built Environment	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	109	2876
Built Environment	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	110	2877
Built Environment	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	123	2890
Built Environment	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	142	2909
Built Environment	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	143	2910
Built Environment	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	92	3121
Built Environment	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	93	3122
Built Environment	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	105	3134
Built Environment	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	53	3067
Built Environment	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	13	3002
Coastal Zone	Mr Ian Harris	Barry Town Council	33	16	1752
Coastal Zone	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	118	2885

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Coastal Zone	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	119	2886
Coastal Zone	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	103	3132
Coastal Zone	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	44	3058
Coastal Zone	Mr Ian Hardy	Middleton Farm Trust	521	1	1769
Coastal Zone	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	5	2994
Coastal Zone	Cofton Limited		1668	22	3101
Community and Utilities		The National Grid Co Plc	7	3	1899
Community and Utilities	Mr Ian Harris	Barry Town Council	33	18	1754
Community and Utilities	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	21	2944
Community and Utilities	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	49	2972
Community and Utilities	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	50	2973
Community and Utilities	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	51	2974
Community and Utilities	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	52	2975
Community and Utilities	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	64	2943
Community and Utilities	Edward Vick	Penarth Town Council	234	6	1939
Community and Utilities	Edward Vick	Penarth Town Council	234	7	1940
Community and Utilities	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	100	2867
Community and Utilities	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	101	2868
Community and Utilities	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	102	2869
Community and Utilities	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	103	2870
Community and Utilities	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	104	2871
Community and Utilities	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	105	2872
Community and Utilities	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	124	2891
Community and Utilities	Mrs Elaine Ancrum	Welsh Assembly Government	244	45	2843
Community and Utilities	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	99	3128
Community and Utilities	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	100	3129
Community and Utilities	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	110	3139
Community and Utilities	Ryan Bowen	Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru	293	18	2774
Community and Utilities	Ryan Bowen	Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru	293	32	2788
Community and Utilities		Barry College	350	4	2915
Community and Utilities	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	20	3034
Community and Utilities	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	21	3035

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Community and Utilities	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	22	3036
Community and Utilities	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	23	3037
Community and Utilities	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	50	3064
Community and Utilities		Orange Personal Communications Sevices Ltd	522	1	1771
Community and Utilities	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	1	2990
Community and Utilities	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	2	2991
Community and Utilities	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	4	2993
Community and Utilities	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	35	3024
Community and Utilities	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	36	3025
Community and Utilities		T. Mobile (UK) Ltd.	1645	1	3078
Community and Utilities		T. Mobile (UK) Ltd.	1645	2	3079
Community and Utilities	Cofton Limited		1668	17	3096
Countryside	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	87	2854
Countryside	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	94	2861
Countryside	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	96	2863
Countryside	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	17	3031
Countryside	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	19	3033
Countryside	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	51	3065
Countryside	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	52	3066
Countryside	Cofton Limited		1668	20	3099
Countryside	Cofton Limited		1668	21	3100
Cowbridge Cattle Market	R.D. Allin		40	11	1688
Cowbridge Cattle Market	Mrs Jane Tennant		253	7	1652
Cowbridge Cattle Market	Mr D.A. Pain	Keep Cowbridge Special	254	2	1653
Cowbridge Cattle Market	Mr D.A. Pain	Keep Cowbridge Special	254	3	1654
Cycling	Mr C.W. Kipling		60	5	2795
Cycling	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	136	2903
Cycling	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	137	2904
Cycling		Dinas Powys Community Council	262	5	2810
Cycling	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	34	3048
Darren Farm	R.D. Allin		40	10	1687
Darren Farm	Sue Bridge	Bellway Estates	126	19	1848

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Darren Farm	Mr A L J Raum	Campaign for Protection of Rural Wales	173	32	1672
Darren Farm	Mike Cuddy	Land Division, Welsh Development Agency	232	23	2798
Darren Farm	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	98	2865
Darren Farm	Mrs. Jean Fairclough	Llandow Community Council	246	19	1886
Darren Farm	Mrs. Jean Fairclough	Llandow Community Council	246	20	1887
Darren Farm	Mrs. Jean Fairclough	Llandow Community Council	246	26	1893
Darren Farm	Dr. C.A. Pearce	Cowbridge and Llanblethian Residents Group	378	1	1604
Darren Farm	Ms J Thomas		379	1	1607
Darren Farm	S.A. Thomas		380	1	1608
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs L. Evans		381	1	1609
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs P.S. Knight		382	1	1610
Darren Farm	J.S Jenkins		383	1	1611
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs Peter Carter		384	1	1612
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs C.J. & S.L. Lewis		385	1	1613
Darren Farm	Mr Arthur Smith		386	1	1614
Darren Farm	Mrs Halcyone Smith		387	1	1615
Darren Farm	Mr B.G. Loader		388	1	1616
Darren Farm	Miss P.J. Williams		389	1	1617
Darren Farm	Mr D.R. Williams		390	1	1618
Darren Farm	Mr Richard Griffiths		391	1	1619
Darren Farm	Mrs J. Williams		392	1	1620
Darren Farm	Mr George Crabb		393	1	1621
Darren Farm	Judith Griffiths		394	1	1622
Darren Farm	D.I. Williams		398	1	1626
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs Liam & Margaret Ginn		399	1	1627
Darren Farm	Rosalin Norris		400	1	1628
Darren Farm	Margaret Fletcher		401	1	1629
Darren Farm	Mr Richard Griffiths		402	1	1630
Darren Farm	R.H. Bradshaw		403	1	1631
Darren Farm	Mrs J.P. Yearsley	Cowbridge and Llanblethian Residents Group	404	1	1632
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs L.E. & N.H. Taylor		405	1	1633
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs H.I Lewis		406	1	1634

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs C.G. Harris		407	1	1635
Darren Farm	Mr. R. Ricketts		409	1	1637
Darren Farm	F.A. Brent		410	1	1638
Darren Farm	Mrs Ros Davies		412	1	1640
Darren Farm	Professor Bernard Elgey Leake		413	1	1641
Darren Farm	Mr Stuart Hiscock		417	1	1645
Darren Farm	Mr David Nevens		418	1	1646
Darren Farm	Mrs R.M. Morgan		419	1	1647
Darren Farm	Mr Richard Norris		420	1	1648
Darren Farm	Jo Norris		421	1	1649
Darren Farm	Mr David Field	Ramblers Association	422	1	1650
Darren Farm	Susan Norris		423	1	1651
Darren Farm	N Brock		426	1	1746
Darren Farm	Linda Adams	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Residents Group	427	1	1655
Darren Farm	J.M. Browning		428	1	1656
Darren Farm	R.J. Browning		429	1	1657
Darren Farm	P.R. Bradshaw		430	1	1658
Darren Farm	Janice S. Palmer		431	1	1659
Darren Farm	Pauline Mead		432	1	1660
Darren Farm	Mr D. Orrell		433	1	1661
Darren Farm	Mr M.J. Lewis		434	1	1662
Darren Farm	Mr V.T. Lewis		435	1	1663
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs J. Row		436	1	1664
Darren Farm	Mrs S. Gibson		437	1	1665
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs T. Saltmarsh		438	1	1666
Darren Farm	Mr John Roberts		439	1	1667
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs R.J. Nottage		440	1	1668
Darren Farm	Miss S.A. Williams		443	1	1671
Darren Farm	M.A. Sanson		444	1	1747
Darren Farm	D.W.J. Neilly		445	1	1673
Darren Farm	Glynis Cornelius Jones		446	1	1674
Darren Farm	Mr Paul Anderson		447	1	1675

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Darren Farm	Mr Stephen John Barrett		448	1	1676
Darren Farm	Mr Gerald John Jones		449	1	1677
Darren Farm	Christine M. Cheeseman		450	1	1678
Darren Farm	Mr John W. Floyd		451	1	1679
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs J.E. Pattinson		452	1	1680
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs C.J. Wilkins		454	1	1682
Darren Farm	Prof C.L. Jones		455	1	1683
Darren Farm	Mrs D. Thomas	History Society	458	1	1686
Darren Farm	Ms Deborah Morgan		459	1	1748
Darren Farm	E.P. Lloyd	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Residents Group.	461	1	1690
Darren Farm	Mr D. Snell		466	1	1695
Darren Farm	D.B. Owen		467	1	1696
Darren Farm	Mrs B.E. Dumbleton		468	1	1697
Darren Farm	Mr Dudley Bennett		470	1	1699
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs B.B. Maddocks		471	1	1700
Darren Farm	Mr Roger Morgan		510	1	1749
Darren Farm	H.P. Wright		511	1	1759
Darren Farm	Mrs M Lewis		513	1	1761
Darren Farm	W.A.M. Jones		514	1	1850
Darren Farm	Mrs Margaret Bradshaw		515	1	1763
Darren Farm	Mrs Claire Goulden		516	1	1764
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs F.H. Anderson		524	1	1773
Darren Farm	Mrs Dawn Rees		531	1	1782
Darren Farm	Mrs Jane Sorotos		532	1	1783
Darren Farm	Mr John Sorotos		533	1	1784
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs D.M.J. & E.P. Weber		534	1	1785
Darren Farm	Mr James Patrick Andrews		537	1	1788
Darren Farm	Mr Colin Massie		538	1	1789
Darren Farm	June Benson	Cowbridge & Llanblethian Residents Group	539	1	1790
Darren Farm	Mr Adrian J. Brewer		542	1	1793
Darren Farm	Katherine G. Jones		543	1	1794
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs Malcolm & Monica Porter		546	1	1797

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs R & M.J. Milton		547	1	1798
Darren Farm	Mrs Beryl Gething		554	1	1805
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs M.& A. Jones		555	1	1806
Darren Farm	T.R Richards		556	1	1807
Darren Farm	Mr Thomas Mainwaring		558	1	1809
Darren Farm	Mr Brian Gething		559	1	1810
Darren Farm	Mr Paul Prescott		564	1	1815
Darren Farm	Mr Keith Lycett		580	1	1830
Darren Farm	Mrs Mary Lycett		581	1	1831
Darren Farm	Mr Neil McLean		591	1	1849
Darren Farm	Brig F.P. Crawley		592	1	1856
Darren Farm	Mr & Mrs R. & V.E. James		593	1	1857
Darren Farm	Mr R Nottage	Glamorgan Bird Club	604	1	1868
Darren Farm	Dr Pamela Jones		613	1	1879
Darren Farm	Mr C Treharne Jones		614	1	1880
Darren Farm	R.J Long		615	1	1881
Darren Farm	Brenda H Richards		650	1	1930
Darren Farm	Mr Alan H Richards		651	1	1931
Darren Farm	O.R Dowdle		652	1	1932
Darren Farm	Mrs Mary Dowdle		653	1	1933
Darren Farm	Mr David Andrew Pugh		654	1	1934
Darren Farm	Mr Cecil England		1640	1	1774
Darren Farm	Mary Wallis		1650	1	2804
Darren Farm	Mrs G.E Wayte		1651	1	2806
Darren Farm	Rebecca Exley		1652	1	2807
Design of New Developments	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	33	2956
Design of New Developments	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	141	2908
Design of New Developments	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	94	3123
Design of New Developments	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	14	3003
Developments involving horses	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	26	2949
Developments involving horses	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	116	2883
Developments involving horses	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	42	3056

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
General Housing	Mr A.J.L Alden	Cowbridge Local History Society	13	4	1851
General Housing	Mr Ian Harris	Barry Town Council	33	15	1751
General Housing	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	35	2958
General Housing	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	36	2959
General Housing	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	38	2961
General Housing	Mr C.W. Kipling		60	6	2796
General Housing	Mr C. Kipling	Penllyn Community Council	159	8	2793
General Housing	John G Taylor	Grenville Estates	223	3	1897
General Housing	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	90	2857
General Housing	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	97	2864
General Housing	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	138	2905
General Housing	Mrs. Jean Fairclough	Llandow Community Council	246	18	1885
General Housing	Mrs. Jean Fairclough	Llandow Community Council	246	22	1889
General Housing	Mrs. Jean Fairclough	Llandow Community Council	246	23	1890
General Housing	Janie Jones	Plaid Cymru	270	45	3028
General Housing	Ryan Bowen	Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru	293	22	2778
General Housing	Dr. C.A. Pearce	Cowbridge and Llanblethian Residents Group	378	2	1605
General Housing	Dr. C.A. Pearce	Cowbridge and Llanblethian Residents Group	378	3	1606
General Housing	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	17	3006
General Housing	V. J. Thomas & Sons		1644	1	3076
General Housing	V. J. Thomas & Sons		1644	2	3077
General Housing	Barry Joint Initiative		1667	1	2832
General Housing	Barry Joint Initiative		1667	2	2833
General Housing	Barry Joint Initiative		1667	3	2834
General Housing	Barry Joint Initiative		1667	4	2835
General Housing	Barry Joint Initiative		1667	5	2836
General Housing	Cofton Limited		1668	2	3081
General Housing	Cofton Limited		1668	4	3083
General Housing	Cofton Limited		1668	7	3086
General Housing	Cofton Limited		1668	13	3092
General Housing	Cofton Limited		1668	18	3097
General Housing	Cofton Limited		1668	19	3098

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
General Industry & Employment	Mr Richard Smith		1648	2	2800
General Industry & Employment	Cofton Limited		1668	14	3093
Golf Courses & Related Development	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	133	2900
Golf Courses & Related Development	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	144	2911
Golf Courses & Related Development	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	28	3017
Green Belt	Mr A L J Raum	Campaign for Protection of Rural Wales	173	33	1839
Green Belt	Mr Gareth Williams	House Builders Federation	249	24	3032
Green Belt	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	47	3061
Green Belt	Mr Andrew Bailey		1550	6	2654
Green Wedges	Mr Ian Harris	Barry Town Council	33	17	1753
Green Wedges	Mr A L J Raum	Campaign for Protection of Rural Wales	173	36	1842
Green Wedges		Dinas Powys Community Council	262	6	2811
Green Wedges	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	48	3062
Green Wedges	L McDonald		1642	1	2988
Green Wedges		Legal & General/Hines	1646	1	3075
Green Wedges		Legal & General/Hines	1646	2	3074
Green Wedges	Cofton Limited		1668	6	3085
Green Wedges	Cofton Limited		1668	23	3102
Green Wedges	Mr Roy Alison	c/o Agent	1669	1	2940
Heritage Coast	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	120	2887
Housing Allocation Llandough Fields	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	99	2866
Housing Allocation Llandough Fields	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	21	3010
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Mr&Mrs D Randolph		19	7	1778
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Mr&Mrs D Randolph		19	8	1935
Housing allocation Pencoedtre		Forest Enterprise	21	2	2913
Housing allocation Pencoedtre		Forest Enterprise	21	3	2928
Housing allocation Pencoedtre		Forest Enterprise	21	4	2929
Housing allocation Pencoedtre		Forest Enterprise	21	5	2930
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Mr Ian Harris	Barry Town Council	33	21	1757
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Mr Ian Harris	Barry Town Council	33	22	1758
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	77	2844

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	80	2847
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	145	2912
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Ryan Bowen	Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru	293	19	2775
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Ryan Bowen	Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru	293	27	2783
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Mr R Nottage	Glamorgan Bird Club	604	2	1884
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	18	3007
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	19	3008
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	20	3009
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Mr Richard Smith		1648	1	2799
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Mrs & Mrs Thomas & Brown		1672	1	2925
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Mrs & Mrs Thomas & Brown		1672	2	2926
Housing allocation Pencoedtre	Mrs & Mrs Thomas & Brown		1672	3	2927
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mike Cuddy	Land Division, Welsh Development Agency	232	22	2797
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	85	2852
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	106	3135
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Christine Sullivan	Westbury Homes Holdings Ltd.	248	4	2808
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Christine Sullivan	Westbury Homes Holdings Ltd.	248	5	2809
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ryan Bowen	Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru	293	21	2777
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ryan Bowen	Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru	293	26	2782
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D.W. Porter		377	1	1603
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Joyce Fryer		395	1	1623
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Fryer		396	1	1624
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Eileen Stocker		397	1	1625
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr John Evans		408	1	1636
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S.T. Flanigan		411	1	1639
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Michael.N. Haberfield		414	1	1642
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Dr J.F. Reynolds		415	1	1643
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Ray.B Reynolds		416	1	1644
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Ashley Yard		424	1	1744
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Kenneth Ruscoe		425	1	1745
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs G. Sewell		441	1	1669
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Simon Parker		442	1	1670

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ian and Melanie Strangward and Lewis		453	1	1681
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Dr Peter Elmes	Welsh Historic Gardens Trust	456	1	1684
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr J.P. Mc Cann		457	1	1685
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Avril King		460	1	1689
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Lynette Williams		463	1	1692
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms Lyn Evans		464	1	1693
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Kevin Anthony Halborg		465	1	1694
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Graham Shaddick		469	1	1698
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S.H. Britton		472	1	1701
Housing Allocation Rhoose	L. Robinson		473	1	1702
Housing Allocation Rhoose	H.W. Stradling		474	1	1703
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs K. Blackman		475	1	1704
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs V.E. Surman		476	1	1705
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Robert Williams		477	1	1706
Housing Allocation Rhoose	W. Murphy		478	1	1707
Housing Allocation Rhoose	N. Churchill		479	1	1708
Housing Allocation Rhoose	V.M. Grisdale		480	1	1709
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr John Pickering		481	1	1710
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Pamela Pickering		482	1	1711
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Sandra Kay Thurlow		483	1	1712
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Geraint Marc Thurlow		484	1	1713
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr James Brian Thurlow		485	1	1714
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Avril Harding		486	1	1715
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Alan Harding		487	1	1716
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs L.T. Heywood		488	1	1717
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr M.P. Heywood		489	1	1718
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs L.M. Wooden		490	1	1719
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr G. Wooden		491	1	1720
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Gerald Creed		492	1	1721
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr L. Edgerton		493	1	1722
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs F. Edgerton		494	1	1723
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Nicola Holloway		495	1	1724

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Ian Holloway		496	1	1725
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Steven W.D. Lewis		497	1	1726
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Edna Reynolds		498	1	1727
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Winifred Iris Wood		499	1	1728
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr & Mrs C. Webber		500	1	1729
Housing Allocation Rhoose	P. Harris		501	1	1730
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Victoria Grice		502	1	1731
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Kelvin Grice		503	1	1732
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr R. Dixon		504	1	1733
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs E. Dixon		505	1	1734
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr M. Dixon		506	1	1735
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr John Battle		507	1	1736
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Edwards		508	1	1737
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Justine Williams		509	1	1750
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs B Lovering		512	1	1760
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs D Ling		519	1	1767
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr P Ling		520	1	1768
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Ian Hardy	Middleton Farm Trust	521	2	1770
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Ian Hardy	Middleton Farm Trust	521	3	1762
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Gaynor Cosgrove		523	1	1772
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs J. Evans		525	1	1775
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr David Evans		526	1	1776
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S. Goring		527	1	1943
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs M.E. Harding		528	1	1779
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Miss J.P. Hopkins		529	1	1780
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ruth May		530	1	1781
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr William Windsor		535	1	1786
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr C. Gilligan		536	1	1787
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J.C. Higson		540	1	1791
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr P. Davis		541	1	1792
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M. Byrne		544	1	1795
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs K.W. Bartlett		545	1	1796

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Anne Sloman		548	1	1799
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Jemma Sloman		549	1	1800
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Mair Elizabeth Williams		550	1	1801
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr David Gaeraint Williams		551	1	1802
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs V.J. Brown		552	1	1803
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr M.W. Brown		553	1	1804
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S Young		557	1	1808
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr David Wright		560	1	1811
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Carol Frieze		562	1	1813
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Brian Frieze		563	1	1814
Housing Allocation Rhoose	V.C. Wilton		565	1	1816
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C.M. Wilton		566	1	1817
Housing Allocation Rhoose	N.G. Wilton		567	1	1818
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Paul Sims-Williams		568	1	1819
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Frances Murphy		569	1	1820
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs J. McFarlane		572	1	1822
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Gill Sims Williams		573	1	1823
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr & Mrs R. & V. Manfield		574	1	1824
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr & Mrs S. & N. Kelland		575	1	1825
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Peter William Anthony		576	1	1826
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Alan.D Sparrow		577	1	1827
Housing Allocation Rhoose	G. Simpkins		578	1	1828
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Williams Richard Simkins		579	1	1829
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr & Mrs J.T. Mills		582	1	1832
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S.M. Mortimer		583	1	1833
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Linda Bohun		584	1	1834
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Moira Bohum		585	1	1835
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Hazel James		586	1	1836
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Beryl Vivienne Watkins		587	1	1837
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Annette Barton		588	1	1838
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr & Mrs J. & S.E. Atherton		589	1	1843
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Whistance		590	1	1844

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr M.C. Lee		594	1	1858
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Brenda Roe		596	1	1860
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D.B. Stabler		597	1	1861
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr David Watts		598	1	1862
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr W.G. Browne		599	1	1863
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr & Mrs Phillip and Hilary Dawe		600	1	1864
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Kenneth Newman		601	1	1865
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms Sallie Warman-Watts		602	1	1866
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr P.E Hoad		603	1	1867
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs H Hinam		605	1	1871
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Paul Hinam		606	1	1872
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M.J Beer		607	1	1873
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr G.M McKenna		608	1	1874
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs P.A McKenna		609	1	1875
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr and Mrs P and A Jacques		610	1	1876
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms Barbara Forster		611	1	1877
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr and Mrs J.D and A Norman		612	1	1878
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M.V Clarke		616	1	1882
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Russell Evans		617	1	1896
Housing Allocation Rhoose	E.M Davies		618	1	2410
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Edward G Lovering		619	1	1894
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Jennie Flanigan		622	1	1902
Housing Allocation Rhoose	MS GAYNOR RUMBELOW		623	1	1903
Housing Allocation Rhoose	MR AND MRS W LEWIS		624	1	1904
Housing Allocation Rhoose	MR C.P DANCE		625	1	1905
Housing Allocation Rhoose	DJ WILLIAMS		626	1	1906
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S WILLIAMS		627	1	1907
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D RUMBELOW		628	1	1908
Housing Allocation Rhoose	MRS BYRNE		629	1	1909
Housing Allocation Rhoose	MR MATTHEW ROYNON		630	1	1910
Housing Allocation Rhoose	MS JULIE SUMMERS		631	1	1911
Housing Allocation Rhoose	T.R FUDGE		632	1	1912

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	MISS R.A TURNER		633	1	1913
Housing Allocation Rhoose	MRS M.P LAVIS		634	1	1914
Housing Allocation Rhoose	MISS N.S TURNER		635	1	1915
Housing Allocation Rhoose	MR JOHN LAVIS		636	1	1916
Housing Allocation Rhoose	MS SUSAN EVANS		637	1	1917
Housing Allocation Rhoose	MR MARTIN DAVID EVANS		638	1	1918
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J HEENAN-DAVIES		639	1	1919
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Roy Sellek		640	1	1920
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C Darlington		641	1	1921
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr James Snelson		642	1	1922
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr David Snelson		643	1	1923
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Shirley Snelson		644	1	1924
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mt Robert Rumbelow		645	1	1925
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms Lisa Roynon		646	1	1926
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Amy Liddiard		647	1	1927
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs J Lawson		648	1	1928
Housing Allocation Rhoose	G.J Hooper		649	1	1929
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Cindy Figero-Goring		658	1	1943
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr R Silvester		659	1	1944
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs J Silvester		660	1	1945
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr S Cavill		661	1	1946
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Ivor Williams		662	1	1947
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs P M Jones		663	1	1948
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr T M Jones		664	1	1949
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C Nash		665	1	1950
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Lee Garland		666	1	1951
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D Christian		667	1	1952
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Martin Hazeldine		668	1	1953
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr J Fordham		669	1	1954
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Helen Pitman		670	1	1955
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Linda Page		671	1	1956
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Brian Page		672	1	1957

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Damian Higson		673	1	1958
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr D R Mason		674	1	1959
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr D R Mason		674	2	1960
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Darren Sweet		675	1	2470
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Sharon Clements		677	1	1962
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs M M Hook		678	1	1963
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M Robinson-Booth		679	1	1963
Housing Allocation Rhoose	N Kelly		680	1	1964
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mavis Dodwell		681	1	1965
Housing Allocation Rhoose	B A Keeble		682	1	1966
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Edward Bell		683	1	1967
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Sian Davies		684	1	1968
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Hilary D'arvall		685	1	1969
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs J Ward		686	1	1970
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Amelia Milligan		687	1	1971
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr John Milligan		688	1	1972
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs C Owen		689	1	1973
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D C Mitchell		690	1	1974
Housing Allocation Rhoose	R Sanders		691	1	1975
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C Williams		692	1	1976
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Glyn Rees		693	1	1977
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms A Dance		694	1	1978
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Norman Pullin		695	1	1979
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs P Pullin		696	1	1980
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M Worsden		697	1	1981
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Anthony O'Reilly		699	1	1983
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms Carell Alden		700	1	1984
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs M Dodwell		701	1	1985
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Gather		702	1	1986
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Chris Prince		703	1	1987
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr and Mrs Wood		704	1	1988
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Miss Dee Bayon		705	1	1989

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	N Evans		706	1	1990
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms A G Campbell		707	1	1991
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr C Harris		708	1	1992
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs K Harris		709	1	1993
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ann Davies		710	1	1994
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms N Cook		711	1	1995
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Howard English		712	1	1996
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs R English		713	1	1997
Housing Allocation Rhoose	T Lomax		714	1	1998
Housing Allocation Rhoose	G Lomax		715	1	1999
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs S McFarland		716	1	2000
Housing Allocation Rhoose	V J Mc Farland		717	1	2001
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs C Dons		718	1	2002
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs T England		719	1	2003
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr M England		720	1	2004
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J Oeppen		721	1	2005
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Christopher Cook		722	1	2006
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Susan Cook		723	1	2007
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms Natalie Bagwall		724	1	2008
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Timothy Richards		725	1	2009
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Miss E Turner		726	1	2010
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Olive Barrett		727	1	2011
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr George Barrett		728	1	2012
Housing Allocation Rhoose	P Yardley		729	1	2013
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J M Kavanagh		730	1	2014
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Vincent Kavanagh		731	1	2015
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms Mary Wood		732	1	2016
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Phillip Thomas Wood		733	1	2017
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Llewelyn Rees		734	1	2018
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Bryn Rowlands		735	1	2019
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Andrew Rowlands		736	1	2020
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Doreen Rowlands		737	1	2021

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Elaine Bryan		738	1	2022
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs M Bagnall		739	1	2023
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Julie Thomas		740	1	2024
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Ronald Thomas		741	1	2025
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Karen Long		742	1	2026
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Thomas Long		743	1	2027
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Robert Brown		744	1	2028
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs D Turner		745	1	2029
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr J H Turner		746	1	2030
Housing Allocation Rhoose	V M Peck		747	1	2031
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Stephen Jones		748	1	2032
Housing Allocation Rhoose	A Fifield		749	1	2033
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M Fifield		750	1	2034
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Kevin J. McAuliffe		751	1	3109
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms Olive Pruce		752	1	2036
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr A Mottram		753	1	2037
Housing Allocation Rhoose	R Evans-Cooper		754	1	2038
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Phyllis Hawkins		755	1	2039
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms Joanne Dobson		756	1	2040
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Christopher David		757	1	2041
Housing Allocation Rhoose	E Bohun		758	1	2043
Housing Allocation Rhoose	G Bohun		759	1	2043
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J W Morgan		760	1	2044
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Paul Wilson		761	1	2045
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Joanne O'Brian		762	1	2046
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr David Johnson		763	1	2047
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Diane Richardson		764	1	2048
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Chris Pritchard		765	1	2049
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Lynne Tomes		766	1	2050
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Leighton Tomes		767	1	2051
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr David Munson		768	1	2052
Housing Allocation Rhoose	K Brazier		769	1	2053

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M J Coles		970	1	2054
Housing Allocation Rhoose	L F Stedham		971	1	2055
Housing Allocation Rhoose	P Chamberlain		972	1	2035
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Alan Davies		973	1	2056
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Owen Connors		974	1	2057
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Janet Morgan		975	1	2058
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Dilys Walsh		976	1	2059
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M Leonard		977	1	2060
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Sarah Brewer		978	1	2061
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr R Western		979	1	2062
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M R Western		980	1	2063
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr S J Derrick		981	1	2064
Housing Allocation Rhoose	W Parkman		982	1	2065
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs A Creed		983	1	2066
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms Michele Pullum		984	1	2067
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Neil Pullum		985	1	2068
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs J M Gartland		986	1	2069
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D Gartland		987	1	2070
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Violet Pembridge		988	1	2071
Housing Allocation Rhoose	B Williams		989	1	2072
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr G. Stephen Whitty		990	1	2073
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Helen Stevens		991	1	2074
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Lynne Harris		992	1	2075
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Linda Stevens		993	1	2076
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs R Wintle		994	1	2077
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs M. E. Chislett		995	1	2078
Housing Allocation Rhoose	L. H. Slimings		996	1	2079
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S. J. Slimings		997	1	2080
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Hilary Evans		998	1	2081
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs A. Preece		999	1	2082
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr M Prece		1000	1	2083
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr G. M. Rees		1001	1	2084

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	K. R. & J. M. Sievwright		1002	1	2085
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs M. E. Hill		1003	1	2086
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr J. D. Taylor		1004	1	2087
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs T. James		1005	1	2088
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Pauline Kear		1006	1	2089
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D Rees		1007	1	2090
Housing Allocation Rhoose	E. D. Parfitt	Young at Heart Club	1008	1	2091
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M. B. Hindley		1009	1	2092
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M. McDowall		1010	1	2093
Housing Allocation Rhoose	P. A. Chinn		1011	1	2094
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs L. C. Light		1012	1	2095
Housing Allocation Rhoose	A. J. Williams		1013	1	2096
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Riona Treadgold		1014	1	2097
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Aileen Sudbury		1015	1	2098
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Michael A. Davies		1016	1	2099
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Miss N. Turner		1017	1	2100
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr K. Harris		1018	1	2101
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs H. Burke		1019	1	2102
Housing Allocation Rhoose	P.J.J. Burke		1020	1	2103
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs I. Thomas		1021	1	2104
Housing Allocation Rhoose	L. S. Thomas		1022	1	2105
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Hodge		1023	1	2106
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Kevin Williamson		1024	1	2107
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs C. Price		1025	1	2108
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs P. Chivers		1026	1	2109
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Michael Meyrick		1027	1	2110
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Miss E. Reynolds		1028	1	2111
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Pauline Harris		1029	1	2112
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Lisa Harris		1030	1	2113
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs D. Boyce		1031	1	2114
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Peter Laxton		1032	1	2115
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ann McKnight		1033	1	2116

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs S. C. Brown		1034	1	2117
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs C. Jones		1035	1	2118
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs C. Evans		1036	1	2119
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Jlie Ockwell		1037	1	2120
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Alyson Perrott		1038	1	2121
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs T. Evans		1039	1	2122
Housing Allocation Rhoose	G. Symmonds		1040	1	2123
Housing Allocation Rhoose	T. R. Williams		1041	1	2124
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Maureen Thomas		1042	1	2125
Housing Allocation Rhoose	E. G. Widger		1043	1	2126
Housing Allocation Rhoose	H.J. Jones		1044	1	2127
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Daniel Wilson		1045	1	2128
Housing Allocation Rhoose	A. H. Poole		1046	1	2129
Housing Allocation Rhoose	David Park		1047	1	2130
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Derrick Jonathon Alsop		1048	1	2131
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D. W. Rowe		1049	1	2132
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Phyllis Hill		1050	1	2133
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Frances J. McLoughlin		1051	1	2134
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs G.J.A.S. Bibby		1052	1	2135
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Carole Perry		1053	1	2136
Housing Allocation Rhoose	E Lenthall		1054	1	2137
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs S. Jones		1055	1	2138
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Baker		1056	1	2139
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs J. Gordon		1057	1	2140
Housing Allocation Rhoose	P. F. Bradshaw		1058	1	2141
Housing Allocation Rhoose	William Lamb		1059	1	2142
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs S. Green		1060	1	2143
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs J. M. Birch		1061	1	2144
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs J. McAllister		1062	1	2145
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Monica Lucas		1063	1	2146
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs H. Hughes		1064	1	2147
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs H. Cridge		1065	1	2148

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Colin Davies		1066	1	2149
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs T. Gulliver		1067	1	2150
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Y. Guthrie		1068	1	2151
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs P. Nogan		1069	1	1069
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr M. Nogan		1070	1	2153
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs Haywood		1071	1	2154
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs O'Connell		1072	1	2155
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs Evans		1073	1	2156
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs Knowles		1074	1	2157
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M Preece		1075	1	2158
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr J. Walsh		1076	1	2159
Housing Allocation Rhoose	K. M. Hobbs		1077	1	2160
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs Humphrey		1078	1	2161
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mary Pexory		1079	1	2162
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs J. Davies		1080	1	2163
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs J. Davies		1080	2	2163
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M. Adams		1081	1	2164
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Suzanne Stoodley		1082	1	2165
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M. L. Boorah		1083	1	2166
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Anthony Mullett		1084	1	2167
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Helen Ashman		1085	1	2168
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr D. W. Price		1086	1	2169
Housing Allocation Rhoose	E. S. Williams		1087	1	2170
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs C. Stonehewer		1088	1	2171
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs C. L. Richards		1089	1	2172
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Peggy Hinam		1090	1	2173
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Gundersen		1091	1	2174
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs F. Ahearn		1092	1	2175
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mary Chick		1093	1	2176
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Horace R. Williams		1094	1	2177
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs L. Serra		1095	1	2178
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Kim Sweet		1096	1	2179

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Colin Arnot		1097	1	2180
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr David Mills		1098	1	2181
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs J. Lancaster		1099	1	2182
Housing Allocation Rhoose	A. H. John		1100	1	2183
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs E. J. David		1101	1	2184
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs G. Evans		1102	1	2185
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D. N. Evans		1103	1	2186
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Kevin Wake		1104	1	2187
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs Kingdon		1105	1	2188
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Pamela James		1106	1	2189
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Graham Butler		1107	1	2190
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Roberts		1108	1	2191
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S. G. Goodchap		1109	1	2192
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Frank and Norma Hamilton		1110	1	2193
Housing Allocation Rhoose	E. R. Llewellyn		1111	1	2194
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr A. Hill		1112	1	2195
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr C. E. Isaac		1113	1	2196
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr J. Evans		1114	1	2197
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Don Davies		1115	1	2198
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Derek K. Baker		1116	1	2199
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Diane Pine		1117	1	2200
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Colin Gundersen		1118	1	2201
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Simon Rees		1119	1	2202
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Miss M. Cunningham		1120	1	2203
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C. Mules		1121	1	1121
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr. K. Weeks		1122	1	2205
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D. Dolbeer		1123	1	2206
Housing Allocation Rhoose	G. Morganbreg		1124	1	2207
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M. Robins		1125	1	2208
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Sandra Cooper		1126	1	2209
Housing Allocation Rhoose	G. V. Briggs		1127	1	2210
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr. Philip Woods		1128	1	2211

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D. R. Wade		1129	1	2212
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Alex Leonard		1130	1	2213
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Sally Kay		1131	1	2214
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Helen McCan		1132	1	2215
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S. Robertson		1133	1	2216
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J. B. Guildford		1134	1	2217
Housing Allocation Rhoose	A. Garrison		1135	1	2219
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs W. Newton		1136	1	2220
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M. R. Guildford		1137	1	2221
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Christopher Hewitt		1138	1	2222
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs Lyden		1139	1	2223
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Pearl Hopkins		1140	1	2224
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs J. Price		1141	1	2225
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs Haynes		1142	1	2226
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs J. Adams		1143	1	2227
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Glenys Hadley		1144	1	2228
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs G. Davies		1145	1	2229
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Thomas Branston		1146	1	2230
Housing Allocation Rhoose	N. James		1147	1	2231
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Angela Oaten		1148	1	2232
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Robert Langford		1149	1	2233
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/Mrs Barnes		1150	1	2234
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Kathleen Greaves		1151	1	2235
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs B. Brooks		1152	1	2236
Housing Allocation Rhoose	B. Mapstone		1153	1	2237
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Cheryl Irene Shropshire		1154	1	2238
Housing Allocation Rhoose	I. C. Sylvester		1155	1	2239
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs M. Woodfin		1156	1	2240
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M. Butchar		1157	1	2241
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr A David		1158	1	2242
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs M Buller		1159	1	2243
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr P Gardner		1160	1	2244

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Nicola Bawden		1161	1	2245
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Wayne Martin		1162	1	2246
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs G Burrige		1163	1	2247
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Sarah Hughes		1164	1	2248
Housing Allocation Rhoose	B Morgan		1165	1	2249
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Hilary Martin		1166	1	2250
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr & Mrs Bobbett		1167	1	2251
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Angela Gibbs		1168	1	2252
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Jennifer Harper		1169	1	2253
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Lorraine Field		1170	1	2254
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr B.L Michael		1171	1	2255
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Helen Williams		1172	1	2256
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Pat Huckson		1173	1	2257
Housing Allocation Rhoose	B Jenkins		1174	1	2258
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Kenneth Harper		1175	1	2259
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C Collins		1176	1	2260
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Wilson		1177	1	2261
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Richard Baker		1178	1	2262
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S Jones		1179	1	2263
Housing Allocation Rhoose	H.M James		1180	1	2264
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr A Hill		1181	1	2265
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Paul Martin		1182	1	2265
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr M.C Hulin		1183	1	2266
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J Taylor		1184	1	2267
Housing Allocation Rhoose	F.J Vizard		1185	1	2268
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Dave Walter		1186	1	2269
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr D Taylor		1187	1	2270
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Miss Gail Adams		1188	1	2271
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Geoffrey Field		1189	1	2272
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Julie Wilkes		1190	1	2273
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr M Freshwater		1191	1	2274
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr E Dorkings		1192	1	2275

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Robert Cameron		1193	1	2276
Housing Allocation Rhoose	T.G and G.M Evans		1194	1	2277
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S.A Wedlake		1195	1	2278
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Ian Field		1196	1	2279
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M Bartlett		1197	1	2280
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Barbara Parsons		1198	1	2281
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S Barker		1199	1	2282
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr J Wood		1200	1	2283
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Sian Phillips		1201	1	2284
Housing Allocation Rhoose	E.J Wedlake		1202	1	2285
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs D Wood		1203	1	2286
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Fred Phillips		1204	1	2287
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Jonathan Ward		1205	1	2288
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Jackie Ward		1206	1	2289
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Stone		1207	1	2290
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J O'Callaghan		1208	1	2291
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Marion Williamson		1209	1	2292
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Nick Grandfield		1210	1	2293
Housing Allocation Rhoose	K Edmunds-Jones		1211	1	2294
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Rev Malcolm Davies		1212	1	2295
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Jean Davies		1213	1	2296
Housing Allocation Rhoose	E Pike		1214	1	2297
Housing Allocation Rhoose	R.J Griffiths		1215	1	2298
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M Dimond		1216	1	2299
Housing Allocation Rhoose	N Moon		1217	1	2300
Housing Allocation Rhoose	T Oram		1218	1	2301
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Shirley Oram		1219	1	2302
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Julian De Laney		1220	1	2303
Housing Allocation Rhoose	T Thomas		1221	1	2304
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr H Thomas		1222	1	2305
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr R.J Williams		1223	1	2306
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr and Mrs Glen		1224	1	2307

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	E.A Higson		1225	1	2308
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ivy Dwyer		1226	1	2309
Housing Allocation Rhoose	B James		1227	1	2310
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Neil Rees		1228	1	2311
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Joanne Hill		1229	1	2312
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms J Morgan		1230	1	2313
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Betty Franklin		1231	1	2314
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr A.J Grindlay		1232	1	2315
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs J.Y Grindlay		1233	1	2316
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C Powell		1234	1	2317
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Paul Huckfield		1235	1	2318
Housing Allocation Rhoose	P.S Gill		1236	1	2319
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Patricia Lewis		1237	1	2320
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Carole Bradshaw		1238	1	2321
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Luke Bradshaw		1239	1	2322
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J Daley		1240	1	2323
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Cheryl Rees		1241	1	2324
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs J Broughton		1243	1	2326
Housing Allocation Rhoose	P Lewis		1244	1	2327
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D.M King		1245	1	2328
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Andrew McNaughton		1246	1	2329
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Robert Ismail		1247	1	2330
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M Ismail		1248	1	2331
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr A.L Gravett		1249	1	2332
Housing Allocation Rhoose	E Howells		1250	1	2333
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Jane Hooper		1251	1	2334
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Tracey Holland		1252	1	2335
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Steven D Barns		1253	1	2336
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Carolyn Barns		1254	1	2337
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Jason Ockwell		1255	1	2338
Housing Allocation Rhoose	G Stevenson		1256	1	2339
Housing Allocation Rhoose	W.J Green		1257	1	2340

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	L Phillips		1258	1	2341
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C.H Williams		1259	1	2342
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Deanne Baxter		1260	1	2343
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Jason Bishop		1261	1	2344
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Franco Attanasio		1262	1	2345
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Mark Alford		1263	1	2346
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Karen Vincent		1264	1	2347
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr/s Craig		1265	1	2348
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Ian Liddiatt		1266	1	2349
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Angela Harper		1267	1	2350
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs V Daly		1268	1	2351
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr R Hilson		1269	1	2353
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Miss J Lloyd		1270	1	2354
Housing Allocation Rhoose	P Jupp		1271	1	2355
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr R Tregear		1272	1	2356
Housing Allocation Rhoose	A Tregear		1273	1	2357
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Miriam Braddon		1274	1	2358
Housing Allocation Rhoose	R.B Morgan		1275	1	2359
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J.A Morgan		1276	1	2360
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Margaret Leyshon		1277	1	2361
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C.A Griffiths		1278	1	2362
Housing Allocation Rhoose	A Griffiths		1279	1	2363
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs E King		1280	1	2364
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D MacPherson		1281	1	2365
Housing Allocation Rhoose	E Foxhall		1282	1	2366
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Anna Stradling		1283	1	2367
Housing Allocation Rhoose	E.M Ginnifer		1284	1	2368
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Barbara Hazeldine		1285	1	2369
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Phillip Hazeldine		1286	1	2370
Housing Allocation Rhoose	P Thomas		1287	1	2371
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Margaret Thomas		1288	1	2372
Housing Allocation Rhoose	F.C Driscoll		1289	1	2373

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	B Goodway		1290	1	2374
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Harding		1291	1	2375
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs S Williams		1292	1	2376
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Harris		1293	1	2377
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Clair Bilcliff		1294	1	2378
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Glenys Edwards		1295	1	2379
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Judith Bryan		1296	1	2380
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Annette O'Toole		1297	1	2381
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S Smart		1298	1	2382
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J Depeiza		1299	1	2383
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Pamela Thomas		1300	1	2384
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Simpson		1301	1	2385
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C Hoare		1302	1	2386
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D.C Anderson		1303	1	2387
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C Browne		1304	1	2388
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C.C Browne		1305	1	2389
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Sheila Hunt		1306	1	2390
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Strike		1307	1	2391
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs M Morris		1308	1	2392
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr & Mrs R Howe		1309	1	2393
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Shier		1310	1	2394
Housing Allocation Rhoose	G.D Shier		1311	1	2395
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs M.T Baker		1312	1	2396
Housing Allocation Rhoose	A.A Baker		1313	1	2397
Housing Allocation Rhoose	A McKee		1314	1	2398
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr David Purnell		1315	1	2399
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Myra Brewer		1316	1	2400
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Betty Slatter		1317	1	2401
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Rosemarie Clark		1318	1	2402
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Jan Cawley		1319	1	2403
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Pat Fletcher		1320	1	2404
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Joyce Thomson		1321	1	2405

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Catherine Morgan		1322	1	2406
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Eira Rowley		1323	1	2407
Housing Allocation Rhoose	T.A Bevan		1324	1	2408
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Frieda Davies		1325	1	2409
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs L.E. Taylor		1326	1	2411
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs J. O'Leary		1327	1	2412
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr T.R. Marshall		1328	1	2413
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Paul Symonds		1329	1	2414
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr K. Clarke		1330	1	2415
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr S. Harris		1331	1	2416
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs T. Harris		1332	1	2417
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs E. Sparrow		1333	1	2418
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M. Radcliffe		1334	1	2419
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs H. Richardson		1335	1	2420
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Derek Richardson		1336	1	2421
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Sarah Moulder-Hurdsfield		1337	1	2422
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr S.L. Moulder Hurdsfield		1338	1	2423
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Linda Thomas		1339	1	2424
Housing Allocation Rhoose	A.C. Tayler		1340	1	2425
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Nick Rudd		1341	1	2426
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Linda M Smith		1342	1	2427
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Pel Eddy		1343	1	2428
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Matthew Eddy		1344	1	2429
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Brian Elliott		1345	1	2430
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J Barlow		1346	1	2432
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Rob Ashman		1347	1	2433
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs K Wright		1348	1	2434
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs A. M. Cosgrove		1349	1	2435
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Miss N. Jones		1350	1	2436
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Evans		1351	1	2437
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Derek Parsons		1352	1	2438
Housing Allocation Rhoose	K Wedlake		1353	1	2439

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Linda Rees		1354	1	2440
Housing Allocation Rhoose	H Bartlett		1355	1	2441
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S King		1356	1	2442
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Lynda Bowen		1357	1	2443
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Jane Hayward		1358	1	2444
Housing Allocation Rhoose	P. Wright		1359	1	2445
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Bolter		1360	1	2446
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Graham Naylor		1361	1	2447
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Ian Michael		1362	1	2448
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Helen Hodgson		1363	1	2449
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs L. Huditch		1364	1	2450
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr & Mrs Evans		1365	1	2451
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Self		1366	1	2452
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Self		1367	1	2453
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Stephen Martin		1368	1	2454
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr David Jones		1369	1	2455
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Catherine Naylor		1370	1	2456
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mandy Kelland		1371	1	2457
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Thomas Donovan		1372	1	2458
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S. Shires		1373	1	2459
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Young		1374	1	2460
Housing Allocation Rhoose	G.R. Niblett		1375	1	2461
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Miss & Mr K.A. & J.G. Haynes & Evans		1376	1	2462
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mary Bryan		1377	1	2463
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mary Whistance		1378	1	2464
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Julie Tucker		1379	1	2465
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Richard Tucker		1380	1	2466
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Nadia Barnsley		1381	1	2467
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D. Pateman		1382	1	2468
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr & Mrs K. & S. Combes		1383	1	2469
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Y.D. Morgan		1384	1	2469
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr A. Owen		1385	1	2471

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr & Mrs Noel		1386	1	2472
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mrs Glynis Neighbour		1387	1	2473
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr Keith William Neighbour		1388	1	2474
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr Charles Sawyer		1389	1	2475
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr K. Harris		1390	1	2476
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mrs Shirley A. Rodd		1391	1	2477
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr Williams G. Rodd		1392	1	2478
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr Tim Martin		1393	1	2479
Housing Allocation Rhooose	R. Ames		1394	1	2480
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mrs Linda Galiford		1395	1	2481
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr Simon Graves		1396	1	2482
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr & Mrs M. & D. Pritchard		1397	1	2483
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mrs P.M. Davis		1398	1	2484
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr John Ball		1399	1	2485
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr J. Rose		1400	1	2486
Housing Allocation Rhooose	N.M. Briggs		1401	1	3105
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Dr D.L. Jones		1402	1	2487
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr & Mrs J.R. Dennett		1403	1	2488
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr J. Davies		1404	1	2489
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr L.E. Alldred		1405	1	2490
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Megan Brown		1406	1	2491
Housing Allocation Rhooose	R.B. Phillips		1407	1	2492
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr George McInnes		1408	1	2493
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr B. Dredge		1409	1	2494
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mr Morris		1410	1	2495
Housing Allocation Rhooose	D. Rowland		1411	1	2496
Housing Allocation Rhooose	A.R. Crockett		1412	1	2497
Housing Allocation Rhooose	G Parry		1413	1	2498
Housing Allocation Rhooose	M.C. Thomas		1414	1	2499
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mrs F. Thomas		1415	1	2500
Housing Allocation Rhooose	P. Cane		1416	1	2501
Housing Allocation Rhooose	Mrs Gwendoline Harris		1417	1	2502

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr F.B. Wilkinson		1418	1	2503
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Valerie Pritchard		1419	1	2504
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr David Pritchard		1420	1	2505
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr & Mrs A.S. Batty		1421	1	2506
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Shirley Payne		1422	1	2507
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Barri Payne		1423	1	2508
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Charles Trenchard		1424	1	2509
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs S. Granett		1425	1	2510
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Beverly Bennett		1426	1	2511
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Tom Bennett		1427	1	2512
Housing Allocation Rhoose	G. Dixon		1428	1	2513
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C. Alexander		1429	1	2514
Housing Allocation Rhoose	E. Welsh		1430	1	2515
Housing Allocation Rhoose	E.W. Butcher		1431	1	2516
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Colin Turner		1432	1	2517
Housing Allocation Rhoose	R. Caldwell		1433	1	2518
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S. Purnell		1434	1	2519
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C.G. Godfrey		1435	1	2520
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Sandra Porter		1436	1	2521
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Yvonne Barton		1437	1	2522
Housing Allocation Rhoose	P. Everleigh		1438	1	2523
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Abhiser Satnaliwala		1439	1	2524
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr & Mrs Ingram		1440	1	2525
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C.R. Regan		1441	1	2526
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Regan		1442	1	2527
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Kirsty Evans		1443	1	2528
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Mark Richards		1444	1	2529
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Gordon.C. Roscow		1445	1	2530
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr C Meadon		1446	1	2531
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs M.R. Meadon		1447	1	2532
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Wendy Hopkins		1448	1	2533
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr A. Hopkins		1449	1	2534

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr James Hopkins		1450	1	2535
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S.K. Ball		1451	1	2536
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Heveron		1452	1	2537
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J. McCarthy		1453	1	2538
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Paul Kavanagh		1454	1	2539
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr David Hallott		1455	1	2540
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Michael Jon Melsom		1456	1	2541
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms Denise Davies		1457	1	2542
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Lindsay Jenkins		1458	1	2543
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Susan Jenkins		1459	1	2544
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Julie Prince		1460	1	2545
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S. Maidment		1461	1	2546
Housing Allocation Rhoose	A.B. Barrell		1462	1	2547
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Carol Lewis		1463	1	2548
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Myra Byron		1464	1	2549
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Jason Lloyd		1465	1	2550
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Graham Cartwright		1466	1	2551
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Alison Cartwright		1467	1	2552
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Alan Baldwin		1468	1	2553
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs S.C. Baldwin		1469	1	2554
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Angela Lawrence		1470	1	2555
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Howard Keith Dodd		1471	1	2556
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr R. Creegan		1472	1	2557
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs C. Creegan		1473	1	2558
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Donna Ashworth		1474	1	2559
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Patricia Rawlings		1475	1	2560
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Amanda Dell		1476	1	2561
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C Anderson		1477	1	2562
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Dawn Tague		1478	1	2563
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Martin Webster		1479	1	2564
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Jonathan Davies		1480	1	2565
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Merrill Hughes		1481	1	2566

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Alan and Susan Brooks		1482	1	2567
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr R.F Evans		1483	1	2568
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr M Parker		1484	1	2569
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Parker		1485	1	2570
Housing Allocation Rhoose	O.H Simmonds		1486	1	2571
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs H.J Coles		1487	1	2572
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs H.J Coles		1487	2	2573
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs H.J Coles		1487	3	2574
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Andrew Coles		1488	1	2575
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Andrew Coles		1488	2	2576
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Andrew Coles		1488	3	2577
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Robert Keen		1489	1	2578
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Robert Keen		1489	2	2579
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Robert Keen		1489	3	2580
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Elizabeth Keen		1490	1	2581
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Elizabeth Keen		1490	2	2582
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Elizabeth Keen		1490	3	2583
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Andrew Davies		1491	1	2584
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Andrew Davies		1491	2	2585
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Andrew Davies		1491	3	2586
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Plumb		1492	1	2587
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Plumb		1492	2	2588
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Plumb		1492	3	2589
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Mark Royle		1493	1	2590
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Rachel Royle		1494	1	2591
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr J.S Dutton		1495	1	2592
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Eccles		1496	1	2593
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J.H and P.J Jupp		1497	1	2594
Housing Allocation Rhoose	G Worrall		1498	1	2595
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr and Mrs C.R Jones		1499	1	2596
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Cantrell		1500	1	2597
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J Haliburton		1501	1	2598

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr J Stock		1502	1	2599
Housing Allocation Rhoose	R Clements		1503	1	2600
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Maureen Smith		1504	1	2601
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr and Mrs Braggins		1505	1	2602
Housing Allocation Rhoose	I Sinclair		1506	1	2603
Housing Allocation Rhoose	H.J Sinclair		1507	1	2604
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr R.D Day		1508	1	2605
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Richard Lewis		1509	1	2606
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Jason Light		1510	1	2607
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D.A O'Rourke		1511	1	2608
Housing Allocation Rhoose	I Workman		1512	1	2609
Housing Allocation Rhoose	B.J O'Dare		1513	1	2610
Housing Allocation Rhoose	V.J Elsey		1514	1	2611
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Rees Stephen		1515	1	2612
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D Rowlands		1516	1	2613
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr E.J Jones		1517	1	2614
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M.T Plant	Rhoose Action	1518	1	2615
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr G.E Gates		1519	1	2616
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Lisa Hooper		1520	1	2617
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Sabry		1521	1	2618
Housing Allocation Rhoose	F.M McCarthy		1522	1	2619
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs L Davenport		1523	1	2620
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Barbara Leach		1524	1	2621
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D and F Hancock		1525	1	2622
Housing Allocation Rhoose	K.I Dally		1526	1	2623
Housing Allocation Rhoose	H Boulton		1527	1	2624
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr P.A Mahon		1528	1	2625
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Edward Blackwell		1529	1	2626
Housing Allocation Rhoose	T Sleightholm		1530	1	2627
Housing Allocation Rhoose	P Gardner		1531	1	2627
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Gerald Cooper		1532	1	2628
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D Cooper		1533	1	2629

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	C.J Mottram		1534	1	2630
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr G.F Layton		1535	1	2631
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Sheilah Davies		1536	1	2632
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D.H Davies		1537	1	2633
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Peter Holly		1538	1	2634
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Alan Robinson		1539	1	2635
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Sqn. Ldr. Francis Harris		1541	1	2636
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr M.C Edmunds-Jones		1542	1	2637
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr David Graeme Morphet		1543	1	2638
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr and Mrs Noel		1544	1	2639
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Julie Morphet		1545	1	2640
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Steven Williams		1546	1	2641
Housing Allocation Rhoose	T Bell		1547	1	2642
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Grace.M. Watkins		1548	1	2643
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Grace.M. Watkins		1548	2	2644
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Grace.M. Watkins		1548	3	2645
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Grace.M. Watkins		1548	4	2646
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Catherine Bailey		1549	1	2647
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Catherine Bailey		1549	2	2648
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Andrew Bailey		1550	1	2649
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Andrew Bailey		1550	2	2650
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Andrew Bailey		1550	3	2651
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Andrew Bailey		1550	4	2652
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Andrew Bailey		1550	5	2653
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Susan Adams		1551	1	2655
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Jenny Hayford		1552	1	2656
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs C Parsons		1553	1	2657
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Leslie.J Parsons		1554	1	2658
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Edwin.R. Morris		1555	1	2659
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr A.R.W Harding		1556	1	2660
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs A Harding		1557	1	2661
Housing Allocation Rhoose	V.J Hopkins		1560	1	2664

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D Morgan		1561	1	2665
Housing Allocation Rhoose	A Eners		1562	1	2666
Housing Allocation Rhoose	D Goodman		1563	1	2667
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Ivy Davies		1564	1	2668
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs L Daly		1565	1	2669
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Peter.J. Anthony		1566	1	2670
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Fred Baker		1567	1	2671
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr and Mrs L Pritchard		1568	1	2672
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Helen Gardner		1570	1	2674
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Julia Gilliatt		1572	1	2676
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Wendy Purbrick		1573	1	2677
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Carol Bates		1574	1	2678
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Don Bates		1575	1	2679
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Dewi Williams		1576	1	2680
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Gemma Davies		1577	1	2681
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr John Davies		1578	1	2682
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Susan Davies		1579	1	2683
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Jane Meadon		1580	1	2684
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Paul Davenport	Rhoose Action	1581	1	2685
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Paul Davenport	Rhoose Action	1581	2	2686
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S Jones		1582	1	2687
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Ben Meadon		1583	1	2688
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Martin Atkinson		1584	1	2689
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Alyson Atkinson		1585	1	2690
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Miss E Turner		1586	1	2691
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr John Owen		1587	1	2692
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Susan and Nicholas Williams		1588	1	2693
Housing Allocation Rhoose	F.E Turner		1589	1	2694
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Kathryn Worsley		1590	1	2695
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J.F Pickering		1591	1	2696
Housing Allocation Rhoose	P.M Pickering		1592	1	2697
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs D.I Owen		1593	1	2698

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Emma Dodwell		1594	1	2699
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Stuart Dodwell		1595	1	2700
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Julia Dodwell		1596	1	2701
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Carol Clements		1597	1	2702
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Keith Clements		1598	1	2703
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr J.E McGowan		1599	1	2704
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs A.J McGowan		1600	1	2705
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Eileen Simmonds		1601	1	2706
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Jenny Hayford		1602	1	2707
Housing Allocation Rhoose	M Caldwell		1603	1	2708
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr and Mrs Tanti		1604	1	2709
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Mark Tythicott		1605	1	2710
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Trudi Owens		1606	1	2711
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr and Mrs M White		1607	1	2712
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr J.T Dixon		1608	1	2713
Housing Allocation Rhoose	P.J Brewer		1609	1	2714
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr and Mrs L Butcher		1610	1	2715
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Ms Olivia M. McAuliffe		1611	1	3108
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr H Pike		1612	1	2717
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Lynette Atwell		1613	1	2718
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr M.A Griffin		1614	1	2719
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs D.D Griffin		1615	1	2720
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Joan Wilson		1616	1	2721
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr C.J. Colligan		1617	1	2722
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Colligan		1618	1	2723
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Cecil Hartland		1619	1	2724
Housing Allocation Rhoose	S Connelly		1620	1	2725
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J Connelly		1621	1	2726
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J Connelly		1621	3	2728
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J Connelly		1621	4	2729
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J Connelly		1621	5	2730
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J Connelly		1621	6	2731

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhoose	J Connelly		1621	7	2732
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Paul Ursell		1622	1	2733
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Paul Ursell		1622	2	2734
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Paul Ursell		1622	3	2735
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Lucy Helen Ursell		1623	1	2736
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Lucy Helen Ursell		1623	2	2737
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Lucy Helen Ursell		1623	3	2738
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Alison Hicks		1624	1	2739
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Steve Hicks		1625	1	2740
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Nathan Sallimore		1626	1	2741
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Nathan Sallimore		1626	2	2742
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Nathan Sallimore		1626	3	2743
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Leanne Meadhurst		1627	1	2744
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Leanne Meadhurst		1627	2	2745
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mrs Leanne Meadhurst		1627	3	2746
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Karen Gallimore		1628	1	2747
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Karen Gallimore		1628	2	2748
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Karen Gallimore		1628	3	2749
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Paul Gallimore		1629	1	2750
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Paul Gallimore		1629	2	2751
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Paul Gallimore		1629	3	2752
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Harry Medhurst		1630	1	2753
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Harry Medhurst		1630	2	2754
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Harry Medhurst		1630	3	3106
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Sarah Dean		1631	1	2755
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr David Dean		1632	1	2756
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Darren Worwood		1633	1	2757
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Darren Worwood		1633	2	2758
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Darren Worwood		1633	3	2759
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Michael Bolwell		1634	1	2760
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Michael Bolwell		1634	2	2761
Housing Allocation Rhoose	Mr Michael Bolwell		1634	3	2762

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing Allocation Rhose	Mr A.G. Edwards		1635	1	2763
Housing Allocation Rhose	Mr A.G. Edwards		1635	2	2764
Housing Allocation Rhose	Mr A.G. Edwards		1635	3	2765
Housing Allocation Rhose	Mrs E. Edwards		1636	1	2766
Housing Allocation Rhose	Mrs E. Edwards		1636	2	2767
Housing Allocation Rhose	Mrs E. Edwards		1636	3	2768
Housing Allocation Rhose	Miss S. Edwards		1637	1	2769
Housing Allocation Rhose	Miss S. Edwards		1637	2	2770
Housing Allocation Rhose	Miss S. Edwards		1637	3	2771
Housing Allocation Rhose	AM Jane Hutt		1638	1	2772
Housing Allocation Rhose	Mrs V.E. Mills		1639	1	2773
Housing Allocation Rhose	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	22	3011
Housing Allocation Rhose	Cofton Limited		1668	8	3087
Housing Allocation Rhose	Cofton Limited		1668	9	3088
Housing Allocation Rhose	Cofton Limited		1668	10	3089
Housing Allocation Rhose	Cofton Limited		1668	24	3013
Housing Allocation Rhose	Cofton Limited		1668	25	3104
Housing Allocation Rhose	E Thomas		1673	1	2352
Housing Allocation Rhose	Mrs Hartery		1674	1	2218
Housing Allocation Rhose	B.K. and N. Wileman-John		1675	1	3110
Housing Allocation Rhose	M. E. Mortimer		1676	1	3111
Housing Allocation Rhose	J. P. Mortimer		1677	1	3112
Housing Allocation Rhose	Mrs M. P. Rimell		1678	1	3113
Housing Allocation Rhose	Robert/Samantha Waugh/Mathers		1679	1	3114
Housing Allocation Rhose	Mrs N. Morgan		1680	1	1680
Housing Allocation Rhose	Paul Morgan		1681	1	3116
Housing Allocation Rhose	Sheila O'Connell		1682	1	3117
Housing Allocation Rhose	Sian Payne		1684	1	3118
Housing Allocation Rhose	I. C. Sylvester		2239	1	2239
Housing allocation The Waterfront Barry	Barry Joint Initiative		1667	2832	1
Housing allocation The Waterfront Barry	Barry Joint Initiative		1667	2833	2
Housing allocation The Waterfront Barry	Barry Joint Initiative		1667	2834	3

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Housing allocation The Waterfront Barry	Barry Joint Initiative		1667	2835	4
Housing allocation The Waterfront Barry	Barry Joint Initiative		1667	2836	5
Housing allocation The Waterfront Barry	Janie Jones	Plaid Cymru	270	3028	45
Housing allocation The Waterfront Barry	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	2864	97
Housing allocation The Waterfront Barry	Mr Ian Harris	Barry Town Council	33	1751	15
Housing allocation White Farm	Mr Ian Harris	Barry Town Council	33	20	1756
Housing allocation White Farm	Mr & Mrs Steven & Helen Walker	White Farm Anti-Development Campaign	147	2	1895
Housing allocation White Farm	Mrs M.E. Twigg		202	3	2825
Housing allocation White Farm	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	82	2849
Housing allocation White Farm	Ryan Bowen	Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru	293	20	2776
Housing allocation White Farm	Mr Keith Lewis		297	3	3073
Housing allocation White Farm	Mrs Wendy Jones	White Farm Anti Development	298	3	3072
Housing allocation White Farm	Mrs M O'Grady		306	3	2802
Housing allocation White Farm	Mr & Mrs Ceri & Angela Price	Pastures Residents Association	330	2	2805
Housing allocation White Farm	Mrs Bramble Coppins		561	1	1812
Housing allocation White Farm	Mr and Mrs E.W Frost		657	1	1938
Introduction	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	19	2942
Introduction	Cofton Limited		1668	1	3080
Minerals	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	47	2970
Minerals	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	48	2971
Minerals	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	83	2850
Minerals	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	106	2873
Minerals	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	107	2874
Minerals	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	108	2875
Minerals	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	126	2893
Minerals	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	127	2894
Minerals	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	128	2895
Minerals	Mrs Elaine Ancrum	Welsh Assembly Government	244	41	2839
Minerals	Mrs Elaine Ancrum	Welsh Assembly Government	244	42	2840
Minerals	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	107	3136
Minerals	Ryan Bowen	Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru	293	29	2785
Minerals	Ryan Bowen	Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru	293	30	2786

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Minerals	Ryan Bowen	Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru	293	31	2787
Minerals	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	28	3042
Minerals	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	29	3043
Minerals	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	30	3044
Minerals	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	31	3045
Minerals	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	32	3046
Minerals	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	33	3047
Minerals	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	29	3018
Minerals	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	30	3019
Minerals	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	31	3020
Minerals	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	32	3021
Minerals	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	33	3022
Nature Conservation	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	34	2957
Nature Conservation	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	78	2845
Nature Conservation	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	79	2846
Nature Conservation	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	84	2851
Nature Conservation	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	92	2859
Nature Conservation	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	111	2878
Nature Conservation	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	112	2879
Nature Conservation	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	113	2880
Nature Conservation	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	114	2881
Nature Conservation	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	115	2882
Nature Conservation	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	91	3120
Nature Conservation	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	104	3133
Nature Conservation	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	38	3052
Nature Conservation	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	39	3053
Nature Conservation	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	40	3054
Nature Conservation	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	41	3055
Nature Conservation	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	43	3057
Nature Conservation	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	45	3059
Nature Conservation	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	46	3060
Nature Conservation	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	6	2995

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Nature Conservation	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	7	2996
Nature Conservation	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	8	2997
Nature Conservation	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	9	2998
Nature Conservation	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	10	2999
Nature Conservation	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	11	3000
Nature Conservation	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	12	3001
Nature Conservation	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	37	3026
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr Ivey Darren	Sports Council for Wales	18	4	1738
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr Ivey Darren	Sports Council for Wales	18	5	1739
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr Ivey Darren	Sports Council for Wales	18	6	1740
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr Ivey Darren	Sports Council for Wales	18	7	1741
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr Ivey Darren	Sports Council for Wales	18	8	1742
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr Ivey Darren	Sports Council for Wales	18	9	1743
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr Ivey Darren	Sports Council for Wales	18	10	1744
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr Ivey Darren	Sports Council for Wales	18	11	1745
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr Ivey Darren	Sports Council for Wales	18	12	1746
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	42	2965
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	43	2966
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	44	2967
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	45	2968
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	46	2969
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	129	2896
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	130	2897
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	131	2898

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	132	2899
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	134	2901
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	35	3049
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	36	3050
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	37	3051
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	27	3016
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Cofton Limited		1668	3	3082
Playing Field/Recreational Provision	Cofton Limited		1668	16	3095
Retailing	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	135	2902
Retailing	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	54	3068
Retailing	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	55	3069
Retailing	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	25	3014
Retailing	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	26	3015
Rural Buildings	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	117	2884
Rural Buildings	Mr Laurence Forse	Harmer Partnership	356	34	2914
Rural Buildings	WTGL Limited		1666	1	2826
Settlement Boundaries	Mr A.J.L Alden	Cowbridge Local History Society	13	9	3029
Settlement Boundaries	Mr A.J.L Alden	Cowbridge Local History Society	13	10	3030
Settlement Boundaries	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	20	2987
Settlement Boundaries	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	54	2978
Settlement Boundaries	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	55	2977
Settlement Boundaries	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	56	2979
Settlement Boundaries	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	57	2980
Settlement Boundaries	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	58	2981
Settlement Boundaries	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	59	2982
Settlement Boundaries	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	60	2983
Settlement Boundaries	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	61	2984
Settlement Boundaries	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	62	2985
Settlement Boundaries	Joy Kipling		59	2	1941

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Settlement Boundaries	Mr C.W. Kipling		60	4	2794
Settlement Boundaries	R H Rees Esq.		128	3	2798
Settlement Boundaries	Mrs J. A. Perkins		216	2	1937
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	81	2848
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	88	2855
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	89	2856
Settlement Boundaries	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	101	3130
Settlement Boundaries	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	102	3131
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Gareth Williams	House Builders Federation	249	23	3031
Settlement Boundaries		Dinas Powys Community Council	262	10	2815
Settlement Boundaries		Dinas Powys Community Council	262	11	2816
Settlement Boundaries	Mrs J.K. Williams		307	3	3107
Settlement Boundaries	Mr T Bowles		332	2	2916
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Laurence Forse	Harmer Partnership	356	35	2931
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Laurence Forse	Harmer Partnership	356	36	2932
Settlement Boundaries	Mr S. Whitehead		462	1	1691
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Neil.T Moaksom		517	1	1765
Settlement Boundaries	Mr & Mrs John & Bridget Otto-Jones		518	1	1766
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Nicholas Hourmont		571	1	2941
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Neil McLean		591	2	2717
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Russell Evans		617	2	2791
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Russell Evans		617	3	2792
Settlement Boundaries	MR & MRS K.W & J Ward		620	1	1898
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Stephen C Powell		655	1	1942
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Andrew Jenkins		656	1	1936
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	23	3012
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	24	3013
Settlement Boundaries	L Pudge		1653	1	2818
Settlement Boundaries	Mr and Mrs P.B Pudge		1654	1	2819
Settlement Boundaries	Mr and Mrs P.B Pudge		1654	2	2820
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Peter Davies		1655	1	2823
Settlement Boundaries	Mr Peter Davies		1655	2	2824

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Settlement Boundaries	Cofton Limited		1668	11	3090
Settlement Boundaries	Cofton Limited		1668	12	3091
Settlement Boundaries	Mr T. Davies		1671	1	2934
Settlement Boundaries	Mr & Mrs A. Wright	C/o Agent	1683	1	2920
Special Landscape Areas	Mr A.J.L Alden	Cowbridge Local History Society	13	7	1854
Special Landscape Areas	Mr&Mrs D Randolph		19	9	2935
Special Landscape Areas	Mr Ian Harris	Barry Town Council	33	19	1755
Special Landscape Areas	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	25	2948
Special Landscape Areas	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	63	2986
Special Landscape Areas	Sue Bridge	Bellway Estates	126	16	1845
Special Landscape Areas	Sue Bridge	Bellway Estates	126	17	1846
Special Landscape Areas	Mr A L J Raum	Campaign for Protection of Rural Wales	173	34	1840
Special Landscape Areas	Mr A L J Raum	Campaign for Protection of Rural Wales	173	35	1841
Special Landscape Areas		Persimmon Homes (Wales) Ltd.	192	14	2821
Special Landscape Areas		Persimmon Homes (Wales) Ltd.	192	15	2822
Special Landscape Areas	Lt.Col. R L Traherne		210	12	2827
Special Landscape Areas	Mike Cuddy	Land Division, Welsh Development Agency	232	21	2831
Special Landscape Areas	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	91	2858
Special Landscape Areas	Mrs. Jean Fairclough	Llandow Community Council	246	21	1888
Special Landscape Areas	Mr C Lakin		284	3	2921
Special Landscape Areas	Mr C Lakin		284	4	2922
Special Landscape Areas		Minimix Ltd	333	3	2923
Special Landscape Areas		Minimix Ltd	333	4	2924
Special Landscape Areas		Minimix Ltd	333	5	2939
Special Landscape Areas		Anstee Trustees	342	4	2937
Special Landscape Areas		Barry College	350	5	2933
Special Landscape Areas	Dr. C.A. Pearce	Cowbridge and Llanblethian Residents Group	378	4	1642
Special Landscape Areas	Mr & Mrs Ann & John Cann		570	1	1821
Special Landscape Areas	Non Watkin Evans		595	1	1859
Special Landscape Areas	L McDonald		1642	2	2989
Special Landscape Areas	Mr Roy Alison	c/o Agent	1669	2	2936
Special Landscape Areas	Mr L McDonald		1670	1	2938

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
St Athan non allocation for housing site	Mr John James		268	2	1777
St Athan non allocation for housing site	Mr G Thomas		353	3	2917
St Athan non allocation for housing site	MR GLYNN WATTS Jones	GLYN W JONES BUILDERS	621	1	1900
St Athan non allocation for housing site	MR GLYNN WATTS Jones	GLYN W JONES BUILDERS	621	2	1901
Strategic Environment	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	22	2945
Strategic Environment	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	95	2862
Strategic Environment	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	122	2889
Strategic Environment	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	125	2892
Strategic Environment	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	139	2906
Strategic Environment	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	140	2907
Strategic Environment	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	90	3119
Strategic Environment	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	95	3124
Strategic Environment	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	15	3004
Strategic Environment	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	16	3005
Strategic Transport & Transport Schemes	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	41	2964
Strategic Transport & Transport Schemes	Sue Bridge	Bellway Estates	126	18	1847
Strategic Transport & Transport Schemes	Janette Shaw	Llysworney Community Association	166	2	2431
Strategic Transport & Transport Schemes		Dinas Powys Community Council	262	7	2812
Strategic Transport & Transport Schemes		Dinas Powys Community Council	262	8	2813
Strategic Transport & Transport Schemes		Dinas Powys Community Council	262	9	2814
Strategic Transport & Transport Schemes	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	18	3032
Strategic Transport & Transport Schemes	Mr Tom Lamshead	Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd	1647	1	2789
Strategic Transport & Transport Schemes	Mr Tom Lamshead	Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd	1647	2	2790
Strategic Transport & Transport Schemes	Cofton Limited		1668	15	3094
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Andrew Davies	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	52	53	2976
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	93	2860
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	38	3027

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan 1998-2011
List of Representors by Issue

Issue	Name	Organisation	Representor No.	Representation No.	Accession No.
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Mr Richard Smith		1648	3	2801
Waste Management	Mr Andrew Peterken	Countryside Council for Wales	237	86	2853
Waste Management	Mrs Elaine Ancrum	Welsh Assembly Government	244	43	2841
Waste Management	Mrs Elaine Ancrum	Welsh Assembly Government	244	44	2842
Waste Management	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	108	3137
Waste Management	Anthony Wilkes	Environment Agency	247	109	3138
Waste Management	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	24	3038
Waste Management	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	25	3039
Waste Management	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	26	3040
Waste Management	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	27	3041
Waste Management	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	56	3070
Waste Management	Mr. Keith Stockdale	Friends of the Earth Barry	376	57	3071
Waste Management	Mr Derek Moore OBE	The Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales	1643	34	3023