

Peter Rowbottom
Group Manager, Development Plans Division
Room 208

16 March 2001

Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan

Please find enclosed one hard copy and a disk setting out my response to the clarification requested by the Vale of Glamorgan Council in the letter dated 5 February 2001.

My response is set out in two sections, the first dealing with all the comments and clarifications, and the second is set out in the form of an Addendum Report.

Please also find attached my T&S/Fees form for your certification.

Colin Cardinal

VALE OF GLAMORGAN UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN REPORT

CLARIFICATION REQUESTED BY THE COUNCIL

Much of the clarification requested by the council refers to the manner in which recommendations are made in respect of a number of the Proposed Changes [PC] and Further Proposed Changes [FPC].

The references made in Paragraph 3 of the Inspector's covering letter to [FPC] concern the need advertise such changes where they, and other changes submitted at the inquiry, had not been the subject of prior public consultation. This paragraph, therefore, only indicates that should any of these changes be pursued at the Modification Stage, whether subject to a recommendation or not within the Inspector's report, they will need to be the subject of formal public consultation at that stage.

Paragraph 4 of the Inspector's covering letter states the Inspector's intention to deal with some 202 Conditionally Withdrawn [CW] objections in the report. Recommendations with regard to these CW objections have to be made in that they are required to overcome any initial duly made objection that had not been Unconditionally Withdrawn in response to the PC or the FPC. Justification for the PC or FPC has therefore to be considered by the Inspector. Without such a recommendation neither the Council nor the objector would know whether or not the Inspector considered the PC or FPC adequate to deal with the original duly made objection.

Moreover, where a PC or FPC was used to rebut a maintained objection, and its content was accepted by the Inspector, this by necessity needed to be referred to in the Inspector's recommendation.

In the Inspector's consideration below of the Council's required clarifications the matters involving PC's and FPC's, i.e. required to deal with Conditionally Withdrawals or maintained objections, are identified as 'refers to CW'.

Chapter 2: Strategic Policies and Their Justification

REC.2.3	refers to CW
REC.2.4	refers to CW
REC.2.6	refers to CW
REC.2.9	Comment Agreed

Chapter 3: Environment

REC.3.1	refers to CW
REC.3.2	see comment related to REC.3.42
REC.3.3	delete references to PCD030 and PCD033 PCD031 and PCD032 refer to CW
ENV1, Development in the Countryside	Comments agreed
REC.3.6	refers to CW
REC.3.7	Comment agreed
REC.3.11	Recommendation should be amended to make clear that it is also amended by RECS 4.8 and 4.10
REC.3.13	delete reference to PCE035
REC.3.25	refers to CW
ENV6	Comment agreed. Add PCD013 to REC.3.25
ENV8	Comment Agreed
REC.3.42	replace references to 'translocation' by 'mitigation' in Section 3.13.4
REC.3.48	refers to CW
REC.3.50	replace references to criterion (iv) by (vi) in Section 3.20. PCD049 refers to CW

Chapter 4: Housing

REC.4.1	Agreed, but no need to change recommendation or report given objection referenced in Appendix to page 4.2 of report. PCE006 refers to CW
REC.4.2	refers to CW

REC.4.3	refers to CW
REC.4.4	Comment agreed
REC.4.5	refers to CW
REC.4.7	<p>References to PC's refer to CW</p> <p>For the sake of clarification a recommended revised Policy HOUS9 and explanatory text is set out which incorporates the amendments proposed in RECS.3.11, 4.7, 4.8, 4.10 and 4.25.</p> <p>“POLICY HOUS9 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA – POLICY HOUS2 SETTLEMENTS</p> <p>Subject to the provisions of Policy HOUS2 development will be permitted which is within or closely related to the defined settlement boundaries provided that it meets all the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the scale, form and character of the proposed development of the proposed development is sympathetic to the environs of the site; (ii) [no change] (iii) [no change] (iv) the provisions of Policy REC3 are met where appropriate and feasible; (v) [no change]” <p>Para.4.4.61 to be revised in accordance with PCE025 subject to the deletion of the words “within the residential settlement boundaries”.</p>
REC.4.13	refers to CW
REC.4.14	refers to CW
REC.4.16	<p>refers to CW</p> <p>PCE036 replaces criterion (vi) of Policy HOUS15</p>
REC.4.20	Comment agreed
REC.4.21	refers to CW
REC.4.22	refers to CW

HOUS1(12)	Comments agreed References to criterion (v) should read (iv) REC.4.25 is not at variance with REC.4.10 see REC.4.7 above
REC.4.26	refers to CW
REC.4.27	refers to CW
REC.4.48	explanatory text referred to in REC.4.48 should be identified as that associated with Policy HOUS1
REC.4.78	references in Section C.19.3 to PCN013 should be amended to PCN012. PCN012 refers to CW
REC.4.85	Representation 349.2 should be amended to 349.5. The vacant workshops identified in the objectors' Appendix 3 are referred to in the recommendation. No other buildings in the paddock area are referred to.

Chapter 5: Economic Development and Tourism

REC.5.2	FPC004 is not the subject of REC.5.2 All references to PC's refer to CW
REC.5.3	Comment agreed. Delete REC.5.1
EMP.1(Site 6)	Comment agreed. References in Section 5.3 to PCF019 should be changed to PCF005.
REC.5.4	refers to CW
REC.5.5	refers to CW
REC.5.8	refers to CW
REC.5.11	refers to CW
REC.5.12	refers to CW
REC.5.17	refers to CW
REC.5.18	refers to CW

REC.5.19	refers to CW
REC.5.20	refers to CW
REC.5.20(EMP10)	Comment agreed Amend REC.5.20 related to EMP10 to REC.5.20A PC refers to CW
REC.5.23	PCF034 subject of supporting representation only
REC.5.24	refers to CW

Chapter 6: Transportation

REC.6.1	References in Section 6.1 to FPCF002 should be amended to FPCG002 which refers to CW.
REC.6.6	refers to CW
REC.6.8	PCG003 should be included in recommendation. Other PC's refer to CW.
REC.6.9	refers to CW
REC.6.14	There are two PCM002 and no PCM003 in the Proposed Changes Document referring to Pages 181 and 196. Change 'PCM002' to 'PCM002 (page 196)'. PC refers to CW.

Chapter 7: Retailing

REC.7.2	see REC.7.6 below
REC.7.3	refers to CW
SHOP1	Comment on representation 274.6 is agreed. That leaves no outstanding objections to 7.2 Policy SHOP1 and the whole of that section should be deleted. The Explanatory Note, list of representations under Para.7.4.10 and REC.7.4 should be relocated to Section 7.3 The criterion requested in objection 40.8 on traffic generation is met by REC7.4 Amend REC7.4 to read 'the inclusion of PCH002 and FPCH002';

REC.7.5	refers to CW.
REC.7.6	REC.7.6 should be amended by adding: “subject to the amendments made by REC.7.2”.
REC.7.7	refers to CW.
REC.7.9	Comment agreed. Delete REC.7.9 and consideration of 356.27 and replace with Explanatory Note to indicate that the objection refers to the content of SPG which was not before the inquiry

Chapter 8: Sport and Recreation

REC.8.5	refers to CW
REC.8.6	refers to CW
REC.8.7	refers to CW
REC.8.8	refers to CW
REC.8.12	refers to CW
REC.8.14	refers to CW

Chapter 9: Minerals

REC.9.2	refers to CW
REC.9.3	Delete “after paragraph 9.4.10” and add “subject to the provisions of REC.9.13 and REC.9.16”.
REC.9.5	refers to CW
REC.9.6	refers to CW
REC.9.7	refers to CW
REC.9.8	refers to CW
REC 9.9	Delete paragraphs 9.7.4.and 9.7.5 and insert:

9.7.4 FPCJ003, deleting ‘national’ from PCJ004, aligns Policy MIN4 with the national policy on appropriate levels of constraint. The MPA advocates that ‘rigorous’ examination be retained in PCJ004 on the ground that it is appropriate to the consideration of proposals affecting the highest category of protected land within the Vale area. Rigorous examination of proposals is only appropriate in landscapes of equally high status, whereas those included in (vi) of PCJ 004 are not of uniform significance. The blanket Criterion (vi) of the Policy as changed by PCJ004 lacks perspective in its failure to observe grades of significance which can be appropriately amended by adding ‘consistent with the status of their designation..

9.7.5 The revision of paragraphs 9.4.3 to 9.4.9 by PCJ005 meets the objection by the Countryside Council for Wales. The ground on which the Quarry Products Association’s counter objection to the change is maintained, namely the lack of a hierarchical approach, appears to refer to the amendment of the policy itself, and not to the supporting text.. The recommended amendment to PCJ004 covers this matter.’

REC9.9 be amended as follows:

‘by PCJ004 as further modified by FPCJ003 and the addition of ‘consistent with the status of their designation.’ at the end of the policy, FPCJ005 and FPCJ006: and’

REC 9.10	Delete existing recommendation and insert into existing REC 9.9 as amendment of PCJ004
RECS.9.13 and 9.16	see REC.9.3 above
REC.9.21	refers to CW. Amend REC.9.21 to include Ewenny
REC.9.22	refers to CW

Chapter 10: Waste Management

Policy WAST1	Delete PCD004 and insert PCK005
REC.10.2	refers to CW
REC.10.4	Delete as PCK005 is not the subject of a maintained or CW objection therefore no recommendation is required.

Chapter 11: Community and Utility Services

REC.11.1	refers to CW
COMM2	Comment agreed. Reference to FPCL002 in Para.11.13.11 should be changed to FPCL003
REC.11.3	refers to CW
REC.11.4	The note on REC11.4 appears to relate to REC11.5, the additional policy on Barry College Annex. add to policy criterion (iii) 'do not result in a significant increase in the original volume of the buildings'.
REC.11.5	refers to CW
REC.11.8	refers to CW
REC.11.9	refers to CW
REC.11.11	refers to CW

VALE OF GLAMORGAN UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN REPORT ON THE OBJECTIONS - ADDENDUM

REC.2.9	Amend REC.2.9 to read: 'I recommend that the plan be modified by the inclusion of PCC004'.
REC.3.3	Delete PCD030 and PCD033.
ENV1	Amend title of Section 3.3 to include HOUS1. Amend the first sub-heading of the list of representations to include HOUS9. The list of representations should be amended such that 356.22 should read 356.24 and 355.2 should be included.
REC.3.7	Delete from the list of HOUS2 villages, St.Nicholas and Peterston-Super-Ely.
REC.3.11	Add to REC.3.7: 'as amended by RECS.4.8 and 4.10.
REC3.13	Delete PCE035
ENV6	Delete PCD013 and the objections listed under that heading from the list of representations and add to the list of representations under ENV4 and ENV5. Add PCD013 to REC.3.25.
ENV8	Reference to PCN021 in Para.3.9.2 should be amended to PCD021.
REC.3.42	Replace references to 'translocation' by 'mitigation' in Section 3.13.4 and REC.3.42.
REC.3.50	Replace references to criterion (iv) by (vi) in Section 3.20 and REC.3.50.
REC.4.4	Delete reference to PCE022.
REC.4.7	For the sake of clarification a recommended revised Policy HOUS9 and explanatory text is set out which incorporates the amendments proposed in RECS.3.11, 4.7, 4.8, 4.10 and 4.25.

“POLICY HOUS9
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA –
POLICY HOUS2 SETTLEMENTS

Subject to the provisions of Policy HOUS2, development will be permitted which is within or closely related to the defined settlement boundaries provided that it meets all the following criteria:

- (i) the scale, form and character of the proposed development of the proposed development is sympathetic to the environs of the site;
- (ii) [no change]
- (iii) [no change]
- (iv) the provisions of Policy REC3 are met where appropriate and feasible;
- (v) [no change]”

Para.4.4.61 to be revised in accordance with PCE025 subject to the deletion of the words “within the residential settlement boundaries”.

REC.4.20	Replace PCE004 by PCE005
HOUS1(12)	Representations 161.2 and 162.2 should be relocated to the list of supporting representations.
REC.4.48	Add “(HOUS1)” after the words “explanatory text” in REC.4.48.
REC.4.78	References in Section C19.3 and REC.4.78 to PCN013 should be amended to PCN012.
REC.5.1	Replace REC.5.1 by: “I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.”
REC.5.4	References in Section 5.3 and Rec.5.4 to PCF019 should be changed to PCF005.
REC.5.20(EMP20)	REC.5.20 related to EMP10 be amended to REC5.20A
REC.6.1	References in Section 6.1 and REC.6.1 to FPCF002 should be changed to FPCG002.
REC.6.8	PCG003 should be included in REC.6.8.

REC.6.14	Change PCM002 to PCM002(page 196).
SHOP1	Section 7.2 Policy SHOP1 be deleted. The Explanatory Note, list of representations under Para.7.4.10 and REC.7.4 should be relocated to Section 7.3 Amend REC7.4 to read ‘the inclusion of PCH002 and FPCH002’;
REC.7.6	REC.7.6 should be amended by the addition of the words: “...subject to the amendments made by REC.7.2.”
REC.7.9	Delete REC.7.9 consideration of 356.27 and replace with Explanatory Note to indicate that the objection refers to the content of SPG which was not before the inquiry.
REC.9.3	Delete “after paragraph 9.4.10” and add “subject to the provisions of REC.9.13 and REC.9.16”.
REC 9.9	<p>Delete paragraphs 9.7.4.and 9.7.5 and insert:</p> <p>9.7.4 FPCJ003, deleting ‘national’ from PCJ004, aligns Policy MIN4 with the national policy on appropriate levels of constraint. The MPA advocates that ‘rigorous’ examination be retained in PCJ004 on the ground that it is appropriate to the consideration of proposals affecting the highest category of protected land within the Vale area. Rigorous examination of proposals is only appropriate in landscapes of equally high status, whereas those included in (vi) of PCJ 004 are not of uniform significance. The blanket Criterion (vi) of the Policy as changed by PCJ004 lacks perspective in its failure to observe grades of significance which can be appropriately amended by adding ‘consistent with the status of their designation.’</p> <p>9.7.5 The revision of paragraphs 9.4.3 to 9.4.9 by PCJ005 meets the objection by the Countryside Council for Wales. The ground on which the Quarry Products Association’s counter objection to the change is maintained, namely the lack of a hierarchical approach, appears to refer to the amendment of the policy itself, and not to the</p>

supporting text. The recommended amendment to PCJ004 covers this matter.'

REC9.9 be amended as follows:

'by PCJ004 as further modified by FPCJ003 and the addition of 'consistent with the status of their designation.' at the end of the policy, FPCJ005 and FPCJ006: and'

REC 9.10	Delete existing recommendation and insert into existing REC 9.9 as amendment of PCJ004
REC.9.21	Amend REC.9.21 to include Ewenny
REC.10.4	Delete PCD004 and insert PCK005
COMM2	Reference to FPCL002 in Para.11.13.11 should be changed to FPCL003
REC.11.4	add to policy criterion (iii) 'do not result in a significant increase in the original volume of the buildings'.

C CARDINAL DipTP MRTPI