

**VALE OF GLAMORGAN UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN:
REPORT ON THE OBJECTIONS**

CONTENTS

(This Volume Bold)

VOLUME 1

CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION
CHAPTER 2	STRATEGIC POLICIES AND THEIR JUSTIFICATION
CHAPTER 3	ENVIRONMENT

VOLUME 2

CHAPTER 4	HOUSING
	PART A - Policies
	PART B - The Allocated Sites
	PART C - Site Specific Matters

VOLUME 3

CHAPTER 5	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM
CHAPTER 6	TRANSPORTATION
CHAPTER 7	RETAILING
CHAPTER 8	SPORT & RECREATION
CHAPTER 9	MINERALS
CHAPTER 10	WASTE MANAGEMENT
CHAPTER 11	COMMUNITY & UTILITY SERVICES

VOLUME 4

APPENDICES

APPENDICES	(A) LIST OF APPEARANCES
	(B) INDEX OF DULY MADE OBJECTIONS
	(C) DOCUMENTS
	(1) CORE DOCUMENTS
	(2) INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

CONTENTS

(This Volume Bold)

VOLUME 1

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1	Policy 00GEN - General Policy Matters	1.1
1.2	Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)	1.3
1.3	Non Statutory Documents	1.4
1.4	Environmental Appraisal.....	1.5
1.5	The Guiding Unitary Development Plan Principles.....	1.6
1.6	The Strategy and Strategic Policy 3	1.7
	The Housing Strategy;	1.9
	Housing Demand	1.12
	Housing Supply	1.14
	The Housing Requirement.....	1.19

CHAPTER 2

STRATEGIC POLICIES AND THEIR JUSTIFICATION

2.1	Policy 1 Environment.....	2.1
2.2	Policy 2 - Environment	2.2
2.3	Policies 1 and 2 (Environment) - Justification.....	2.5
2.4	Policy 3 - Housing and its Justification.....	2.6
2.5	Policies 4, 5 and 6 -Economic Development and Tourism	2.7
2.6	Policy 7 - Improvements to Transportation Network.....	2.10
2.7	Policies 9 and 10 – Retailing.....	2.11
2.8	Policy11 - Sport and Recreational Facilities	2.13
2.9	Policy14 - Community and Utility Services.....	2.14

CHAPTER 3 - ENVIRONMENT

3.1	Omissions and General Considerations.....	3.1
3.2	- Objectives	3.3
3.3	Policy ENV1 Development in the Countryside (including HOUS2, HOUS3, HOUS8 and HOUS9).....	3.4
3.4	Policy ENV2 - Agricultural land.....	3.11
3.5	Policy ENV03 - Green Wedges (including Green Belt and Special Landscape Areas).....	3.13
3.6	Policies ENV4 and ENV5 - Coastal Policies (including The Glamorgan Heritage Coast and The East Vale Coast).....	3.21
3.7	Policy ENV6 - Water Resources	3.25
3.8	Policy ENV7 - Small Scale Rural Conversions	3.26
3.9	Policy ENV8 Development Involving Horses	3.29
3.10	Policy ENV9 Conservation of the Countryside	3.30
3.11	Policy ENV10 - Protection of Landscape Features	3.32
3.12	Policy ENV11 - Woodland Management.....	3.33
3.13	Policies ENV12, ENV13, ENV14 and New Policy ENV	3.34
3.13.1	Policy ENV12 International Areas	3.34
3.13.2	Policy ENV13 National sites	3.35
3.13.3	Policy ENV14 Local sites.....	3.36
3.13.4	- Additional Policy ENV XX Protected Species	3.37
3.13.5	Paragraphs 3.4.53 to 3.4.57	3.38

3.14 Policy ENV15 Protection of Built and Historic Environment	3.39
3.15 Policies ENV16 and ENV17	3.40
3.16 Policies ENV 18 and ENV 19	3.42
3.17 Policy ENV22 - Conservation and Enhancement of Open Space	3.44
3.18 Policy ENV23 - Regeneration of Urban Areas	3.45
3.19 Policy ENV24 - Contaminated Land and Unstable Land	3.46
3.20 Policy ENV25 -Design of new developments.....	3.47

VOLUME 2

CHAPTER 4 - HOUSING

PART A - Policies

A.1 Policy HOUS00 - General Housing Objections and Omissions of Policy	4.2
A.2 Policy HOUS1 - Residential Allocations.....	4.3
A.3 Policy HOUS2 - Additional Residential Development	4.3
A.4 Policy HOUS3 - Dwellings in the Countryside.....	4.3
A.5 Policy HOUS4 - New Settlements.....	4.4
A.6 Policy HOUS5 - Agricultural or Forestry Dwellings.....	4.6
A.7 Policy HOUS7 - Replacement and Extension of Dwellings in the Countryside.....	4.7
A.8 Policy HOUS8 - Additional Residential Development	4.8
A.9 Policy HOUS9 - Residential Development within Settlement Boundaries	4.9
A.10 Policy HOUS10 - Conversion of Large Dwellings	4.11
A.11 Policy HOUS11 - Nursing Homes	4.12
A.12 Policy HOUS13 - Affordable Housing	4.13
A.13 Policy HOUS14 - Affordable Housing in the Rural Vale.....	4.14
A.14 Policy HOUS15 - Gypsy Caravans.....	4.16

PART B - The Allocated Sites

B.1 Policy HOUS1(1) - Barry Waterfront	4.18
B.2 Policy HOUS1(2) - Harbour Road Barry	4.20
B.3 Policy HOUS1(3) - Pencoedtre North East Barry	4.21
B.4 Policy HOUS1(7) - Penarth Haven, Penarth.....	4.22
B.5 Policy HOUS1(8) - Cogan Hall Farm, Penarth	4.23
B.6 Policy HOUS1(10) - Redwood Close, Boverton	4.24
B.7 Policy HOUS1(12) - Cowbridge Road and The Saw Mill, Ystradowen	4.25
B.8 Policy HOUS1(13) - Rhoose Point.....	4.27
B.9 Policy HOUS1(16) - Adjacent St.Michael's Church, Colwinston	4.28
B.10 Policy HOUS1(17) - St.John's Well, St.Athan	4.29
B.11 Policy HOUS1(20) - White Farm, Barry	4.31

PART C - Site Specific Matters

C1 Aberthin - Court Farm	4.35
C2 Barry.....	4.36
C2.0 General....	4.36
C2.2 Barry - Highlight Farm/ Highlight Lane	4.38
C2.3 Barry - Land to the North of Pleasant View....	4.39
C2.4 Barry-Merthyr Dyfan..	4.40
C2.5 Barry - Palmersvale Business Centre.	4.41
C2.6 Barry - Pencoedre, North East Barry	4.43
C2.7 Barry- Land to the north of Port Road	4.44
C2.8 Barry- Port Road/Five Mile Lane	4.45
C2.9 Barry - Ty Verlons.....	4.46

C2.10 Barry - Land to the rear of St James Crescent.....	4.47
C3 Bonvilston - Land between The Village Hall and Church Cottage	4.48
C4 Broughton	4.49
C5 Colwinston.....	4.50
C6 Corntown - Land adjacent to Corntown Court	4.51
C7 Cowbridge.....	4.52
C7.0 General.....	4.52
C7.1 Cowbridge - Darren Farm.....	4.54
C7.2 Cowbridge - Slade Farm.....	4.58
C7.3 Cowbridge - Llanblethian Farm.....	4.59
C7.4 Cowbridge - Land at the edge of the Northern Settlement Boundary.....	4.60
C7.5 Cowbridge - Land adjacent Llanblethian Farm.....	4.62
C8 Dinas Powys	4.63
C8.0 General.....	4.63
C8.1 Dinas Powys - Cardiff Road.....	4.64
C8.2 Dinas Powys - Cross Common.....	4.65
C8.3 Dinas Powys - Eastbrook.....	4.65
C8.4 Dinas Powys - Southra.....	4.67
C8.5 Dinas Powys - Caerleon Road and Rhuddlan Way.....	4.68
C8.6 Dinas Powys - St.Andrews Road and Westra.....	4.69
C9 East Aberthaw ...	4.70
C10 Ewenny.....	4.71
C11 Llanbethery	4.72
C12 Llancarfan.....	4.73
C13 Llandough	4.74
C13.0 General.....	4.74
C13.1 Llandough - Cogan Pill Road.....	4.75
C13.2 Llandough - Corbett Road.....	4.76
C13.3 Llandough - Sites at Leckwith Road and Llandough Hill.....	4.77
C13.4 Llandough - Llandough Fields.....	4.79
C14.1Llandow - Land to the West of the Railway Line, OS0626.....	4.81
C14.2Llandow - New Village Proposal..	4.83
C15 Llanmaes	4.84
C15.0 General.....	4.84
C15.1 Llanmaes – land north of the village.....	4.85
C15.2 Llanmaes – land north east of the village.....	4.86
C15.3 Llanmaes – land west of the village.....	4.87
C16 Llantwit Major/Boverton ..	4.88
C16.0 General.....	4.88
C16.1 Llantwit Major - Land at Eglwys Brewis Road/Llantwit Major Bypass.....	4.89
C16.2 Llantwit Major/Boverton - OS Field 3759.....	4.90
C16.3 Llantwit Major/Boverton- Land to south of the Boverton.....	4.91
C16.4 Llantwit Major/Boverton - Land to the South.....	4.93
C16.5 Llantwit Major/Boverton - Field 3968.....	4.94
C16.6 Llantwit Major/Boverton - Land to the north of Boverton.....	4.95
C16.7 Llantwit Major/Boverton- Plasnewydd Farm.....	4.96
C17 Michaelston-le-Pitt ...	4.97
C18 Ogmore-by-Sea	4.98
C19 Rhoose	4.99
C19.0 General.....	4.99
C19.1 Rhoose - Fonmon Road, Font-y-gary.....	4.100
C19.3 Rhoose - Land between Porthkerry Road and Rhoose Point.....	4.101
C19.4 Rhoose - Lower Farm.....	4.102
C20 Siginstone – Part OS 1848	4.104
C21 Southerndown.....	4.105
C21.1 Southerndown - Land East of Southerndown House.....	4.105
C21.2 Southerndown - Great House Yard.....	4.106

C22 St Andrew's Major –	4.107
C23 St.Athan	4.108
C23.1St.Athan - Allotments - Eglwys Brewis	4.108
C23.2St.Athan - West House Farm	4.110
C24 St Brides Major	4.111
C24.0 General	4.111
C24.1 St Brides Major - Area to the South	4.111
C24.2 St Brides Major - New Vicarage and adjoining land	4.112
C24.3 St Brides Major - Penylan Farm	4.113
C25 St Nicholas	4.114
C25.0 General	4.114
C25.1 St Nicholas - Land off Ger y Llan	4.114
C25.2 St Nicholas - Part OS 0913 and 1415, Duffryn Lane	4.115
C26 Sully	4.116
C26.0 General	4.116
C26.1 Sully – Land east of Swanbridge Road and north of Lavernock Road	4.117
C26.2 Sully – Beach Road	4.118
C26.3 Sully - Land East of Sully Road	4.119
C27 Tair Onen – New Village Proposal	4.120
C28 The Downs	4.121
C29 Tre-Aubrey	4.122
C30 Treoes - Ty Mawr Farm	4.123
C31 Trerhyngyll – OS 7084, 7100, and 7200	4.124
C32 Twyn-yr-Odyn	4.125
C33 Welsh St Donats	4.126
C34 Wenvoe	4.127
C34.0 General	4.127
C34.1 Wenvoe - Land to the North of the Residential Settlement Boundary	4.128
C34.2 Wenvoe - Land between Port Road and Old Port Road	4.129
C34.3 Wenvoe - Land to the South of the Residential Settlement Boundary	4.130
C35 West Aberthaw - The Boys Club of Wales Site	4.131
C36 Wick	4.132
C36.0 General	4.132
C36.1 Wick - Sites to the south and north of Green Isaf	4.133
C36.2 Wick- Lilla Cottage	4.134
C36.3 Wick - Land adjacent to the North-Western Boundary	4.135

VOLUME 3

CHAPTER 5 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM

5.1 Policy EMP/TOUR00 - General and Omissions	5.1
5.2 Policy EMP1 - Land for Employment Uses	5.3
5.3 Policy EMP1 (Site6) - Hayes Lane	5.7
5.4 Policy EMP1 (Site8) - Hayes Wood	5.8
5.5 Policy EMP1 (Site18) -	
West Point Industrial Estate & Llandough Sidings, Penarth Road	5.9
5.6 Policy EMP1(20) - Vale Gate & HTV, Culverhouse Cross	5.10
5.7 Policy EMP1 (Site 21) - Land to the North of Rhooose	5.18
5.8 Policy EMP2 - Special Employment Sites	5.19
5.9 Policy EMP2(1) – Pencoedtre	5.21
5.10 Policy EMP2(2) - Miskin	5.23

5.11 Policies EMP3 and EMP4	
New Business & Industrial Development General Industry	5.25
5.12 Policy EMP5 - Protection of Land for Employment Uses	5.28
5.13 Policies EMP6 and EMP7	
Developments Involving Hazardous Substances	
Development Adjacent to Hazardous Industrial Uses.....	5.29
5.14 Policy EMP8 - Agricultural Service Industries	5.30
5.15 Policy EMP9 and PCF029	
Agricultural Enterprise and Associated Development	5.31
5.16 Policy EMP10 - Non-Conforming Business and Industrial Uses	5.32
5.17 Policy EMP12 - Cowbridge Cattle Market	5.33
5.18 Policy TOUR 1 - New Hotels in the Countryside.....	5.36
5.19 Policy TOUR 4 - Caravan, Chalet and Tent Sites.....	5.37
5.20 Policy TOUR 5 - Non-Residential Tourist Attractions.....	5.38
5.21 Implementation	5.39

CHAPTER 6 - TRANSPORTATION

6.1. Policy TRAN00 - General or Omissions.....	6.1
6.2. Policy TRAN 1 Strategic highways	6.4
6.3. Policy TRAN 1(i): The Airport Access Road	6.6
6.4. Policy TRAN 1(ii): The Barry Waterfront to Cardiff Link	6.10
6.5. Policy TRAN 2 Local highways	6.12
6.6. Policy TRAN 3 Rail Development.....	6.15
6.7 Policy TRAN 4 Interchange at Rail Stations.....	6.17
6.8. Policy TRAN 5 Redundant Rail Routes & Facilities	6.18
6.9. Policy TRAN 6 Rail Freight.....	6.19
6.10 Policy TRAN 7 Cardiff International Airport	6.20
6.11.Policy TRAN 8 Cycling development	6.21
6.12.Policy TRAN 9 Parking	6.23
6.13.Para.6.5.2	6.25

CHAPTER 7 RETAILING

7.1. Policy SHOP00 Retailing policies in general or omission of policy.....	7.1
7.2. Policy SHOP1 The shopping environment of district centres.....	7.3
7.3. Policy SHOP2 New and improved shopping facilities.....	7.4
7.4. Policy SHOP3 Retail development	7.5
7.5. Policy SHOP4 Retail warehousing in Barry Waterfront.....	7.7
7.6. Policy SHOP5 Ground floor uses in primary shopping areas	7.8
7.7. Policy SHOP11 Upper floors in town and district shopping centres	7.9
7.8. Policy SHOP12 New retail development outside district shopping centres.....	7.10

CHAPTER 8 SPORT & RECREATION

8.1. Policy REC00 Sport & Recreation policies in general or omission of policy.....	8.1
8.2. Policy REC1 Protection of existing recreational facilities	8.3
8.3. Policy REC3 Provision of open space within new residential developments	8.4
8.4. Policy REC5 New playing field provision.....	8.5
8.5. Policy REC6 Childrens play facilities	8.8
8.6. Policy REC7 Sport and leisure facilities	8.9
8.7. Policy REC8 Golf courses and golf driving ranges.....	8.11
8.8. Policy REC9 New golf related developments	8.14
8.9. Policy REC10 Development of allotment land	8.15
8.10.Policy REC11 Informal public open space and country parks.....	8.16

8.11. Policy REC12	Public rights of way and recreation routes	8.18
8.12. Policy REC13	Sailing	8.23

CHAPTER 9 MINERALS

9.1.	Policy MIN00	Minerals policies in general or omission of policy	9.1
9.2.		Marine dredged sand	9.3
9.3.		National planning guidance.....	9.4
9.4.	Policy MIN1	Mineral Exploration	9.5
9.5.	Policy MIN2	Release of limestone reserves.....	9.6
9.6.	Policy MIN3	Protection of further limestone resources	9.7
9.7.	Policy MIN4	New or extended mineral working sites	9.9
9.8.	Policy MIN5	Preferred order of release of reserves	9.12
9.9	Policy MIN6	Buffer zones	9.15
9.10	Policy MIN7	Restoration and after-care	9.17
9.11	Policy MIN9	Derelict sites	9.19
9.12	Policy MIN11	Mineral-related industry at ports	9.21

CHAPTER 10 WASTE MANAGEMENT

10.1	Policy WAST00	Waste management policies in general or omission of policy	10.1
10.2.	Policy WAST1	Waste management facilities	10.4
10.3.	Policy WAST3	Disposal of special waste.....	10.6
10.4.	Policy WAST4	Waste disposal on agricultural land.....	10.8

CHAPTER 11 COMMUNITY & UTILITY SERVICES

11.1	Policy COMM00	general or omission of policy	11.1
11.2.	Policy COMM1	Llandough Hospital	11.2
11.3.	Policy COMM2	Reuse of redundant hospitals.....	11.4
11.4.	Policy COMM3	Provision of schools	11.8
11.5.		Library Provision.....	11.9
11.6.		Community halls	11.10
11.7.		Utility Services - general.....	11.11
11.8.		Public sewage treatment.....	11.13
11.9.		Telecommunications	11.14
11.10	Policy COMM5	Wind generators and farms	
	Policy COMM6	Other renewable energy schemes	11.16
11.11.		Cemeteries.....	11.17

VOLUME 4

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A LIST OF THOSE APPEARING AT THE INQUIRY

APPENDIX B INDEX OF DULY MADE OBJECTIONS

APPENDIX C LIST OF DOCUMENTS
 (1) CORE DOCUMENTS
 (2) INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

ALC	Agricultural land classification
AAR	Airport Access Road
BT	British Telecommunications plc
CCW	Countryside Council for Wales
CIA	Cardiff International Airport
CPRW	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales
DETR	Department of the Environment, Transport, and the Regions
FoE Cymru	Friends of the Earth (Cymru)
FoE Penarth	Friends of the Earth (Penarth)
FRCA	Farming and Rural Conservation Agency
HSOP	Housing Strategy Operational Plan
JHLAS	Joint Housing Land Availability Study
MPA	Minerals Planning Authority
PGW	Planning Guidance Wales
PIZ	Public Information Zone
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance
PG(W)PP	Planning Guidance (Wales) Planning Policy 1996
SAS	Surface Access Strategy
SEWUDPLG	South East Wales Unitary Development Plans Liason Group
SLA	Special Landscape Area
SPG	Supplementary Planning Guidance
SWIFT	South Wales Integrated Fast Transit Strategy
TAN	Technical Advice Note
TENS	Trans European Network budget
WDA	Welsh Development Agency
WO	Welsh Office

CHAPTER 4 - HOUSING

Explanatory Note

I have dealt with objections to the Housing Chapter in the following manner:

Part A considers objections that are of a policy nature;

Part B considers objections made to the Housing Sites allocated under Policy HOUS1;

Part C considers all other Site Specific objections made. These include: suggested changes to Residential Settlement Boundaries under Policies HOUS2 and HOUS8; suggested changes to Green Wedge boundaries under ENV3; and omissions of Sites under Policy HOUS1. Because of the number of such objections I have considered them in alphabetic settlement order. In a number of cases, objections are made which concern different sites within or adjacent to an individual settlement. In such cases, I first deal with any general objections concerning the settlement as a whole. I then turn to the specific factors involved with each individual objection site.

All conclusions concerning matters of a site-specific nature should be read together with my conclusions on the policy matters covered within the Introduction and Environment Sections of my report.

PART A - Policies

A.1 Policy HOUS00 - General Housing Objections and Omissions of Policy

Explanatory note: General objections were made to the reasoned justification of the Housing Chapter which involved the consideration of the housing requirement and range and choice of housing sites. These are dealt with under “The Strategy and Strategic Policy 3” in Chapter 1. General matters concerning the consideration of Policies HOUS2, HOUS3, HOUS8 and settlement boundaries are dealt with under Policy ENV1 in Chapter 3. Similarly a number of general objections were made which concern the consideration of development at particular settlements. These are dealt with within PART C of this chapter.

The Council has accepted under PCL004 that a new policy should be included within the plan concerning the retention of community facilities in rural settlements and villages. This rectifies an omission from the plan and satisfies objection 47.1 which is Conditionally Withdrawn. The omission of a policy on new settlements is dealt with under the objections to Policy HOUS4. General objections made by the Environment Agency with regard to surface water run-off are accepted and are appropriate and are covered by PCE006, PCE007, PCE010 and PCE011.

Supporting Representations

270.26	Plaid Cymru	{Support for mixed use developments}
232.5	Land Division, Welsh Development Agency	
238.14	Country Landowners Association	{Support for objective set out in paragraph 4.3.}

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections

47.1	Campaign for Real Ale	{Rural public houses}
247.1	Environment Agency	

Maintained Objections

359.50	Friends of the Earth Cymru	{Omission of policy on self - build housing development}
--------	----------------------------	--

ISSUE:

4.1.2 Whether the plan should include a policy on self-build housing developments.

CONCLUSIONS:

4.1.3 Self-build housing would be appropriate in any of the areas identified as suitable for housing under the housing policies of the plan as long as the criteria of those policies are satisfied. There is no need to identify specific areas or sites within the plan.

RECOMMENDATION:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.1 the acceptance of PCL004, PCE006, PCE007, PCE010 and PCE011.

A.2 Policy HOUS1 - Residential Allocations

Explanatory Note: Objections made to the general application of Policy HOUS1 are dealt with under “*The Strategy and Policy 3*”. Objections to the individual allocation sites are considered within PART B of this chapter. Objections made to the non-allocation of land under Policy HOUS1 are considered at Part C.

A.3 Policy HOUS2 - Additional Residential Development

Explanatory Note: Objections made to the general application of Policy HOUS2 are dealt with under Policy ENV1. Site Specific objections made concerning Policy HOUS2 are dealt with in PART C.

A.4 Policy HOUS3 - Dwellings in the Countryside

Explanatory Note: Objections made to the general application of Policy HOUS3 are dealt with under Policy ENV1.

A.5 Policy HOUS4 - New Settlements

Explanatory Note: Objections concerning specific proposals for new settlements are considered under PART C of this Chapter. Within this section my considerations are involved only with the principle of such new settlements taking into account PCE019. PCE019 clarifies the definition of new settlements and adequately covers objection 244.15 which is Conditionally Withdrawn.

Supporting Representations

237.40	Countryside Council for Wales	{Support for Policy HOUS 4}
--------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections

244.15	Welsh Office	{Clarification of 'new settlements'}
--------	--------------	--------------------------------------

Maintained Objections

249.12	House Builders Federation	{New Settlements}
264.2	Barratt South Wales	{New settlements.}
331.3	Marcross Holdings Limited	{Proposal for new settlement at Llandow airfield.}
248.3	Westbury Homes Holdings Ltd.	{Need for flexibility when identifying new settlements}
248.1	Westbury Homes Holdings Ltd.	{Benefits of New Settlements}

ISSUE:

A.5.1 Whether Policy HOUS4 prejudices the findings of the proposed sub-regional housing requirement study, is premature and should be deleted or amended to provide greater flexibility in the consideration of new settlements.

CONCLUSIONS:

A.5.2 Para.9.1.6 of PGW clearly states that: *“Any proposals for new settlements and urban villages should be promoted through, and fully justified in, the development plan.”*. This paragraph also states: *“New settlements on greenfield sites are unlikely to be appropriate in Wales and should only be proposed where development would offer significant environmental, social and economic advantages over further expansion or regeneration of existing settlements”*. It is therefore appropriate for the Council to consider their approach in relation to the forecast housing requirements for the Vale and on the basis of current regional guidance.

A.5.3 There is currently no regional guidance that indicates that a housing deficit exists across the region which would justify the development of such a new settlement. Moreover, objectors adduce no statistical evidence of such a deficit. Whilst I have determined previously that greater provision should be made, I also consider that, within the plan period, this can be better accommodated in supporting the overall strategy of the plan and the regeneration of the existing settlements in the Waterfront Strip. In reaching this conclusion I have taken into account objections which propose housing in new large settlements at Llandow and Tair Onen. My detailed consideration of these proposals is set out within PART C.

A.5.4 The Council is strongly opposed to the concept of new settlements in the countryside and is of the opinion that such settlements would not relieve pressure for development around existing towns and villages. It considers that such new settlements would require new demands on roads, drainage, schools and other infrastructure services. Whilst the Council however does not produce significant evidence to support such a view, it does point to the fact that proposals for new settlements would, by their very nature, be isolated.

A.5.5 The inhabitants of new settlements would therefore be highly dependent on car travel and such developments would be likely to be less sustainable than developments integrated with existing settlements. Moreover, the objector does not provide significant evidence of the benefits of such new settlements beyond stating that a mixed-use development of commercial housing and employment uses adjacent to a transport corridor can deliver benefit. I am satisfied that the Council's view has

more merit, and the promotion of the plan's overall strategy must be the overriding consideration.

A.5.6 I have determined that sufficient additional land can be provided in accord with this strategy at locations which involve the logical expansion of existing settlements and the regeneration of brownfield sites. As a result there is no need for Policy HOUS4 to be amended to accommodate the more flexible approach suggested by an objector. The fact that the plan may be adopted ahead of the longer-term regional study being completed does not preclude the possibility of any of its findings being taken into account in future reviews of the plan. In that it provides both certainty and clarity about the approach to be taken towards new settlements within the plan period, Policy HOUS4, and its reasoned justification as proposed to be changed under PCE019, is entirely appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.2. the acceptance of PCE019:

A.6 Policy HOUS5 - Agricultural or Forestry Dwellings

Explanatory Note: PCE020 clarifies where the policy will apply and makes clearer its meaning. The reasoned justification is also amended to provide guidance on functional testing. As such, objection 244.16 is adequately covered and is Conditionally Withdrawn.

Supporting Representations

237.41	Countryside Council for Wales	{Support for Policy HOUS 5}
--------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections

244.16	Welsh Office	{Clarification of Housing Policy}
--------	--------------	-----------------------------------

Maintained Objections

238.15	Country Landowners Association	{Support for Policy HOUS 5.}
--------	--------------------------------	------------------------------

ISSUE:

A.6.1 Whether Policy HOUS5 or its reasoned justification should be amended to take account of the fact that a dwelling may be needed in connection with a farm diversification scheme.

CONCLUSIONS:

A.6.2 The objector agrees with the principle of Policy HOUS5 but considers it should take account of the needs of such diversification schemes. The Council considers that each such proposal should be treated on its merits. In that it would be difficult within the policy or its reasoned justification to accommodate the needs of different diversification schemes, the Council's approach is justified.

RECOMMENDATION:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.3 the acceptance of PCE020.

A.7 Policy HOUS7 - Replacement and Extension of Dwellings in the Countryside

Maintained Objections

310.1	Jones, Mr F.C.	{Restriction of extension/replacement size of dwellings in countryside.}
356.21	Harmer Partnership	{Size of replacement dwelling in the countryside.}

ISSUE:

A.7.1 Whether criterion (ii) of Policy HOUS7 should be deleted.

CONCLUSIONS:

A.7.2 Criterion (ii) clearly indicates that the percentage limit is only applied to replacement dwellings not extensions. However, although the Council considers that the use of the percentage limit provides clear and certain guidance to developers, I consider the limit chosen to be arbitrary and unnecessary. The volume of a building provides little, if any, reliable indication of good design. Moreover, no reference is made within the policy or its reasoned justification as to what would be deemed to constitute the original building. Such lack of definition illustrates a lack of clarity.

A.7.3 The other criteria attached to the policy provide sufficient safeguards to ensure that proposals appropriately reflect the character of their rural location in terms of appearance and scale. PCE022 makes clear that all of the criteria are relevant.

RECOMMENDATION:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.4 the deletion of criterion (ii) of Policy HOUS7, the deletion of the first sentence of Para.4.4.56 and the acceptance of PCE022.

A.8 Policy HOUS8 - Additional Residential Development

Explanatory Note: Objections made to the general application of Policy HOUS8 are dealt with under Policy ENV1. I have recommended there that Policy HOUS8 be deleted and combined with HOUS2 under a single New Policy HOUS2.

Proposed Change PCE023

Maintained Objections

159.6

Penllyn Community Council

{Exception Sites for Affordable Housing}

ISSUE:

A.8.1 Whether, having regard to my conclusions regarding Policy HOUS8, it is necessary to refer to Policy HOUS14 within the amended Policy HOUS2.

CONCLUSIONS:

A.8.2 The Council considers that the inclusion of the cross-reference to Policy HOUS14 within the reasoned justification of Policy HOUS8 provides clarity and illustrates an important exception to the provisions of that policy. The objector is of the view that such a reference invites developers to build affordable housing beyond rural village boundaries. It is further considered that, unless the viability of a community is threatened, no “*so called*” affordable housing should be allowed outside present village boundaries.

A.8.3 The safeguards the objector requires are generally contained within Policy HOUS14 itself. The policy clearly indicates that an identified local need has to be demonstrated before such development could be favourably considered. Consequently, some reference to such exception sites should be made in the reasoned justification to Policy HOUS2 as recommended for change. The form of words used in PCE023, as amended by FPCE004, is appropriate for this purpose. The reasoned justification for Policy HOUS14 should also be updated to refer to para.9.2 of PGW which also indicates that special provision may be considered to help ensure the viability of local communities.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.5 the inclusion of PCE023 as amended by FPCE004 within the reasoned justification to the recommended new Policy HOUS2.

REC.4.6 the inclusion within the reasoned justification of Policy HOUS14 of reference to section 9.2 of PGW.

A.9 Policy HOUS9 - Residential Development within Settlement Boundaries

Explanatory Note: Objections made to the general principle of Policy HOUS9 are dealt with under Policy ENV1. I have recommended that Policy HOUS9 be amended with consequential amendments being made to PCE025, PCE024 and PCE025. These add clarity to the policy and partially satisfy objection 356.25.

Supporting Representations

237.43	Countryside Council for Wales	{Support for Policy HOUS 9}
--------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

Maintained Objections

52.11	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	{Omission Proposals Map}
207.4	Harry, Mrs R	{Provision of open space on new housing developments}
212.3	Jenkins, Messrs J S & D N	{Provision of open space on new housing developments}
244.34	Welsh Office	{Proposals Map}
356.25	Harmer Partnership	{Clarification of the term "open space".}

ISSUES:

A.9.1 Whether:

- (i) in criterion (i) the words “*surrounding uses*” should be replaced by the words “*the scale and form of surrounding development.*”;
- (ii) areas of high quality townscape and areas of historical, archaeological, landscape or ecological importance subject to criterion (iii) of Policy HOUS9 should be identified on the Proposals Map.
- (iii) the words “*when appropriate and feasible*” should be added at the beginning of criterion (iv)

CONCLUSIONS:

Issue (i)

A.9.2 The scale and form of surrounding development should be the main consideration of criterion (i). Consequently, in that the scale and form of a surrounding use may not involve built development and may not have a built scale and form, I consider the wording suggested by the objector has some merit. However, in that it would be unlikely, in all cases, for a site to be surrounded by development I consider that criterion (i) should be reworded to read: “*(i) the scale, form and character of the proposed development is sympathetic to the environs of the site*”.

Issue (ii)

A.9.3 Whilst the Council accepts that, ideally, every proposal, asset and constraint should be available in map form, it considers that, in practice, this is not possible. I understand the Council’s difficulties and, although I consider it to be important that the Proposals Map makes reference to the area policies that will form the basis for planning decisions, I have previously concluded that the inclusion of conservation areas is inappropriate. I am also satisfied that PCN019 adequately covers reference to those policies that are Borough wide.

A.9.4 I have previously concluded that national grid references should be added in Appendix 2 to the list of designated sites and Conservation Areas are acceptably set out in Appendix 3. The Council could, however, give further consideration to listing, within the Appendices, important Archaeological sites.

Issue (iii)

A.9.5 The requirement of criterion (iv) to provide open space in conjunction with housing development is clearly inappropriate both in the case of small developments and in localities where

the need is met by existing facilities in the locality. It is recognised in the advice in Policy REC 3 that in assessing the requirements of individual developments regard will be had to the extent and nature of local needs and the opportunities to satisfy that need in the locality. I consider that to ensure consistency “*when appropriate and feasible*” should be added at the beginning of criterion (iv).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.7 the acceptance of PCN019, PCE024 and PCE025 subject the deletion from PCE025 of the words “*..within settlement boundaries..*”;

REC.4.8 the amendment of criterion (i) to read: “*(i) the scale, form and character of the proposed development is sympathetic to the environs of the site*”;

REC.4.9 the listing within the Appendices of important Archaeological sites;

REC.4.10 that “*when appropriate and feasible*” be added at the beginning of Criterion (iv).

A.10 Policy HOUS10 - Conversion of Large Dwellings

Supporting Representations

240.2

Bebb, Mr & Mrs N

{Conversion of large underoccupied dwellings into smaller units}

Maintained Objections

359.28

Friends of the Earth Cymru

{Requirement for a sustainable parking policy}

ISSUE:

A.10.1 Whether car parking should not be required to be provided when dwelling conversions are within the urban area and there are bus and rail facilities close by or within easy walking or cycling distance.

CONCLUSIONS:

A.10.1 I consider the reference to accessibility introduced in Policy TRAN 9 by PCG010 allows the flexibility in the application of parking standards which the objector seeks. While I have sympathy with the objector's underlying motivation I find the further criterion, that parking be not provided when dwellings are within easy walking or cycling distance, unacceptably vague since destinations other than 'within the urban area' are not referred to.

RECOMMENDATION:

REC.4.11 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

A.11 Policy HOUS11 - Nursing Homes

Explanatory Note: PCE028 adds an additional criterion relating to the disposal of clinical waste and adequately meet the objection by the Environment Agency, which is Conditionally Withdrawn.

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections
247.7 Environment Agency

{Disposal of clinical waste}

Proposed Change PCE028

Supporting Representations
247.61 Environment Agency

{Support for the Proposed Change}

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections
244.37 Welsh Office

{New Criterion added to Policy HOUS 11 - Disposal of Clinical Waste}

376.4 Friends of the Earth Barry

ISSUE:

A.11.1 Whether

- (i) Criterion (vii) of PCE028 should be changed to 'CAR AND CYCLE PARKING.....GUIDELINES'.
- (ii) Criterion (ix) should be replaced by '(xi) A PLAN FOR MINIMISATION OF CLINICAL WASTE DISPOSAL ALONG THE LINES OF THE AUDIT COMMISSION REPORT IS DRAWN UP AND AGREED WITH THE COUNCIL'.

CONCLUSIONS:

Issue (i)

A.11.2 This objection does not relate to a Proposed Change and I therefore treat it as not duly made.

Issue (ii)

A.11.3 It is not clear why the objector requires the excision of Criterion (ix) as it has no functional relationship to the subject of objection. The principle of the minimisation of waste of all types is fundamental to Chapter 10 of the Plan. As expressed in PCE 028, adequate arrangements for clinical waste disposal are a pre-requisite for the grant of planning permission and march hand-in-hand with Waste Management Strategy. I do not consider further elaboration necessary.

RECOMMENDATION:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.12 the acceptance of PCE028.

A.12 Policy HOUS13 - Affordable Housing

Explanatory Note: PCE030, PCE031 and PCE032 add clarity to the policy and satisfy objections 233.7, 249.13 and 267.5.

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections

233.7	Welsh Office Housing Division (Tai Cymru)	
249.13	House Builders Federation	{Affordable housing provision.}
267.5	ABP - Grosvenor Waterside Developments Ltd	{Paragraph 4.4.70 - wording.}

Maintained Objections

270.31	Plaid Cymru	{Creation of ghettos.}
359.29	Friends of the Earth Cymru	{Clarification of affordable housing requirements}

Proposed Change PCE031

Supporting Representations

249.22	House Builders Federation
--------	---------------------------

ISSUE:

A.12.1 Whether:

- (i) the plan should take a more proactive role in the provision of affordable housing.
- (ii) criteria 11(iv) and (v) of Policy HOUS14 should be applied to Policy HOUS13;

CONCLUSIONS:

Issue (i)

A.12.2 Policy HOUS13 accords with Government guidance as set out in PGW and TAN2. Para.9.2.2 of PGW indicates that: “.. *Policies must indicate that an authority will seek to negotiate with developers where it is intended to include an element of affordable housing in proposed developments. ...*”. Policy HOUS13, as proposed to be changed under PCE031 and PCE032, is in accord with this advice. Also, matters such as the different types of tenure, commuted payments and the effect of the Capital Receipts Initiative are matters for the Council to take into account in their negotiations with developers. It is not necessary therefore for such detailed information to be set out in the plan.

Issue (ii)

A.12.3 Policy HOUS13 relates purely to the Council’s intention to negotiate with developers for the inclusion of affordable housing in proposed housing developments. Such criteria are not therefore necessary within Policy HOUS13.

RECOMMENDATION:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.13 the acceptance of PCE031 and PCE032.

A.13 Policy HOUS14 - Affordable Housing in the Rural Vale

Explanatory Note: PCE034, and PCE035 as proposed to be amended by FPCE006, identify what facilities and services are required to allow development to proceed and, as such, add clarity to the plan. They satisfy objections 247.8 and 247.83. PCE033 makes clear that the policy is an exception site and PCE015 and PCE023 (as amended by FPCE004) provide useful cross-references to other policies. These proposed changes only partially satisfy objection 249.14.

Supporting Representations

237.44	Countryside Council for Wales	{Support for Policy HOUS 14}
--------	-------------------------------	------------------------------

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections

246.9	Llandow Community Council	{Affordable housing in rural areas}
-------	---------------------------	-------------------------------------

Maintained Objections

159.3	Penllyn Community Council	{Affordable housing.}
228.8	Wenvoe Community Council	
247.8	Environment Agency	{Provision of services}
249.14	House Builders Federation	{Affordable housing in rural areas}
359.30	Friends of the Earth Cymru	{Deletion of policy on affordable housing in the rural vale}

Proposed Change PCE034*Maintained Objections*

159.7	Penllyn Community Council	{Exception Sites for Affordable Housing}
-------	---------------------------	--

Proposed Change PCE035*Maintained Objections*

247.83	Environment Agency	
--------	--------------------	--

ISSUE:

A.13.1 Whether:

- (i) Policy HOUS14 should be deleted;
- (ii) criterion (iv) should be deleted

CONCLUSIONS:**Issue (i)**

A.13.2 Policy HOUS14 is an “*exceptions policy*” governing “*Exception Sites for Affordable Housing in the Rural Vale*”. It is generally in accord with Government guidance encompassed in Section 9.2 of PGW and TAN2 “*Planning and Affordable Housing*”. Para.12 of TAN2 makes clear that “*Rural exception sites... will be released as an exception to normal plan policies ... and should be located within or adjoining existing villages*”. Para.2.2.2 states that local planning authorities should demonstrate “*the need for affordable housing by means of a local needs survey*” and “*include policies for affordable housing in their development plans for the areas where need has been identified*”. In the interim, until the results of a Rural Housing Needs Survey are published, the onus rests with the applicant to identify a local need for such housing. The need for such housing has to be clearly demonstrated through compliance with all the criteria of Policy HOUS14 as proposed to be changed by PCE033, PCE034 and PCE035. Consequently, adequate safeguards are in place to ensure that a large over-provision of housing in the Rural Vale does not occur. Criterion (iii) ensures that the benefits of such housing will be secured for initial and subsequent occupants and not modified to “*standard Vale Executive residences*”.

Issue (ii)

A.13.3 Open space provision is important in all developments and exception sites should meet all the other criteria against which an application for housing development is determined. The criteria contained within Policy HOUS14 ensure that any proposal would meet the provisions of other

policies of the plan. With regard to my recommendations concerning Policies ENV1, HOUS2, HOUS3 and HOUS8, the only difference lies in the fact that the scale of such affordable housing may be greater than the “*small-scale rounding-off*” proposed under a revised Policy HOUS2.

RECOMMENDATION:

I recommend that the plan be modified by

REC.4.14 the acceptance of PCE033, PCE034 and PCE035 as amended by FPCE006.

A.14 Policy HOUS15 - Gypsy Caravans

Explanatory Note: PCE036 makes clear that proposals for a site for use for residential caravans occupied by gypsies does not require the site to be simultaneously suitable for residential, employment and recreational use. This adds clarity to the policy and ensures that undue pressure is not put on neighbouring authorities. As such this satisfies objection 230.11 which is Conditionally Withdrawn. PCE037 and PCE038 add clarification to Para.4.4.77 and satisfy objections 244.17. 249.14.

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections

230.11	Cardiff County Council	
244.17	Welsh Office	{Reference to Circular}

Maintained Objections

238.16	Country Landowners Association	{Policy HOUS 15 - wording.}
374.1	Wallis, Mr Max	{Provision of Gypsy Sites}

ISSUES:

A.14.1 Whether:

- (i) a further criterion should be added to Policy HOUS15 to read: “(vii) The proposal does not have an unacceptable impact on nearby agricultural enterprises”;
- (ii) Policy HOUS15 should be amended: (a) to recognise the need for a gypsy caravan site or sites within the Vale for travelling, as well as residential, caravans; and (b) to make clear that the Council will endeavour to find suitable sites and be lenient with general planning restrictions.

CONCLUSIONS:

Issue (i)

A.14.2 Para.4.4.77 of the plan makes clear that proposals for gypsy sites should be determined in relation to land use factors and should be consistent with agricultural, archaeological, countryside and environmental objectives. Similarly, criterion (ii) of Policy HOUS15 makes it clear that such proposals should not have an unacceptable effect on agriculture. As such, the proposed new criterion is not necessary. However at the inquiry it was accepted by the Council that there is an implication within criterion (vi) that the provision of such sites would be limited to within settlement boundaries. This was accepted as being too restrictive. Consequently I consider that criterion (vi) and the last sentence of Para.4.4.77 should be deleted.

Issue (ii)

A.14.3 With regard to the objector’s view that there is insufficient provision for gypsy accommodation in the Vale, the Council indicates that up until 1997 the Welsh Office bi-annual surveys had illustrated that there had been no demand for a gypsy site. This survey is currently the best source of information available. Evidence adduced by the objector was based on little more than an anecdotal history of various unauthorised sites that have been set up in the Vale and a view that gypsies from Cardiff wish to live in the Vale. I consider there to be no significant evidence of a need for the provision of such a site to be made in the plan.

A.14.4 Policy HOUS15, however, is a criteria-based policy against which any applications for such sites can be assessed. This policy, and its reasoned justification, clearly recognises the nomadic way of life of gypsies and takes into account the advice given in para.9.1.9 of PGW. Although the objector makes reference to a Good Practice Guide on “*Managing Unauthorised Camping*” this does not form part of current planning guidance in Wales and I have given it little weight. Moreover, although not specifically consulting the Police, or the Gypsy Liaison Group, about the need for such sites, it is quite clear that a number of gypsy groups and the police were consulted

generally on the provisions of the plan. No objections to the plan were forthcoming from those consultations. Other than my conclusions above I consider that no further amendment is required to Policy HOUS15 or its reasoned justification.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.15 the deletion of criterion (vi) of Policy HOUS15 and the last sentence of Para.4.4.77;

REC.4.16 the acceptance of PCE036, PCE037 and PCE038.

PART B - The Allocated Sites

B.1 Policy HOUS1(1) - Barry Waterfront

Explanatory Note: PCE001 clarifies: (a) that affordable housing can be provided at this location by any sector of the housing market and (b) the minimum level above ordnance datum. These changes satisfy, respectively, objection 267.4 which was Conditionally Withdrawn and objection 287.2.

PCE002 and FPCE001 were withdrawn by the Council at the inquiry and objector 267 withdrew its objections to these changes. Objection was however still made to PCE002 by another objector and this objection is dealt with below.

Objections 267A & B were made to Policy ENV23 which involve consideration of the extent of Policy HOUS1(1). I deal with these here. In relation to objection 267A, the Council accept that the Waterfront, Barry Comprehensive Redevelopment Area should include the former Coal Hoist Embankment and the land adjacent to the bypass as encompassed by application 94/00144/OUT. This rectifies an omission and as such satisfies the objection which was Conditionally Withdrawn.

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections

267.4 ABP - Grosvenor Waterside Developments Ltd {Accuracy of figures.}

Maintained Objections

267.17A&B ABP - Grosvenor Waterside Developments Ltd {Barry Waterfront.CDA}
287.2 Welsh Development Agency {Verify minimum level above ordnance datum.}
287.3 Welsh Development Agency

Proposed Change PCE001

Maintained Objections

249.21 House Builders Federation

Proposed Change PCE002

Supporting Representations

247.64 Environment Agency {Support for the Proposed Change}

Maintained Objections

376.13 Friends of the Earth Barry

Policy ENV23

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections

267.3A ABP - Grosvenor Waterside Developments Ltd {Barry Waterfront CDA.}

Maintained Objections

267.3B ABP - Grosvenor Waterside Developments Ltd {Barry Waterfront CDA.}

ISSUE:

B.1.1 Whether:

- (i) PCE001 is unnecessary and unhelpful;
- (ii) the detailed history of contamination in the Barry Waterfront Area should be set out in the reasoned justification of the Barry Waterfront site.
- (iii) the South Quay Area of No.1 Dock should be included within the Waterfront, Barry Comprehensive Redevelopment Area.

CONCLUSIONS:

Issue (i)

B.1.2 The figure of 20% affordable housing on this site has been agreed through a Section 106 agreement. Also, having regard to the fact that there is nothing in the plan which applies “*blanket*” targets for such housing, I consider that PCE001 adds justifiable clarification.

Issue (ii)

B.1.3 It is neither necessary nor appropriate to outline the detailed history of contamination at this site. The Council accepts that considerable care has been taken by the developers in undertaking remedial action on this site. Conditions attached to the extant planning permission ensure that land contamination and its remediation is a factor to be considered by the developers.

Issue (iii)

B.1.4 Whilst the Council has no objection in principle to the redevelopment of the South Quay area it considers that its first priority in the regeneration of the Barry Docks area is the Waterfront, Barry Comprehensive Redevelopment Area as defined by the outline planning permission. Whilst it is further accepted that the lease on the tank storage site will expire at the end of 2006 it is also considered that the tank storage area will need to be removed and that remediation work may be required.

B.1.5 Although the Council considers that its location outside the Redevelopment Area will not inhibit the continuing development of the area I consider that its inclusion within such an area would add considerable clarification to the plan. From observation at my site visits redevelopment of this area would be of considerable visual benefit to the Dock area and should be progressed as quickly as possible. Whilst it is clear that little can happen on the ground before 2006 I accept the objector’s contention that redevelopment of this area could be undertaken before the end of the plan period.

B.1.6 The inclusion of this area both within the Redevelopment Area and the residential settlement boundary would enable preliminary discussions as to the intended use of this area to be undertaken. This in itself would reduce the uncertainty that is currently attached to the area and help promote the development of the first phase of the regeneration of the Barry Dock area. This area is in my view a very important site visually and consideration of the uses to which it should be put should not be delayed. I have no doubt also that this site is well placed to add, within a mixed-use development, to the housing land supply within the plan period to an extent of about 100 dwellings. Such a mixed-use would be consistent with the overall regeneration objectives of the plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.17 the acceptance of PCE001

REC.4.18 the amendment of the Proposals Map boundary to include the South Quay Area of Dock No.1 within the Waterfront, Barry Comprehensive Redevelopment Area and the residential settlement boundary of Barry;

REC.4.19 the consequential amendment of the reasoned justification to Policy HOUS1(1) to indicate that additional residential development will be promoted within this area before the end of the plan period.

B.2 Policy HOUS1(2) - Harbour Road Barry

Explanatory Note: The Council withdrew PCE003 and FPCE002 at the inquiry and objections made to this policy were withdrawn. I therefore make no recommendation.

B.3 Policy HOUS1(3) - Pencoedtre North East Barry

Explanatory Note: PCE004 makes clear that a water-main crosses the site which will require protective measures to be provided at the developer's expense. This adds clarity to the plan and satisfies objection 293.2 which was Conditionally Withdrawn.

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections

293.2

Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru

{Water-main at Pencoedtre, north east Barry.}

RECOMMENDATION:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.20 the acceptance of PCE005.

B.4 Policy HOUS1(7) - Penarth Haven, Penarth

Explanatory Note: PCE005 makes clear that the site lies within 250 metres of a landfill site and FPCE003 adds further clarity to the text of PCE005. FPCN003 and FPCN004 include the full extent of the boundary of the outline planning permission for redevelopment at Penarth Haven and rectify PCN003 and PCN004. All the objections made are satisfied.

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections

217.6 Cardiff Bay Development Corporation {Penarth Haven Comprehensive Redevelopment Area.}

Maintained Objections

247.3 Environment Agency {Proximity of site to landfill site.}

Proposed Change PCE005

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections

217.12 Cardiff Bay Development Corporation {Objection to revised last sentence of paragraph 4.4.18}

Maintained Objections

247.84 Environment Agency

Proposals Map

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections

217.4 Cardiff Bay Development Corporation {Penarth Haven Comprehensive Redevelopment Area.}

217.10 Cardiff Bay Development Corporation {extent of CDA}

217.11 Cardiff Bay Development Corporation {extent of CDA}

RECOMMENDATIONS:

I recommend that the plan be modified by

REC.4.21 the acceptance of PCE005 as amended by FPCE003.

REC.4.22 the acceptance of FPCN003 and FPCN004.

B.5 Policy HOUS1(8) - Cogan Hall Farm, Penarth

Maintained Objections

304.1	NCH Action for Children	{Walking distance of facilities for affordable housing at Cogan Hall Farm}
360.28	Friends of the Earth (Penarth Area)	{Cogan Hall Farm Development} Page 065
164.1	Kingston, Philip	

ISSUES:

B.5.1 Whether Policy HOUS1(8) and Paras. 4.4.20 - 4.4.26 should be redrafted to:

- (i) make reference to a playing field deficit;
- (ii) make reference to the lack of community facilities;
- (iii) to exclude the reference to extensions to Comeston Lakes Country Park; and
- (iv) to indicate the lack of consultation on the planning brief.

CONCLUSIONS:

Issue (i)

B.5.2 This matter is dealt with in the Recreation Chapter where I have concluded that the proposal made for the inclusion of some 8ha of playing fields in relation to this development would be inappropriate.

Issue (ii)

B.5.3 The Cogan Hall Farm development has the benefit of outline planning permission for residential and associated development. The Council in conjunction with the WDA Land Division has produced a development brief for the site. As part of this brief an area of land within the site has been identified for potential community use but the site in question does not form part of the Section 106 agreement and therefore technically has outline planning permission for residential purposes. There is therefore little that can be included within the plan that will ensure the provision of such community facilities as churches, a community hall, children's play area or a general store. The WDA have however indicated that they are prepared to make land available for a community use should such a need arise in the future.

Issue (iii)

B.5.4 Although an objector refers to the lack of consultation which has taken place on the extension of the Cosmeston Lakes Country Park, the Council point out that consultation took place on the outline planning application. This application has been determined and it is not appropriate to consider this matter further.

Issue (iv)

B.5.5 Outline planning permission has been granted by the Council. Consequent to any subsequent Section 106 agreement between the parties the adequacy of the planning brief for the site is a matter for the Council and the developer and not an appropriate matter for the plan. As such all other comments made by objectors have been overtaken by events. These matters include the need for such development, the possibility of chemical hazard, the location of cycleways and footpaths, the accessibility to schools and bus routes, and the diversion of affordable housing to the Harbour View site.

RECOMMENDATION:

REC.4.23 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

B.6 Policy HOUS1(10) - Redwood Close, Boverton

Explanatory Note: objections are made concerning the allocation of Site HOUS1(10) as a gypsy site. The objection is factually incorrect as the site is not allocated as a gypsy site but for housing purposes.

Maintained Objections

219.1	Lewis, E	
295.1	Insley, J	{Concerns over site being used by gypsies.}
296.1	Insley, P .T	{Concerns over site being used by gypsies.}

RECOMMENDATION:

REC.4.24 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

B.7 Policy HOUS1(12) - Cowbridge Road and The Saw Mill, Ystradowen

Explanatory Note: as the allocation site has planning permission and is being constructed objections 60.1, 161.2, 161.2 and 251.3 have been overtaken by events.

Supporting Representations

58.1	Edwards, R	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
60.2	Kipling, C.W.	{ Ystradowen boundary - support.}
62.1	Rees, Mr J	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
63.2	Zaslona, Mr A	{Ystradowen Boundary - support.}
64.2	Zaslona, Mrs S	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
65.1	Makemson, Susan E.	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
66.1	Burnham, Mr David	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
67.1	Smith, R.H. & J.J.	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
69.1	Yeats, Jason	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
70.1	Jenkins, T.S.	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
71.1	Jenkins, D.A.	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
72.2	Allen, D	{Ystradowen boundary support.}
73.1	Baldwin, Mr S.R.	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
74.1	Usher, C	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
75.1	Griffiths AJ	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
76.1	Bater, Mr & Mrs A.J.	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
77.1	Winstanley, S.A.	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
78.1	Cheeseman, C.A.	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
79.1	Spriggs, Constance	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
80.1	Mudd, Stephen	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
81.1	Rich, Tim	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
159.2	Penllyn Community Council	{Ystradowen boundary support.}
161.1	Jones, Victoria	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
162.1	Jones, Sean P	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
163.2	Skinner, Richard	{Ystradowen boundary support.}
163.3	Skinner, Richard	{Ystradowen boundary support.}
188.1	Gray, Mr & Mrs	{Ystradowen boundary support.}
237.42	Countryside Council for Wales	{Support for Policy HOUS 8}
270.29	Plaid Cymru	{Development pressure.}
280.2	TBI plc	{Support for Policy HOUS 08.}

Maintained Objections

60.1	Kipling, C.W.	{Omission of Highgrove development from map.}
161.2	Jones, Victoria	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
162.2	Jones, Sean P	{Ystradowen boundary - support.}
212.1	Jenkins, Messrs J S & D N	{Housing allocation at Ystradowen}
212.2	Jenkins, Messrs J S & D N	{Housing allocation at Ystradowen}
251.3	Fairfax J A	{Ydevelopment in stradowen}

ISSUES

B.7.1 Whether:

- (i) the allocated site should be extended to include 0.5ha of land which constitutes the remaining part of O.S. parcel 5371;
- (ii) criterion (iv) of Policy HOUS9 should be amended by adding the words “when appropriate and feasible” at its beginning.

CONCLUSIONS:

Issue (i)

B.7.2 The UDP Strategy seeks to concentrate development opportunities in the major urban areas of Barry, Penarth and Rhosneigr with emphasis placed on the development of three large brownfield sites. Policy HOUS1.12 allocates a 4.5ha site for housing in Ystradowen and constitutes the largest allocation outside the Strategy area. The allocated site has the benefit of planning permission. It is being developed in two parts and when completed will result in a significant expansion of the village.

B.7.3 I have previously concluded that the proposed settlement boundaries in the Rural Vale are

defined too strictly such that they would not cater for even the modest amount of development suggested would occur by windfall development. I have therefore recommended under a new Policy HOUS2, that favourable consideration should be given to ‘*small-scale*’ development which constitutes the ‘*rounding-off*’ of the edge of settlement boundaries. I have also recommended that ‘*small-scale rounding off*’ development should in the context of the Rural Vale constitute no more than 5 dwellings and be consistent with the provisions of Policy HOUS9. Development at Highgrove is omitted from the Proposals map as at the time of preparation of the plan it was fully committed and under construction.

B.7.4 The development of the objection site would not however fall within the above definition of “*small-scale rounding-off*” and does not represent “*infill*” development between the existing site and Wern Fawr bungalow in that it not a site that is enclosed or surrounded by existing development. “Wern Fawr” and its neighbour are clearly isolated dwellings in the countryside being separated from the Ystradowen settlement boundary by the objection site. Notwithstanding that the site is enclosed by existing hedges, the development of the objection site would compromise the provisions of Policy ENV1 and result in an unacceptable loss of open countryside.

B.7.5 Moreover, the Council indicates that the development of the site would result in the loss of Grade 3a agricultural land. Although the objector is doubtful that such classification is accurate, no evidence is adduced to support such a view other than reference to the size of the site. I am satisfied therefore that the Council’s evidence on this matter provides the best available to me. Consequently, and notwithstanding that the allocated site may well have involved the development of land of similar quality, I consider that the additional loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land adds weight to my view that this site should be protected from development.

Issue (ii)

B.7.6 My conclusions concerning Policy REC3 and Para.8.4.6 are relevant to this issue and I consider that the objectors concern about Policy HOUS9 is largely covered there. However, in terms of consistency, criterion (v) of Policy HOUS9 should be amended to read: “(v) *the provisions of Policy REC3 are met*”.

RECOMMENDATION:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.25 the amendment of criterion (v) of Policy HOUS9 to read:

“(v) *the provisions of Policy REC3 are met*”.

B.8 Policy HOUS1(13) - Rhose Point

Explanatory Note: PCE009 makes clear that the site lies within 250 metres of a landfill site. This satisfies objection 247.4. PCE008 rectifies a factual error and satisfies objection 57.2. PCN012 satisfies objection 57.1A.

Supporting Representations

57.3 Blue Circle Industries plc

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections

57.1A Blue Circle Industries plc

247.4 Environment Agency

{Proximity of site to landfill site.}

57.2 Blue Circle Industries Plc

{Para. 4.4.31- factual error.}

Proposed Change PCE009

Supporting Representations

247.63 Environment Agency

{Support for the Proposed Change}

RECOMMENDATION:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.26 the acceptance of PCE008 and PCE009.

B.9 Policy HOUS1(16) - Adjacent St.Michael's Church, Colwinston

Explanatory Note: The Council explain that the planning permission which is referred to in Para.4.4.37 expired in June 1989. The objection is therefore misconceived. PCE011 Adequately covers the omission of archaeological matters for this site under 174.8. Objection 174.8 also covers similar matters for sites HOUS1(9) and HOUS1(19) for which PCE006 and PCE012 are relevant.

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections

174.8	Glam/Gwent Archaeological Trust	{HOUS1 sites}
-------	---------------------------------	---------------

Maintained Objections

291.1	Colwinston Community Council	{Permission has not expired.}
-------	------------------------------	-------------------------------

Proposed Change PCE011

Supporting Representations

247.66	Environment Agency	{Support for the Proposed Change}
--------	--------------------	-----------------------------------

RECOMMENDATION:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.27 the acceptance of PCE006, PCE011and PCE012.

B.10 Policy HOUS1(17) - St.John's Well, St.Athan

Maintained Objections

6.1	Wright, Mr Robin H.	{Delete housing site at St.John's Well, St.Athan}
353.1	Thomas, Mr G	{Proposed extension to St. Athan settlement boundary.}
353.2	Thomas, Mr G	{Proposed extension to St. Athan settlement boundary.}

ISSUE:

B.10.1 Whether the site subject of Policy HOUS1(17) should:

- (i) be deleted from the plan, or;
- (ii) be extended to include adjacent land at “The Croft”, Higher End.

CONCLUSIONS:

Issue (i)

B.10.2 Site HOUS1(17) was first allocated for housing in the Draft Rural Vale Local Plan as part of a larger development site. After public consultation the Council resolved to reduce the size of the allocation to the 1.49ha it now comprises within the plan. The approved South Glamorgan Structure Plan identifies St Athan as a village where “*infilling and rounding off of the existing built up areas*” would be permitted. However the village is not within the Strategy area of the plan which now seeks to concentrate development opportunities in the urban areas of the Waterfront Strip from Penarth to Rhose.

B.10.3 The Council considers that the proposed allocation provides a logical “*rounding-off*” of a village which is identified in the plan as one of four rural villages suitable for such development and adds to the range and choice of allocated housing sites. The site is recognised however as having sewerage and drainage problems which would be required to be rectified prior to its development. No objection was made by the Highways department to an outline application considered and refused on prematurity grounds in 1995.

B.10.4 I am not convinced by the Council’s approach to this site, having regard to the fact it does not lie within the Strategy area. In my view the site, although considered to be a logical “*rounding-off*” of the village, would constitute a larger scale extension of the village into an area of open countryside than would normally be acceptable under the policies of the plan. Moreover, from experience at my site visits, the site, being located in very close proximity to the St Athan airfield, is subject to considerable intermittent noise. This taken together with the fact that no evidence is given to illustrate that the sewerage and drainage problems affecting the site can be satisfactorily and economically overcome I am not convinced that the site is suitable for allocation for housing.

B.10.5 In reaching such a conclusion I have taken into account the planning history of the site but consider that there is an overriding need to ensure that proposals made in the plan do not compromise its overall strategy. I have however given little weight to the argument concerned with the loss of wildlife habitat or to the fact that an open aspect is lost from the objector’s house. No evidence is adduced by the objector concerning the effect on wildlife. In terms of the effect on the open aspect of the objector’s house the planning system does not exist to protect the private interests of one person against the activities of another beyond ensuring the amenities enjoyed by occupiers, such as privacy and overlooking, are maintained.

Issue (ii)

B.10.6 The objection site is effectively two parcels of land comprising a paddock and part of the rear garden of “The Croft”. The southern parcel of land is adjacent and west of Site HOUS1(17) and both parcels have an open countryside character. The Council indicate that the open area of fields provides a “buffer” between the residential core of the village to the south and the Airfield. I agree with this view and also consider that Site HOUS1(17) also exhibits the same properties. I have

concluded above that I do not consider the allocation of Site HOUS1(17) should be progressed. For the same reasons I do not consider should it be extended to include either of the two parcels of land comprising the objection site.

RECOMMENDATION:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.28 the deletion of residential Site HOUS1(17) and the consequential amendment of the St Athan settlement boundary, but that no modification be made with respect of objections made by Objector 253

B.11 Policy HOUS1(20) - White Farm, Barry

Supporting Representations

82.2 Dodd, Mr C.C. {White farm - support.}

Conditionally Withdrawn Objections

293.3 Welsh Water-Dwr Cymru {White Farm}

Maintained Objections

8.2 Perkins, Mr Jason {White farm}
10.1 Jackson, E {White Farm}
14.1 Tuck, Vivienne {White Farm}
15.2 Ellis, Mr E {White Farm}
16.1 Ellis, Mrs A {White Farm}
20.1 Stephens, Carin {White Farm}
23.2 Jones, C. {White Farm}
25.1 Jenkins, Gladys {White Farm}
26.1 Bichard, Mr & Mrs A {White Farm}
27.1 Metcalfe, Alice. B {White Farm}
28.1 Cooper, {White Farm}
30.1 Moore, Ms A.M. {White Farm}
31.1 Jackson, Telfer {White Farm}
32.1 Jackson, V {White Farm}
33.5 Barry Town Council {White Farm}
35.2 Whitefarm Anti development {White Farm}
36.2 Allely, Verity {White Farm}
42.2 Frost, Mr & Mrs E. W {White Farm}
43.1 Van De Polder, Mrs {White Farm}
46.2 Butler, Julie {White Farm}
53.1 Germon, Lisa {White Farm}
84.2 Colcot Residents Association {White Farm}
85.1 Residents & Friends of Central Park {White Farm}
87.1 Neighbourhood Watch {White Farm}
88.2 Curtis, Rob {White Farm}
88.4 Curtis, Rob {White Farm}
89.1 Salter, Claire {White Farm}
90.1 White Farm Anti-Development Campaign {White Farm}
91.1 Archer, Mr K.J {White Farm}
116.4 Kavanagh, Ms J {White Farm}
117.2 Curtis, Peter {White Farm}
118.2 Curtis, Anthony {White Farm}
119.2 Woolcock, Allison {White Farm}
120.1 Allely, Jane {White Farm}
140.1 Bates, Joanne {White Farm}
143.1 Webber, Mr A.C.D {White Farm}
144.2 Webber, Mrs G.M. {White Farm}
145.2 Bennett, Mrs J {White Farm}
146.1 Jones, Mr G {White Farm}
147.1 White Farm Anti-Development Campaign {White Farm}
150.1 Mappedoram, Julian {White Farm}
151.2 Mappedoram, Angela {White Farm}
152.2 Mappedoram, Miss S {White Farm}
153.2 Mappedoram, Mrs Y {White Farm}
154.1 Evans, Ken {White Farm}
172.1 White Farm Anti-Development Campaign {White Farm}
177.1 Jackson, Neale {White Farm}
180.1 Bishop, Noel {White Farm}
197.1 Baker, Mrs D {White Farm}
198.1 Bounds, Mr D {White Farm}
200.1 Baker, Rhydian {White Farm}
201.1 Rhys-Tyler, Alan M {White Farm}
202.1 Twigg, Mrs M.E. {White Farm}
266.2 Bryan, Dr A M {White Farm}
270.28 Plaid Cymru {White Farm}
297.2 Lewis, Mr Keith {White Farm}
298.1 White Farm Anti Development {White Farm}
299.2 Bartlett, Sian {White Farm}
300.1 Watkins, Cllr A {White Farm}
301.2 Davy, Hilary {White Farm}
302.1 Yearsley, Helen {White Farm}
303.2 Cash, Olga {White Farm}
306.1 O'Grady, Mrs M {White Farm}
319.1 Stoneman, Mr Ian {White Farm}
321.1 Davies, James {White Farm}
323.1 Slack, Nigel {White Farm}

325.1	Beattie, Mr David	{White Farm}
326.2	Slack, Sy	{White Farm}
327.1	Harris, C.D & S	{White Farm}
328.1	Rowlands, Sylvia	{White Farm}
329.1	Edson, Janine	{White Farm}
330.1	Pastures Residents Association	{White Farm}

ISSUES:

B.11.1 Whether:

- (i) Policy HOUS1(20) should be deleted and allocated for recreational purposes.
- (ii) the Proposals Map should be amended to show the extent, if any, of land to be allocated for recreational purposes.

CONCLUSIONS:

Issue (i)

B.11.2 It is acknowledged by the Council that the site was originally designated for informal open space purposes in the adopted Barry Local Plan 1983 and the Vale of Glamorgan Local Plan Deposit Draft (as amended) 1985. However, a Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development (CAAD) was granted on part of the site in June 1994. An offer, (based on public open space land values) was submitted to the owners in late 1978 to acquire the 17.5 acres (7.1ha) but rejected. The Council is currently in negotiation with the owners to give effect to an outcome whereby some element of residential development will be accepted in exchange for the remainder being transferred as informal open space. Given the fact that the CAAD exists, and that the Council is involved in such negotiations, it is unrealistic to expect that the whole site could remain in recreational use or designated as a Green Wedge.

B.11.3 The objectors' many concerns about the development of the site would be covered by the fact that any such development would need to comply with all of the criteria set out in Policy HOUS9. The Council for its part does not put forward any evidence to indicate that such criteria could not be complied with. I am, therefore, satisfied that site HOUS1(20) is suitable for housing and recreation use. I am also of the view that should the negotiations between the Council be brought to a conclusion that there is a reasonable prospect that the site would be developed within the plan period. Consequently, I see no reason why the extent of the housing allocation should not counted as part of the contribution the plan makes to the overall housing supply.

Issue (ii)

B.11.4 It was clear to me at the inquiry that the negotiations between the parties concerning the proportion of housing and recreational use on the site had reached an impasse. In that I consider it to be necessary for the plan to give clear indication about the capacity of sites within it, I consider such an impasse requires to be overcome. Council officers at the inquiry could give no indication as to what the Council would consider to be an acceptable proportional split and as such I have had regard to the illustrative draft master plan put forward on behalf of the owner of White Farm.

B.11.5 Although this draft plan includes proposals for land owned by the Council I consider that it illustrates well how such a split between residential and recreational use could be obtained on the site. It takes into account well the steep contours that exist on parts of the site, whilst at the same time ensuring that a significant proportion of the site could be retained in informal recreation use.

B.11.6 Moreover, in that the major part of the recreational area would follow the line of Cold Brook and Footpath 18, the setting of the Grade B Listed Church of St Dyfan and St Teilo would be preserved and enhanced. Consequently I conclude that the proportional split of recreational use and housing land should be specified in the plan based on the illustrative plan submitted to the inquiry (ID142) and that some 12.8 acres (5.2ha) of housing land allocated within the plan. Such land could accommodate of the order of 130 dwellings at a density of 25 dwellings per hectare. The remaining 7.4 acres (3.1ha) to be identified as informal open space.

RECOMMENDATION:

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.29 the inclusion of some 5.2ha of the White Farm site as housing land within the housing allocations of the plan is identified on the illustrative plan submitted (ID142). The remaining 7.4acres (3.1ha) to be identified as informal open space.

PART C - Site Specific Matters

Explanatory Note: My conclusions on all site specific matters have to be read with my conclusions and recommendations concerning “The Strategy” at Chapter 1 and “The Environment and Housing Policies” at Chapter 2. These sections cover the non-site specific matters that have been raised by objectors concerning the general housing allocation and associated matters made within the plan.

For purposes of clarity I have dealt with the Site Specific Matters on a settlement basis in alphabetical order.

Objections made to the inclusion of land at Culverhouse Cross under Policy ENV3 are dealt with in conjunction with my considerations of Policy EMP1(20) in Chapter 5.

C1 Aberthin - Court Farm

Maintained Objections

171.1

Mrs J Rawlings

{Policy HOUS2 -Aberthin Village Boundary}

ISSUE

C1.1 Whether land at Court Farm should be included within the Aberthin residential settlement boundary

CONCLUSIONS:

C1.2 I have concluded previously that favourable consideration should 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 (i). Small-scale development is to be defined as no more than five dwellings.

C1.3 From observation at my site visit it was clear to me Aberthin has a clear and well defined settlement boundary adjacent to the objection site which clearly delineates between the settlement and open countryside. The development of the objection site rather than involving a “*small-scale rounding-off*” of the settlement boundary would result in a large-scale extension of it into the open countryside. Any resulting development of the site would, in terms of its form, scale and character, be unsympathetic to the general open environs of the site and, as such, is unacceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.30 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C2 Barry

C2.0 General

C2.0.1 The strategy embodied within the plan seeks to maximise the opportunities for residential, employment, retail and leisure development within the urban areas of the Waterfront Strip. Barry lies within the Waterfront Strip. By far the greater proportion of allocated development sites are located within this area where with limited public investment they can be served by public transport. It is also significant that approximately 55% of these allocations are on brownfield sites and particular emphasis has been given to the regeneration of Barry Docks.

C2.0.2 Although I have concluded that there is a need for the further allocation of housing sites within the plan, I have also recommended that land to the north and east of Barry should be designated as Green Belt. In my view, the openness of this area is clearly under considerable pressure for development as a result of accessibility to the major employment areas of Cardiff. The importance of ensuring that coalescence between the settlements of Barry, Dinas Powys, Penarth and Sully is avoided has long been recognised. Consequently, any further housing development proposals for Barry should be considered against the need to protect this area from major and inappropriate development.

C2.1 Barry - Highlight Farm/North of Waycock Cross

Maintained Objections

192.7	Persimmon Homes (Wales) Ltd.	{Non allocation of land at west Barry under Policy Hous 01.}
-------	------------------------------	---

ISSUE

C2.1.1 Whether land at Highlight Farm/north of Waycock Cross should be allocated within the plan for housing.

CONCLUSIONS:

C2.1.2 Notwithstanding that I have concluded that there is a need for the further allocation of housing sites within the plan, I have also previously recommended that land to the north of Barry should be designated as Green Belt. The objection site is located within this area.

C2.1.3 The objection site comprises about 3ha of undeveloped countryside. The south eastern part of the site slopes away to the north west to a stream course crossing the site, beyond which the land rises towards prominent wooded and hedge-lined higher ground and the existing adjacent housing development of Highlight Park to the north.

C2.1.4 The urban area of Barry, with the exception of the Highlight Park development, is well contained to the south of the Waycock Valley ridge line. 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. Such development would not only be divorced from the main urban area of Barry, it would involve a major incursion into an area of open countryside and landscape that I consider demands long term protection from development.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.31 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C2.2 Barry - Highlight Farm/ Highlight Lane

Maintained Objections

343.1	Lakin, Mr C	{Proposed extension to north west settlement limit of Barry.}
-------	-------------	---

ISSUE

C2.2.1 Whether land at Highlight Farm, Highlight Lane should be included within the Barry residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C2.2.3 The objection site comprises an area of land and buildings located on the north western fringes of Barry within the area I consider should be designated as Green Belt. The site comprises the original farmhouse which is no longer in agricultural use, redundant farm buildings which benefit from planning permission for conversion to residential use, a redundant filter bed site and an undeveloped frontage to Lakin Drive/Highlight Lane which has the benefit of planning permission for residential development. In my view this development, which is located immediately adjacent to the residential settlement boundary lies within the recognisable limits of this part of Barry.

C2.2.4 In reaching this conclusion I have taken into account that the settlement boundary in the plan is consistent with that included within previous plans and that the area to the north of Highlight Park is subject to development pressures. However, the redefinition of the boundary in this location would make absolutely clear the demarcation between the urban area of Barry and the open countryside.

C2.2.5 I recognise also that the development of the area for residential purposes would involve some consolidation of the built development in the locality. However, given its location immediately adjacent to the existing residential development at Highlight Park and below that existing in Lakin Drive, I consider its impact on the landscape of the Waycock Valley would be minimal. A sensitively designed scheme taking the form, scale and character of the existing farmhouse and barns could constitute a development providing an appropriate and pleasant transition between the urban area of Barry and the countryside.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified:

REC.4.32 to include land at Highlight Farm, Highlight Lane within the Barry residential settlement boundary.

C2.3 Barry - Land to the North of Pleasant View

Maintained Objections

311.1	Gibbons, Mr P	{Development outside settlement boundary.}
311.2	Gibbons, Mr P	{Development outside settlement boundary.}

ISSUE

C2.3.1 Whether land to the north of Pleasant View should be included within the Barry Settlement Boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C2.3.2 I have previously recommended that residential settlement boundaries should include residential curtilages. I have also recommended that land to the north of Barry, within which this proposal is located, should be designated as Green Belt. Whilst I am in agreement with the conclusion of another Inspector, Appeal Ref.A/99/513186/T, that, on paper, there is some justification that the proposed extension of the settlement boundary might represent a “rounding-off” of the settlement boundary the situation on the ground illustrates a different position. Consequently, I am also in agreement with that Inspector’s view that, with the exception of the existing garage in its eastern corner, the objection site and its possible extension, together with the remainder of the field of which they form part are within open countryside.

C2.3.3 The objection site is located close to crest of a ridge which falls away quite steeply to form the south east side of the wide Nant Brynhill valley. Consequently, I am of the same view as the previous Inspector that development on the site would unacceptably consolidate the residential framework in the area to the detriment of the setting of the town and the rural character of the Nant Brynhill valley. Development of the site would, as a consequence, be unsympathetic to the general open environs of the site and contrary to the provisions of Policy HOUS9(i). As such I consider the residential settlement boundary as defined by the Council on the objection site to be justified.

C2.3.4 In reaching this conclusion I have had regard to the fact that the detailed design, orientation and siting of a new dwelling on the objection site would not lead to unreasonable loss of privacy and amenity to the occupiers of existing dwellings fronting Port Road East or Pleasant View. However such matters cannot override the harm that would be caused to the openness of the area.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.33 the inclusion of the garage in the eastern corner of the site within the settlement boundary.

C2.4 Barry-Merthyr Dyfan

Maintained Objections

281.1 The Representative Body of The Church in Wales { Merthyr Dyfan, proposed for housing.}

ISSUE

C2.4.1 Whether land at Merthyr Dyfan should be allocated for residential purposes.

CONCLUSIONS:

C2.4.2 I have not accepted that the Council has illustrated that there is no need for the further allocation of housing sites within the plan. However, notwithstanding that the site lies within the residential settlement boundary of Barry, where residential development is considered acceptable, it is clear that there are good reasons why such development should not be allocated on this site.

C2.4.3 The objection site adjoins the Church of St Dyfan and St Teilo which is Listed Grade II* and forms an important greenfield setting for the building. Development on the site would undoubtedly unacceptably impact on the greenfield setting of the Grade II* Listed Building and be unsympathetic to the general open environs of the site. Such development would be contrary to the provisions of Policies ENV15 and HOUS9(i) which are in this case overriding. Whilst the Council also point to the unacceptable effect of such an allocation on Policies ENV16, ENV17 and ENV22, no reasons are set out which I can take into account.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.34 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C2.5 Barry - Palmersvale Business Centre

Maintained Objections

223.1	Grenville Estates
223.2	Grenville Estates

ISSUE

C2.5.1 Whether land at Palmersvale Business centre should be allocated for residential purposes.

CONCLUSIONS:

C2.5.2 The objection site lies within the Plan's strategy area and it is not disputed by the Council that the site is physically capable of being developed for housing. It is allocated within the plan as an employment site under Policy EMP1 to cater only for B1 and B8 use that is constrained and unsuitable for general industrial development because of its location adjoining existing residential development. I noted at my site visit that a large unit was being constructed on the northern part of the site.

C2.5.3 The Council, whilst being dismissive of the objector's conclusion that there is a range of employment sites available for potential developers, does not itself point to any evidence of supply and demand. The employment topic paper however indicates that the rate of take up of employment land in the Vale of Glamorgan has been of the order of 6.8ha per annum over an 18 year period. Such a rate would indicate a requirement of 102ha for the plan period as against the 160ha allocated in the plan.

C2.5.4 Whilst the objector points to the marketing difficulties associated with the site I am unable to give much weight to this matter as there is little verifiable evidence of the difficulties indicated. The Council put forward the view that three other factors should be borne in mind when considering such provision. These involve, the fact that there should be sufficient range and choice, that opportunity for major expansion is now limited and that the majority of the allocations have planning permission. These factors do not overcome the fact that there is a considerable allocation of employment land within the plan and that the loss of the objection site would have marginal effect on the provisions made in the plan for employment.

C2.5.5 The appropriate use for this site should be determined taking into account the fact that the site is bounded to the south and west by residential development. Notwithstanding that an industrial unit has been constructed on the northern part of the site, I consider that the remaining triangular site could more suitably be allocated for residential use than for employment purposes. Given suitable attention to the design of its northern boundary with the existing employment uses such residential use could contribute to residential regeneration of this locality in the provision of about 20 dwellings.

C2.5.6 However, from my consideration of objection 283.1, it seems likely that part of the objection site lies within the edge of the Public Information Zone (PIZ) of the Barry Chemical Works which is a notifiable installation designated by the Health and Safety Executive. Should this be found to be the case, and although a matter not referred to by the Council in its evidence, then whilst such notifiable installations are subject to stringent controls it would be prudent for my conclusions to take account of such a situation. Clearly in such a case the allocation of the site for residential use would not be consistent with the need to ensure that development is not permitted adjacent to industrial or other establishments which is likely to cause unacceptable pollution or hazards to users of the development. In such a situation my conclusions above would be overridden and the site allocated more appropriately for employment use.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified:

REC.4.35 subject to the further consideration of the effect of the Public Information Zone of the Barry Chemical Works, by the allocation of the undeveloped part of the objection site for residential purposes under Policy HOUS1.

C2.6 Barry - Pencoedtre, North East Barry

Explanatory Note : In that this site is allocated in the plan as a Special Employment Site under Policy EMP2, objections made involving matters concerning this site, including the reallocation of the site for housing and the extent of a buffer zone, are dealt with under that heading in Chapter 5.

For the reasons I have set out there I have recommended that the plan should be modified by the re-allocation of the Pencoedtre Special Employment Site for about 7ha of mixed housing land under Policy HOUS1 and about 7ha of Class B1 and B8 employment use under Policy EMP1, details to be considered as part of a revised development brief for the area;

C2.7 Barry- Land to the north of Port Road

Maintained Objections

38.1	Robinson, Mr Graham	{Barry Settlement Boundary}
38.2	Robinson, Mr Graham	{Barry Settlement Boundary}
131.1	Robinson, Mr D. A.	
305.1	Robinson, Clifford	{Opportunity for low density executive housing accomodation.}
309.1	Bird, Mr Jonathan	{Amendment to Barry settlement boundary (north of Port Rd to golf range).}
269.1	James, Mr David Wilmor	{Sport/Leisure Consent at north Barry}

ISSUE

C2.7.1 Whether land to the north of Port Road should be included within the Barry residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C2.7.2 I have previously recommended that land to the north of Barry within which the objection site is located should be designated as Green Belt. It lies within an area which the document “*Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan*” describes as the “*Wenvoe Environs*” area where the aims of this area are “*to retain the area as a natural buffer between Cardiff and Barry*”. Although this document can be given little weight it nevertheless defines a suitable and appropriate aim for the area.

C2.7.3 The site is consists mainly of trees covered by two Tree Preservation Orders and scrub and there exist on the site concrete floor slabs from a war time army camp. It is clearly within open countryside and should be preserved as such notwithstanding that it is likely to have little use for agriculture. I have had regard to the planning history of the site, and the Council’s view that Policies ENV1, EMP9, TOUR4, TOUR5 and REC8 could still be applicable to this location. However, any major built development on the site would clearly represent an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside where its openness would be affected. The site is bounded to the south by the A4050(Port Road East) which forms a logical and defensible boundary to the Barry urban area.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.36 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C2.8 Barry- Port Road/Five Mile Lane

Maintained Objections

54.1	Boland, Mark
54.2	Boland, Mark
54.3	Boland, Mark

ISSUE

C2.8.1 Whether land at the corner of Port Road and Five Mile Lane should be identified on the plan as a development site.

CONCLUSIONS:

C2.8.2 The Welsh Office granted planning permission for the construction of a motel and petrol filling station in 1965. The consent for the development was renewed in 1974 and as a result of a specified operation being conducted on the site the consent remains extant.

C2.8.3 Although the status of the objection site is not disputed, the purpose of the Proposals Map is not to act as a marketing document for all sites with extant planning permissions but to identify policies and proposals contained within the plan. The site is located to the north of Port Road which forms the natural boundary for Barry at this point. The site is therefore more appropriately considered as countryside under the terms of the plan.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.37 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C2.9 Barry - Ty Verlons

Maintained Objections

283.1 BG plc Property Division {Settlement boundary for Barry.}

ISSUE

C2.9.1 Whether land at Ty Verlons should be included within the Barry residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C2.9.2 The Council indicates that the residential settlement boundary of south-east Barry has been drawn to exclude any land that is not currently in residential use to minimise any potential conflict between residential and employment uses. The objection site lies within Public Information Zone (PIZ) of the Barry Chemical Works which is a notifiable installation designated by the Health and Safety Executive. Whilst such notifiable installations are subject to stringent controls, the allocation of the site for residential use is not consistent with the need to ensure that development is not permitted adjacent to industrial or other establishments which are likely to cause unacceptable pollution or hazards to users of the development. Such a factor is overriding.

C2.9.3 The objection site covers 1.56ha and comprises an operational gas-holder and field used for horse grazing. The site is bounded to the north by a supermarket, Ty Verlon Industrial estate and a petrol filling station to the east and beyond Cardiff Road to the south is the Barry chemical complex. To the west the site abuts the Barry residential settlement boundary formed by the dwellings in Laura Street. Consequently the Council's view that the open area of the objection site is countryside under the provisions of Policy ENV1 is illogical and illustrates a significant deficiency in the plan. Moreover, in that the Council make reference to the suitability of the area to accommodate employment uses under Policy EMP3, I note that this policy, under the provisions of criterion (i), excludes, except for rural uses acceptable under Policy ENV7(Rural Buildings), consideration of sites within the countryside.

C2.9.4 Whilst the large industrial area adjacent to the objection site is distinct and separate from the residential settlement boundary, such an area is clearly part of the urban area of Barry and the plan should recognise that fact. The Council indicates that the objection site is better related to these employment uses than the residential area. In that the site lies within the PIZ, I agree with the Council but consider the plan should reflect this situation. The boundaries of major existing employment areas should be delineated on the plan where reference to Policy EMP3 could be made explicit. The whole of the objection site should be included within this definition and, as such, should the area become surplus to requirements certainty would be given by the plan concerning the acceptability of alternative development.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified:

REC.4.38 to identify major existing employment areas on the Proposals Map and that such areas be referenced to Policy EMP3.

C2.10 Barry - Land to the rear of St James Crescent

Explanatory Note : I consider here two objections which cover two overlapping sites. In that the issues involved are essentially the same, my conclusions deal with them together.

Maintained Objections

92.1	Trustees of the Romilly Estate	
126.12	Bellway Estates	{Barry - additional residential allocations.}
126.13	Bellway Estates	{Barry settlement boundary.}

ISSUE

C2.10.1 Whether land to the rear of St James Crescent should be allocated in the plan for housing purposes.

CONCLUSIONS:

C2.10.2 I have not accepted, for the reasons I set out in Chapter 1, that the Council has adequately justified that there is no need for the further allocation of housing sites within the plan. However, whilst the objectors consider that the development of the 4ha objection site is a logical “rounding-off” of the urban area of Barry, in my view it would constitute a significant and unwarranted extension of development into the rural landscape.

C2.10.3 At present there is a clear visual break along the A4226 between the urban area of Barry and the countryside at the Waycock Cross roundabout. The development of either of the objection sites would involve the development of a significant part of the open frontage of the A4226 between the roundabout and the Cwn Ciddy Motel. Concerning the smaller site, the objector points to the hedge on the western boundary as being a clear and defensible boundary. I do not share this view in that this hedge simply separates one field from another yet both have a similar open agricultural character. The development of the objection site would only serve to bring the agricultural land to the west of the site under pressure for development.

C2.10.3 The objectors point to the constraints imposed by the Coastal Zone, the railway line and Porthkerry Country Park and considers the site represents the final opportunity for any extension of Barry on its western edge. I accept that this is the case and, given that I have proposed the designation of a green belt to the northern and eastern boundaries of Barry, I also consider expansion to the west provides the only reasonable opportunity for the longer-term growth of the town if coalescence with other settlements of the Eastern Vale is to be avoided.

C2.10.4 However, the need for such longer-term growth is not for consideration within this plan. Moreover, given that a considerable number of housing sites are already proposed for Barry within the plan period, there is no good reason for me to recommend development of this greenfield site. For the purposes of this plan I consider the residential settlement boundary to be correctly drawn tightly to the existing residential edge of the town and I have proposed the inclusion of this area within a Green Wedge.

C2.10.5 The Council has expressed strong reservations with regard to the schematic access proposal put forward by the objectors. This is a matter which would need consideration at the planning application stage and, as such, I have not taken this matter into account in formulating my recommendations on this site.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.39 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C3 Bonvilston - Land between The Village Hall and Church Cottage

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on these objections have to be taken together with my conclusions set out in Chapter 3 above concerning general matters involving the delineation of residential settlement boundaries and Chapter 1 which considers the housing requirement.

Maintained Objections

203.2	William Johns-Powell Settlement Trust	{Proposed housing at Bonvilston}
203.3	William Johns-Powell Settlement Trust	{Additional residential development}
203.4	William Johns-Powell Settlement Trust	{Bonvilston settlement boundary}
213.3	Wm. Powell & Sons Ltd.	{Settlement boundary for Bonvilston}

ISSUE

C3.1 Whether land between the Village Hall and Church Cottage should be included within the Bonvilston residential settlement boundary and allocated for housing.

CONCLUSIONS:

C3.2 The objection site is located on the south-western fringe of Bonvilston and is an area, 0.48ha, of agricultural land which has a frontage to the southern side of the A48 road and lies between Church Cottage to the east and the village hall to the west. It lies within the Bonvilston Conservation Area and the village is correctly described within SPG “*Conservation Areas in the Rural Vale*” as: “... a loose knit, but continuous line of houses and boundary walls set along the A48”.

C3.3 A previous Inspector concluded, when dismissing an appeal on this site in May 1999, that: “... The edges of the Conservation Area include fields and rural gaps, farmland and open countryside, which also form part of its traditional character. The appeal site is a significant gap on the edge of the village which contributes to its character and provides essential views of its rural and agricultural surroundings. Regardless of the quality of design of the scheme, the result of this proposed development would be the urbanisation of a rural frontage of this historic settlement. which would inevitably have an adverse visual impact upon the setting of the nearest listed building.”

C3.4 I agree with the Inspector’s conclusions in that case and consider them similarly applicable in my confirmation of the Council’s delineation of the Bonvilston residential settlement boundary which excludes the objection site. Development of this site would, apart from being unnecessary to meet the plan’s housing requirement, unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This reason alone is sufficient for me to conclude that this land should remain as countryside and its development for housing resisted.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.40 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C4 Broughton

Maintained Objections
258.1

Evans, Mr & Mrs H

{Modification of Broughton settlement boundary.}

ISSUE

C4.1 Whether the Broughton residential settlement boundary to the west side of Broughton should be amended to reflect a more logical line

CONCLUSIONS:

C4.2 I have previously concluded that the Council has attributed a wider than necessary policy basis to the definition of residential settlement boundaries, which not only lacks reasoning in the plan but is also unjustified. The Council indicate that the settlement boundary for Broughton has three purposes. These purposes are not set out in the plan but are all covered by other policies of the plan.

C4.3 Planning permission exists for the conversion of four outbuildings to residential use and an appeal has been allowed for the erection of a dwelling on the objection site. Despite this planning history the Council indicate that it still maintains its view that the site should remain outside the settlement boundary. In the Council's view the inclusion of the objection site could result in proposals for further intensive residential redevelopment of this prominent site. I do not share the Council's view and agree with the previous Inspector who concluded: *"...as a definition of the development limits of the village, I find the Local Plan settlement boundary to be out of date and misleading"*.

C4.4 Moreover, I am not of the view that the inclusion of the residential curtilages on the objection site within the residential settlement boundary would imply that residential development on this land would be acceptable. The areas involved are all included within the Monknash Conservation Area where the effect of any proposal on its character and appearance would and should override any settlement boundary consideration under the provisions of Policy HOUS9(iii). Similarly it is not the function of residential settlement boundaries to override any other objective of the plan such as, for example, objective 5 Para 4.3.1 which concerns urban sprawl and sporadic housing in the countryside and the policies covering The Heritage Coast. In my view policy for the Heritage Coast would also be adequately covered by the landscape provisions of Policy HOUS9(iii).

C4.5 Consequently, I consider the Council's approach to residential settlement boundaries is misplaced and confused and denies the existence of the many important development control policies in the plan. As I have concluded earlier in my report, residential settlement boundaries should have only the one function, which is to determine the relationship of individual settlements to the countryside. As a result I am sympathetic to objections made that the settlement boundaries should be amended to reflect the existing residential development and its curtilages. Consequently, I consider that the objector's proposed amendment to the Broughton residential settlement boundary is justified and that the plan should be amended in so far as only existing and previously allowed residential curtilages are included.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified:

REC.4.41 to include existing and previously allowed residential curtilages within the Broughton residential settlement boundary.

C5 Colwinston

Maintained Objections
17.2

Thomas, Mr G.R

{Colwinston Settlement Boundary}

ISSUE

C5.1 Whether land to the north of St David's Church Primary School should be included within the Colwinston residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C5.2 The objection site consists of a small field enclosure located between the Primary School and the Maes-y-Bryn housing development and comprises about 0.16ha.. The landscape of the objection site is open and characterised by a natural environment that contributes to the rural nature of the village. It is an area which, as a previous Inspector has concluded in dismissing an appeal on this site, has: *"far more in common with...open countryside...and is.. part of the open rural setting of the village and not part of the built up area itself"*.

C5.3 Moreover, the site provides a natural gap between the main residential part of the village and houses that constitute a physically separate ribbon of houses within open countryside. The further consolidation of this ribbon of development by built development would not only result in a loss of openness but would unacceptably affect the rural character and appearance of the village. As such I do not consider that its development would constitute either acceptable *"infill"* or *"small-scale rounding-off"* under the provisions of the policies of the plan as I have recommended should be modified. Consequently I find no reason to recommend the inclusion of this site within the residential settlement boundary of Colwinston.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.42 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C6 Corntown - Land adjacent to Corntown Court

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be read together with my conclusions above concerning general matters involving the delineation of residential settlement boundaries and concerning the delineation of Green Wedges.

Maintained Objections
351.2

Ryan, Mr P

{Proposed extension to Corntown settlement boundary.}

ISSUE

C6.1 Whether land adjacent to Corntown Court should be excluded from the South of Bridgend Green Wedge and included within the Corntown residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C6.2 The objection site comprises approximately 0.61ha of agricultural land and is located at the north-eastern extremity of Corntown which is a village having only a limited number of facilities for residents. It is located, under Policy ENV3, within the “*South of Bridgend Green Wedge*” which I have concluded should have the single function of preventing urban coalescence.

C6.3 The objector refers to the fact that the land in question was associated with Corntown Court, which is a Grade 2 Listed Building, and had apparently been used as an orchard. The Council indicate that whilst the western section of the objection site was formerly included within the curtilage of Corntown Court the eastern section was and still remains as agricultural land. However, it was clear to me at my site visit that the residential curtilage of Corntown House has now been clearly defined by a fence which extends beyond the defined settlement boundary. This residential curtilage clearly forms part of the open setting of Corntown Court and seemingly constitutes a small part of the objection site. In my view this area should be included within the residential settlement boundary of Corntown and excluded from the Green Wedge.

C6.4 The major part of the objection site is however clearly related to the open countryside and the cul-de-sac on located to the south forms the clear boundary between it and the village of Corntown. A previous Local Plan Inspector concluded with regard to this area that: “*This village is very much a linear village, with little development in depth. Certainly, development is deeper at this eastern end of the village, but I see no reason for a substantial extension of the built-up area into the adjoining area of the green Wedge.*” I find no reason to conclude otherwise in this case, as I consider the development of the objection site would significantly extend this part of the village to the north.

C6.5 This area is an integral part of the Ogmere/Ewenny Valley landscape and is covered by the Green Wedge designation where the protection of the area from development is essential. The development of the objection site would result in the unacceptable loss of the openness of the countryside between Corntown and Bridgend, notwithstanding that the site is bounded by hedges and an unkempt area of the recreation ground to the east. Such development would also clearly increase the potential for coalescence to occur between these two settlements.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.43 the Corntown residential settlement boundary being amended to include the residential curtilage of Corntown Court.

C7 Cowbridge

C7.0. General

C7.0.1 Cowbridge is a substantial free-standing settlement serving an extensive rural hinterland and contains a good range of shops, commercial and community facilities. It is the second largest settlement in the rural Vale after Llantwit Major and has an estimated population of about 3760 in the town and 6,100 within the administrative ward. However, its character, when compared to Llantwit Major, is that of a small town rather than a large village and its town centre illustrated to me a greater degree of vitality than was evident at Llantwit Major. The town has bus-based public transport links to adjoining main centres and a network of services link the town with outlying rural settlements.

C7.0.2 Considerable expansion of Cowbridge took place in the 1960's and 1970's as a result of which the population of the town doubled. Since that time the pace of development has slowed considerably. Between 1982 and 1999 some 344 dwellings have been completed and occupied and at April 1999 only 22 remained to be developed. The Council accept that the supply on larger sites, i.e. over ten dwellings, has diminished in recent years. That points to the fact that a consistent number of windfall and conversions have contributed to the supply over the period. I note also that the Council's most recent Housing Monitoring records show that there are only 17 units which have the benefit of planning permission. The fact that there are also some 27 units with expired planning permission is not a convincing argument of adequate supply. The fact that these consents have been allowed to expire calls their viability, and therefore their relevance, into question. This is particularly so where new housing market demand appears to be strong.

C7.0.3 Of the 344 dwellings constructed some 239 have been built on sites of over ten dwellings leaving 105 being provided on lesser sites in the 18 years since 1982. This indicates that an average of less than 6 sites per annum were being brought forward each year. Over the last three years only some 10 dwellings have been completed on sites of under ten dwellings. 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, I consider that further housing provision should be made for Cowbridge within the plan period.

C7.0.4 Whilst the town does not have a significant employment base, the 1991 census Workplace data indicated that some 54% of economically active residents worked in the Rural Vale followed by Cardiff (23%) and Bridgend (6%). Clearly therefore residents of Cowbridge will continue to rely on the major centres of Cardiff and Bridgend for a large part of their job opportunities and major services. However, in that Cowbridge still constitutes the major service centre in the Rural Vale, the demand for housing is likely to remain high. Such demand for housing would also be strengthened by the likely continued growth of employment at Llandow.

C7.0.5 At Llandow, the Vale Business Park and the adjoining Llandow Trading Estate represent one of the principal employment locations in the plan area. Together they cover about 60ha and have been progressively developed over a recent years for a variety of B1, B2 and B8 activities. No residential developments are proposed at Llandow and I have concluded elsewhere that a new village associated with this development would not be consistent with the plan's overall strategy. Consequently, the closest settlements that currently provide sufficient shopping, leisure and public transport facilities to accommodate the residential needs of such an employment centre are Llantwit Major and Cowbridge. However, both these two settlements, and the villages between, will undoubtedly experience additional pressure for residential development associated with the large-scale employment growth being promoted at Llandow.

C7.0.6 Additional commuting caused by the Llandow employment development is inevitable and if it is to be minimised then either one or other or both of these settlements should help relieve the development pressure caused. Although Llantwit Major is larger and in closer proximity to Llandow than Cowbridge, its character still remains that of an extended village where the need to preserve or enhance its core conservation areas require that only limited further development be allowed.

Conversely, in that Cowbridge already has the character of a small country town and a public transport system which serves the rural villages, I consider that some limited development is not only possible but desirable if it is to maintain its important service function in the Rural Vale.

C7.0.7 The Council allocates only two small housing sites in Cowbridge under Policy HOUS1, which cater for only 12 dwellings in total. I have already concluded that, as far as the Rural Vale is concerned, that the policies of the plan are too restrictive. I have also concluded that small sites should be excluded from the plan's allocations and left as windfall. The plan provides no reasonable allocation 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.

C7.1 Cowbridge - Darren Farm

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Cowbridge.

Maintained Objections

126.2	Bellway Estates	{Cowbridge housing}
126.3	Bellway Estates	{Cowbridge housing}

ISSUE

C7.1.1 Whether, having regard to the form and landscape setting of Cowbridge and the effect on traffic at Llysworney, land at Darren Farm should be allocated for housing.

CONCLUSIONS:

C7.1.2 The objection site comprises land measuring some 37ha abutting the western edge of the urban area of Cowbridge. It is bounded to the north by the A48, to the south east by the B4270 Llantwit Major Road, to the east by residential development at Darren Close and to the west by Llantfrynach Lane. Of the 37ha the objector indicates that some 5.8ha of the site presents an opportunity for housing development of approximately 145 dwellings to include also the provision of informal open space linked to the town centre via an existing footpath. To the west, the housing and open space would be bounded by an access road which would provide a new road link between the A48 and the B4270. Matters concerned with landscape, archaeology, agricultural land and the implications of a link road between the A48 and the B4270 are material to the consideration of this site.

Landscape

C7.1.3 Although the Council point to the Landscape Study “*Landscapes Working for the Vale of Glamorgan 1999*”, whilst this provides useful guidance is not included within the plan and has not been subject to public consultation. However, the objection site is not included, either within the landscape study or within any former designated areas of special landscape value or importance. Within the landscape study, the objection site lies within Area No.7 known as the Colwinston Lias Plateau and it is significant that matters of a visual, geological and vegetation nature within this area are described as being of modest value only.

C7.1.4 Whilst the landscape study refers to the land either side of the A48 corridor and the need to manage and incorporate aspects of design along its length, this can be given little weight as no decisions have yet been taken by the Council about its intention to implement such matters. However, in that specific reference is made to the need for additional tree planting along the Cowbridge by-pass, such tree planting could be provided adjacent to the objection site as part of any proposed development.

C7.1.5 Although reference is also made within the study to the Colwinston Lias Plateau as having a role as the western setting for Cowbridge it does not specifically refer to the objection site. When approaching from the west along the A48 I observed that site lies mainly behind the high roadside hedges where development would not be clearly seen. From this direction the main view is that formed by the town’s eastern edge which is set against high ground beyond the town centre. From the east, when approaching Cowbridge along the A48, it would be seen only in the long distance between the high ground of Llanblethian Hill and Penllyn Castle and as a small extension of the existing harsh urban edge of the town with the rural area still evident beyond it.

C7.1.6 Closer to the objection site, when viewed from the B4270, the visual impact of the site would be greater in that its existing landscape is generally lacking in landscape features exposing the visually harsh urban edge of the town formed by the properties in Darren Close. However,

development of the part of the objection site enclosed by the proposed new access and link road could enable a long term strengthening of the landscape of the area associated with the provision of a substantial area of open space. Moreover the line of the link road would itself provide a defensible edge to Cowbridge which could be reinforced by planting both along it and within the remaining area of the objection site to the west. Such planting would also help to enhance the setting of the Church of St.Brynach. Planting along the A48 could also reinforce the line of the Old Roman Road whilst at the same time reduce the effect of its harsh line and lighting. Having regard to the above I conclude that there are no overriding landscape constraints to the development of the part of the objection site enclosed by the proposed access road.

Archaeology

C7.1.7 Although a study undertaken by the Glamorgan-Gwent Archaeological Trust involved the consideration of two areas on the objection site it concluded: *“Whilst the potential for archaeological remains on this site are high this is a situation which exists on other allocated sites in the plan.”* There is however a range of policies in the plan which seek to retain, record and preserve interests of archaeological importance. Any developer would need to comply with such policies and, given such compliance, I do not see any overriding development constraint of this nature being likely.

Agricultural Land

C7.1.8 I am mindful that the majority of the objection site is classified on the provisional ALC map as land of Grade 2 quality in the north of the site with undifferentiated Grade 3 to the south. The objector’s survey indicates that Sub-grade 3a land covers 26.4ha which constitutes the bulk of the site with sub-grade 3b covering 11.6ha. The FRCA is concerned that the objector’s submitted report may not be an accurate reflection of agricultural land quality as assessed in the published ALC system. However, the FRCA indicates *“Experience gained elsewhere indicates to us a likelihood, but not a certainty, that the results of a laboratory test on topsoils within the site would create a need to downgrade the majority of the identified subgrade 3a to 3b”*.

C7.1.9 Notwithstanding the above, land covered by a 3a grading should only be developed exceptionally if there is an overriding need for such development, and sufficient land in lower grades is unavailable. Given my general conclusions regarding the housing requirement at Cowbridge I find such an overriding need in this case. Given also the likelihood that it may need to be downgraded I consider that such exceptional circumstances exist to allow its loss from agriculture.

The Link Road

C7.1.10 The Council accepted at the inquiry that the link road between the A48 and the B4270 would have a variety of benefits. An agreed statement between the Council and the objector indicates:

“In particular it would allow a weight restriction ban to be imposed for the village of Llysworney, thereby removing extraneous heavy goods traffic and relieving the environmental and safety problems caused by a significant number of heavy lorry movements through the village. It is also likely that a significant proportion of the remaining extraneous car traffic, but not all, would also choose to re-route via the proposed link road.

The link road would also provide benefits the Llysworney By-pass could not offer. The link road would provide an opportunity to remove through traffic from Cowbridge Town Centre. This could be circa.15% at certain times. Road safety benefits would occur on the Cowbridge By-Pass. The proposed roundabout would be situated where the highway changes from a dual to single carriageway. The resultant slowing of traffic reduces accident potential on a major highway.”

C7.1.11 Whilst I have regarded the benefits of the proposed link road as secondary to those concerned with the use of the site for housing, they are nevertheless substantial. Conversely, however, this statement has to be compared with the agreed statement, dated August 1988, presented to the inquiry in respect of objections made to Policy TRAN2(i). This indicates that *“although the*

link road, taken together with traffic management measures on Llysworney Road, would become in effect a Llysworney By-Pass, it would be unlikely to achieve the aim of removing all through traffic from the centre of that village. Moreover, it is clear also that such a scheme would not provide the complete solution to traffic problems in Llysworney, it would provide only limited relief to Cowbridge and would require additional improvements to be made to the B4270”.

C7.1.12 It is also unlikely that funding could be obtained for such a by-pass if the link road was provided at Cowbridge. However, in that there have been, and still remain, considerable difficulties in obtaining funding for such a by-pass it seems to me that, on balance, the provision of the link road presents the best opportunity to considerably ameliorate the well known and long recognised traffic problems of Llysworney village.

C7.1.13 The objector points to a report produced by the Llysworney Community Association. This report produced in 1998 concluded, amongst several other well reasoned conclusions, that there seems little immediate prospect of re-prioritising available Council resources into a road scheme for Llysworney. It further concluded that the only practicable option lies in a privately financed scheme for development in Llysworney or elsewhere. Moreover, as the Council has been unable to reach agreement with local residents with regard to a suitable alignment for the by-pass no safeguarding line has been proposed in the plan. This indicates to me that a considerable amount of preparatory work still remains to be started and that there is little likelihood of the necessary funds being made available from the public purse for its construction until, at the earliest, very late in the plan period. I reach this conclusion notwithstanding that the scheme appears to meet many of the criteria for Transport Grant Package Bids.

C7.1.14 Such a situation is highly unsatisfactory given the need to overcome the environmental difficulties at Llysworney and improve access to the Llandow employment site. Furthermore, even should an alignment be agreed quickly through a privately financed scheme this would almost certainly require the release of some land for housing at Llysworney. Such a course of action would be contrary to the provisions of the housing strategy for the Rural Vale. Moreover, such a scheme would need careful environmental assessment given the need to preserve or enhance the rural setting of Llysworney Conservation Area and the village. In this respect the objector points to the effect on the landscape associated with the provision of a by-pass on the alignment included in the previous local plan. Such adverse effects would undoubtedly be present whatever alignment was to be finally chosen.

Summary

C7.1.15 I have concluded that: there is a need for more housing land to be allocated at Cowbridge; there are no overriding landscape or archaeological constraints to the development of the objection site, and; that the loss of agricultural land is not so significant as to override the need for the further development of Cowbridge. Consequently I consider that the objection site should be allocated for housing as illustrated on the objector’s plan number 824/06 dated May 99.

C7.1.16 Whilst the construction of the link road and associated traffic management measures will not remove all through traffic from Llysworney I consider substantial environmental benefits would be produced for Cowbridge and that village. Such benefits clearly outweigh any disadvantages and add weight to my conclusion that the development at Darren Farm should be accepted. Consequently, I conclude that the part of the objection site contained by the proposed link road be included under Policy HOUS1 as an allocated housing site. I further conclude that Policy TRAN2 should be amended to make clear the functions of a link road between the A48 and B4270 at Cowbridge which also provides access to the proposed development.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that the plan be modified such that:

REC.4.44 the part of the objection site contained by the proposed link road be

included under Policy HOUS1 as an allocated housing site, and

REC.4.45 Policy TRAN2 should be amended to reflect the implementation and functions of a link road between the A48 and B4270 at Cowbridge.

C7.2 Cowbridge - Slade Farm

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Cowbridge.

Maintained Objections
192.11

Persimmon Homes (Wales) Ltd.

{Non allocation of land at Slade Farm, Cowbridge,
under Policy HOUS 01.}

ISSUE

C7.2.1 Whether land at Slade Farm should be allocated for housing under Policy HOUS1.

CONCLUSIONS:

C7.2.2 Whilst the objection site is well located in terms of its proximity to the town centre and its accessibility to other services and public transport, it is very prominent in the landscape. The site is situated on the eastern edge of Cowbridge where the land rises from the valley towards Stalling Down. It is clearly visible from the Cowbridge High Street and other parts of the town centre and provides a pleasant rural backdrop of open countryside which is very much part of its character of this small country town.

C7.2.3 Visually, the site also forms part of a rural backstop to the town being prominent in the long distance views obtained when approaching the town from the west along the A48. In that it lies across the extension of the alignment of the Roman Road, which broadly follows the alignment of the A48 and the High Street, it constitutes a very important view in the landscape when approaching from this direction. Whilst the residential properties of Slade Farm and Windyridge are also prominent, when viewed from this direction they are seen as isolated dwellings in the countryside and well illustrate the prominence that the objection site itself would have if it were to be developed. Consequently, I do not accept the objector's view that the site has, overall, a relatively urbanised visual enclosure. Its exposure to views from the west is one of its major qualities which should be preserved for the benefit of the character of the town as a whole.

C7.2.4 I have had regard to the objector's view that development of the site "*.. given a well conceived landscape framework would "soften" the existing visual envelope and provide an attractive and enhanced immediate eastern backcloth to the town.*". Although tree planting could ameliorate the closer views of the site obtained from the By-pass it would not appreciably reduce the impact on the town that its development would have when viewed from further west along the A48. Its development, however sensitively designed, would represent an unacceptable extension of development into a prominent area of open countryside. Consequently I do not consider that it would form an appropriate "*rounding-off*" of the eastern side of the town.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.46 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C7.3 Cowbridge - Llanblethian Farm

Maintained Objections

259.1	Thomas, Mr & Mrs A	{Restrictive nature of Cowbridge / Llanblethian settlement boundary.}
52.10	Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council	{Objection to Cowbridge and Llanblethian Settlement Boundary}

ISSUE

C7.3.1 Whether land at Llanblethian Farm should be included within the residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C7.3.2 The settlement boundary being pursued by the objector has been reduced in depth by about 15m from that originally depicted in the original objection. This revised objection site now coincides with the extent of the residential curtilages of a proposed scheme of 4 dwellings. The Cowbridge with Llanblethian Town Council object to the inclusion of any part of the objection site within the settlement boundary.

C7.3.3 The Council consider that it would be inappropriate to exclude the existing farm buildings from the settlement boundary in that there is an extant permission for the conversion of an existing barn on the site. In addition the Council point out that any barns on the site could be suitable for residential conversions if they meet the criteria contained in Policy ENV7. From inspection at my site visit I agree with this view and consider that given their appropriate design they would not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area or the setting of the Grade II* Listed Building, "The Great House".

C7.3.4 Similarly, I am in agreement with the objection made on behalf of the owners of the site, that the inclusion of the additional small area of land within the settlement boundary would enable the adoption of a courtyard form of development of 4 dwellings. This would clearly be more appropriate for the site than any suburban form of development. Indeed, I share the view, expressed by the Council's Planning Officer in a letter to the objector, that the type of scheme being pursued "*would be of a scale and form which would enhance the Conservation Area*".

C7.3.5 Such a scheme would enable the removal of modern and unsightly agricultural/industrial buildings, whilst allowing the retention of the older more attractive stone barns. Consequently, I consider that the settlement boundary should be amended as shown on the objector's plan numbered GPJ4A. Matters concerning flood mitigation are more related to detailed matters associated with development control and the Environment Agency.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified:

REC.4.47 to amend the residential settlement boundary of Cowbridge and Llanblethian as shown on the objector's Plan numbered GPJ4A.

C7.4 Cowbridge - Land at the edge of the Northern Settlement Boundary

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on these objections have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Cowbridge.

Maintained Objections

255.1	Thomas, Mr T	{Amendment to Cowbridge settlement boundary.}
256.1	John, Mr David	{Amendment to Cowbridge settlement boundary.}

ISSUE

C7.4.1 Whether land adjacent to the Cowbridge By-pass should be included within the residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C7.4.2 This objection refers to two parcels of land, one measuring approximately 11ha and the other about 1ha. The larger parcel consists of open land in recreational use surrounding a leisure centre. In the south east corner of the site there is also a small area of ponds and meadow which is in use as a private wild fowl reserve. The other smaller site forms part of the indicative floodplain of the river Thaw. Both sites are bounded by the A48 Cowbridge By-pass to the north and by residential development to the east, south and west. Both sites lie within the Cowbridge and Llanblethian Conservation Area where special attention should be given to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character and appearance. In this respect however the High Street dominates the settlement and gives it, and the major part of the Conservation Area, a distinctly urban character.

C7.4.3 Whilst the Council considers that the inclusion of the objection sites within the residential settlement boundary would imply that the principle of additional residential development on the land was acceptable, I do not share its view. The areas involved are all included within the Conservation Area where the effect of any proposal on its character and appearance would and should override any settlement boundary consideration under the provisions of Policy HOUS9(iii). Similarly it is not the function of residential settlement boundaries to override any other policies of the plan such as, for example, Policies REC1 and ENV22 covering recreation and conservation matters.

C7.4.5 The Council's approach to residential settlement boundaries is misplaced and confused and denies the existence of the many important development control policies in the plan. I have concluded earlier that residential settlement boundaries should have only one function, the determination of the relationship of individual settlements to the countryside. Clear demarcation between the countryside and the settlement of Cowbridge is formed by the By-pass, and the area of land covered by the objection is clearly not countryside but part of the town, albeit serving a non-residential function.

C7.4.6 Notwithstanding that the need to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area must clearly be taken into account, I consider that the settlement boundary of Cowbridge should be amended to include both objection sites within it. In reaching this conclusion I have had regard to the fact that two residential developments have been allowed on appeal adjacent to the objection sites. The latest of these appeals was considered after the designation of the Conservation Area. The Inspector in that case determined that the development would "round-off" and complete the settlement pattern of the locality since it adjoins the existing residential development to the east. This, it was considered, would preserve the character and amenity of that part of the Conservation Area. Clearly therefore the Inspector's conclusion was only drawn in relation to that part of the Conservation Area and no conclusion was made about the suitability of residential development within other parts of it.

C7.4.7 The larger objection site lies between the By-pass and the rear of properties in High

Street and is bounded by development of no particular visual quality. I consider, therefore, that it has the capability to accommodate some further residential development without causing harm to the urban character of the High Street or the Conservation Area as a whole. In that the objection sites are in several ownerships, including that of the Council, the objectors consider that it would be appropriate for a comprehensive brief and management plan for the areas to be prepared. Given the scale of the larger site and the importance of the Conservation Area I agree that such an approach is necessary. I am not convinced however, given the dominance and close proximity of the By-pass structure that residential development would be appropriate on the smaller site. Such site should still be included within any comprehensive study in that it could well accommodate additional landscaping, nature conservation and pedestrian and cycle routes.

C7.4.8 The objector points to several benefits that could be provided for the local community as part of such development. Provided that a sensitive approach is taken to the development of these sites I consider that not only could such benefits be produced but also the Conservation Area as a whole could be enhanced. The Council believes that the town's linear character would be undermined and that important views of the Thaw Valley beyond would be restricted. I cannot agree with this analysis. Development would extend no further in depth from the High Street than already occurs at its eastern end, and the views of the Thaw Valley are already severely restricted by the By-pass.

C7.4.9 The extent and type of such residential development that should be accommodated is a matter that would need resolution within the development brief. However, the preparation of such a brief would ensure that the balance of the housing land requirement I have identified for Cowbridge would be available for the latter part of the plan period.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that the plan be modified:

REC.4.48 to include the objections sites within the residential settlement boundary of Cowbridge and that a comprehensive development brief and management plan be prepared for the objection sites. It should be made clear in the explanatory text of the plan that this area should provide the balance of the housing land requirement for Cowbridge within the latter part of the plan period.

C7.5 Cowbridge - Land adjacent to Llanblethian Farm

Maintained Objections

55.1 Park Estates (Cardiff) Ltd.

ISSUE

C7.5.1 Whether land adjacent to Llanblethian Farm should be included within the residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C7.5.2 The objection site is part of open agricultural land located opposite the Grade II* Listed Building, “The Great House” and within the Cowbridge with Llanblethian Conservation Area. To the west of the site are residential dwellings and to the east lies Llanblethian Farm.

C7.5.3 Notwithstanding that the site might be considered as a ‘*small-scale rounding-off*’ of the settlement boundary, in this case it forms an important part of the open setting of “The Great House”. Consequently I take the view that not only would development on this site unacceptably harm this setting but would be cause unacceptable harm to the open character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. This is overriding in this case notwithstanding that some ‘*infilling*’ has taken place to east of Llanblethian Farm and that I have previously recommended some consolidation of development at that farm.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.49 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C8 Dinas Powys

C8.0 General

C8.0.1 My conclusions with regard to site specific objections associated with Dinas Powys have to be read together with my conclusions and recommendations concerning the general objections made to Policies ENV1, ENV3 in Chapter 3. I have recommended there that the area surrounding Dinas Powys, outside the settlement boundary, should be designated Green Belt. This would avert the need for Green Wedges to be designated under Policy ENV3 for this area.

C8.0.2 The Council indicates that the growth of Dinas Powys has taken place over the past thirty years in response to demand for private housing on greenfield sites in a rural location within a reasonable commuting distance by car to Cardiff and Barry. The area is clearly subject to considerable development pressures and problems common to the urban fringe. Pressure for growth has been eastwards and southwards and the Council expresses considerable concern about the prospect of coalescence with Penarth, Sully and Llandough and the further loss of countryside between Dinas Powys and Barry, notwithstanding its location within the Waterfront Strip.

C8.0.3 I share that concern and consider that the essential long-term protection of this area from inappropriate development in the countryside would be better served by its early designation as Green Belt. As such, any further residential development of Dinas Powys should be strictly limited to the area within its settlement boundary. This approach is also essential to ensure that the effects of the Barry Waterfront - Cardiff Link Road are minimised.

C8.0.4 Having regard to the above I consider that the essential issue, in each of the site specific objections below associated with Dinas Powys, is whether the objection sites should be included within the Dinas Powys residential settlement boundary.

C8.1 Dinas Powys - Cardiff Road

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Dinas Powys.

Maintained Objections		
334.1	Pyecroft, Mr S F	{Prop. to amend W boundary of Green Wedge betwn Penarth & Dinas Powys.}
334.2	Pyecroft, Mr S F	{Proposal to extend southern settlement boundary of Dinas Powys.}

ISSUE

C8.1.1 Whether land adjacent to the south of Dinas Powys fronting the east side of the A4055 should be included within the residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C8.1.2 The objection site is part of the open countryside lying between Dinas Powys and eastern Barry and the developed area is part of the south western facing slopes of the Pop Hill. The remaining part of the objection site is an area of open recreational land to the west of the A4055. The seven existing houses within the site are large detached properties in large plots surrounded by mature tree cover each having direct access onto the A4055.

C8.1.3 The houses are well separated from the main developed area of Dinas Powys, have somewhat of an open ribbon form and constitute little more than isolated dwellings in the countryside. In that they do not form an integral part of the settlement, their inclusion within the settlement boundary would be inappropriate. Further consolidation of either the ribbon development formed by the housing or the development of the open recreational land to the west would constitute a significant and unwarranted extension of development into the open countryside and would promote the coalescence of the settlements in the area.

RECOMMENDATION

REC4.50 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C8.2 Dinas Powys - Cross Common

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Dinas Powys.

Maintained Objections		
338.1	Laskey, M J	{Proposed amendment to the south of Dinas Powys settlement limit.}
338.2	Laskey, M J	{Proposed extension to southern boundary of Dinas Powys settlement limit.}

ISSUE

C8.2.1 Whether land to the west and south-west of St Cyres School should be included within the Dinas Powys residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C8.2.2 The objection site constitutes part of the open countryside lying between Dinas Powys and Penarth. Notwithstanding that it lies between the proposed line of the Barry Waterfront - Cardiff Link Road and the settlement of Dinas Powys it forms an important constituent of the fragile open gap between the two above settlements. Consequently I consider that the major part of the site should continue to be excluded from the Dinas Powys residential settlement boundary.

C8.2.3 However, I have concluded elsewhere in my report that settlement boundaries should have only the single function of defining the limits of the countryside and that residential curtilages should be included within such boundaries. The settlement boundary should be modified to include such residential curtilages of residential properties that lie within the objection site and currently abut the settlement boundary.

RECOMMENDATION:

REC.4.51 I recommend that the plan be modified to include those parts of the objection site that constitute residential curtilage.

C8.3 Dinas Powys - Eastbrook

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Dinas Powys.

Maintained Objections

51.1	Symonds, Mr Ian	{Objection Green Wedge Policy}
341.2	Jones, Mr R Keith	{Proposed change to settlement boundary to include land at Penyturmpike Rd.}
341.1	Jones, Mr R Keith	{Proposal for land east of Penyturmpike Rd to be released from green wedge.}

ISSUE

C8.3.1 Whether land at, and adjacent to, Mill Farm, Pen-y-Turnpike Road, to the north of Dinas Powys, should be included within the residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C8.3.2 The objection sites form part of the open countryside lying between Dinas Powys and Llandough. Although these sites lie within a “V” shaped indentation in the settlement pattern of Dinas Powys, the land and properties within the sites do not form an integral part of that settlement. The objector points to the lack of prominence of the major part of the site due to its location on lower land than surrounding development and the existence of woodland boundaries. In my view however such lack of prominence is not good reason to consider the development and loss of the important open gap that exists between the above settlements.

C8.3.3 The settlement boundary of this part of Dinas Powys is correctly drawn and any development of the objection sites would not only encroach into this area of countryside but would unacceptably compromise the openness of the area between Dinas Powys and Llandough. In reaching such a conclusion I have taken into account the instances of trespass that have been experienced by the objector but consider that this is not sufficient reason to override the importance I attach to the need to protect the openness of the area.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.52 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C8.4 Dinas Powys - Southra

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Dinas Powys.

Maintained Objections

207.2
207.3

Harry, Mrs R
Harry, Mrs R

{Proposed Housing allocation at Southra, Dinas Powys}
{Dinas Powys settlement boundary is incorrect}

ISSUE

C8.4.1 Whether land at Southra should be included within the residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C8.4.2 The objection site is located on the south western fringe of the settlement and comprises a group of agricultural buildings which are currently being converted for residential purposes and an area of open countryside lying to their west. It also lies to the south of the large open area of Dinas Powys Common which separates the site from the major part of the defined settlement boundary.

C8.4.3 I have taken into account that the objection site is located adjacent to a development of flats known as “The Gables”. However this development is uncharacteristic of the more rural and fragmented type of development which generally exists in the particular locality of the objection site and further development of this type could only compromise the openness of the immediate area.

C8.4.4 Consequently I consider, contrary to the view of the objector, that area clearly has an open and more rural character than the more urban form of development within the defined settlement boundary to the east and to the south of the railway. As such, I do not consider that development on the easterly part of the objection site would constitute appropriate “*infilling*” or that the development of the larger more open area to the west could reasonably be described as “*rounding-off*”. Any further development of the objection site would not only encroach into an area of countryside but would unacceptably compromise the openness of the area that lies between Dinas Powys and Barry.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.53 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C8.5 Dinas Powys - Caerleon Road and Rhuddlan Way

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Dinas Powys. Objections concerning the allocation of land under Policy REC5 are dealt with at Chapter 8

Maintained Objections

204.3

Northway Bros Ltd.

{Residential development in Dinas Powys}

204.4

Northway Bros Ltd.

{Dinas Powys settlement boundary}

ISSUE

C8.5.1 Whether land at “Caerleon Road and Rhuddlan Way” should be allocated for housing and included within the residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C8.5.2 The objection sites are located on the northern and eastern fringes of Dinas Powys. The northern site is a flat area of rough grazing land whilst the eastern site is an undulating area of countryside, both areas lying within the narrow open gap of countryside lying between Penarth and Dinas Powys. Although both sites are contiguous with existing residential development and, notwithstanding that they lie between the proposed line of the Barry Waterfront -Cardiff Link Road and the settlement of Dinas Powys, they form an important constituent of the fragile open gap between the above two settlements.

C8.5.3 The objector considers that a narrower Green Wedge would suffice and meet the same objective of preventing coalescence of the two settlements of Penarth and Dinas Powys. Contrary to that view, I consider that development of either one of these two sites would not only severely affect the openness of the countryside between these settlements but would promote such coalescence.

C8.5.4 Whilst there is also no doubt that separation of the two settlements would be maintained by the proposed link road, it is essential that the openness that currently exists should continue to be fully protected if the environmental effects of the road are to be mitigated. Consequently I consider that the objections sites should be protected from development and that they should continue to be excluded from the Dinas Powys residential settlement boundary.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.54 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C8.6 Dinas Powys - St.Andrews Road and Westra

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning general development at Dinas Powys.

Maintained Objections

111.1	Evans, Mr David
128.2	Rees Esq., R H

ISSUE

C8.6.1 Whether land at St Andrews Road and Westra should be included within the residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C8.6.2 The objection sites are located on the western fringes of the settlement and are associated with a group of large dwellings having extensive curtilages located to the west of St Andrews Junior School. The dwellings are part of a ribbon form of development extending into open countryside along both St Andrews Road and Westra. Although the dwellings are included within the defined settlement boundary, large parts of their curtilages are excluded. Consequently 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. Another Inspector expressed a similar view in 1988 and stated: “...indeed I found the whole of the area west of the school and common to have a distinctly rural character”.

C8.6.3 From observation at my site visit, the definition of the residential settlement boundary in this area is neither logical nor correct and should be redefined to exclude all of the properties to the west and south of St Andrews School. The ribbon form of the development, when taken together with the large curtilages of the properties, has a similar rural character to that which exists at “Southra”, which is an area which is not included within the settlement boundary. Therefore, in terms of consistency alone, the area including the objection sites should be excluded from the settlement boundary. Of greater weight, however, is the fact that the consolidation of development in this area would promote the loss of the openness that currently exists between Dinas Powys and Barry.

C8.6.4 The objection site at St.Andrews Road consists of an open field with one small outbuilding in its north-western corner. Contrary to the objector’s view that it would provide a suitable infill site, it would unacceptably encroach into the surrounding countryside and further consolidate an existing loosely knitted form of development. Moreover, it would also conflict with the concept of a buffer zone surrounding the nearby quarry.

C8.6.5 The objection site at Westra includes a detached house known as “St.Hillary” and its gardens and tennis court and lies to the rear of residential properties fronting both St.Andrews Road and Westra Road. Whilst surrounded by residential curtilages its development would lead to further consolidation of development in an area that has a distinctly rural character. Notwithstanding that the Council have accepted residential development on part of this area I consider the need to protect this area and the open countryside between Barry and Dinas Powys from further development is overriding.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified:

REC.4.55 to exclude all the properties west of St.Andrews School from the Dinas Powys residential settlement boundary.

C9 East Aberthaw

Maintained Objections
216.1

Perkins, Mrs J. A.

ISSUE

C9.1 Whether land adjacent to “The Chequers” should be included within the East Aberthaw residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C9.2 The objection site is bounded by walls on three sides and backs onto the railway line and the “coastal zone”. Whilst it fronts on to the main road it is at a considerably lower level and is approached from the cul-de-sac serving “The Chequers” known as Station Drive. Whilst the site lies within the East Aberthaw Conservation Area it is not visible from the road, is in a degraded condition and is more associated with the village than the countryside. Given the above, I consider that its development with appropriate attention to the design could well enhance this part of the Conservation Area and the village as a whole. As such, I see no reason why the development of the site could not satisfy the criteria set out in Policy HOUS9.

C9.3 Whilst development of the site may be partially visible from the main road I do not agree with the Council that the inclusion of the objection site within the settlement boundary would lead to unacceptable “ribbon development” along the south-eastern boundary of the village. The Council accept that any development of the site would constitute “*rounding-off*” and I have accepted that “*small-scale rounding-off*” is acceptable as long as it satisfies the criteria of Policy HOUS9. In reaching my conclusion concerning this objection, I have taken into account that although the site is within the quarry buffer zone no objection is raised on this basis. As such, I conclude that the objection site should be included within the residential settlement boundary.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified:

REC.4.56 to include the land adjacent to ‘The Chequers’ within the East Aberthaw residential settlement boundary.

C10 Ewenny

Maintained Objections

335.1

Turberville, Mr Picton

{Proposal to extend settlement boundary of Ewenny}

335.3

Turberville, Mr Picton

ISSUE

C10.1 Whether land at Wick Road should be included within the Ewenny residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C10.2 The objection site has an area of some 2.8ha and is situated in an elevated position to the south west of Corntown. It is located between Ewenny and Corntown to the rear of a ribbon of development that links the two villages. Whilst lying to the rear of large residential properties fronting the south side of Corntown Road, it is a greenfield site and clearly within an area of open countryside.

C10.3 Whilst the objector considers that the site would form a logical extension to this part of the village, relate well to the existing built form, and be of appropriate scale, I disagree. Development of the site would represent a large and unacceptable extension of residential development into open countryside in an elevated and prominent location.

C10.4 The residential settlement boundary of Corntown and Ewenny properly reflects the ribbon form and character of the village which has developed along the slope of the Ewenny/Ogmore Valley. Development of the site would lead to an unacceptable lateral development of the village up the valley slopes.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.57 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C11 Llanbethery

Maintained Objections
191.1

Hancock, K.R.

{Position of Llanbethery settlement boundary.}

ISSUE

C11.1 Whether land at “The Wild Goose” public house should be included within the Llanbethery residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C11.2 The objection site consists of an open car parking area to the public house located on the western edge of the village. The site is surrounded by agricultural land to the north and west and fronts the village road to the south. It lies within the Llanbethery Conservation Area where special attention must be paid to preserving or enhancing its character and appearance.

C11.3 I have concluded earlier in my report that residential settlement boundaries should have only the one function, which is to determine the relationship of individual settlements to the countryside. As a result I am sympathetic to the objection made that the settlement boundaries should be amended to reflect the existing residential development and its curtilages. The public house is contained within the settlement boundary and, consequently, I consider that the objector’s proposed amendment to the Llanbethery residential settlement boundary is justified and that the plan should be amended accordingly.

C11.4 I am not of the view that the inclusion of the areas suggested by the objector within the residential settlement boundary would necessarily imply that residential development on this land would be acceptable. The area involved is included within the Conservation Area where the effect of any proposal on its character and appearance would and should override any settlement boundary consideration under the provisions of Policy HOUS9(iii). However, whilst the Council indicates that this would be the case it also accepts that residential development on this site would constitute a “*rounding-off*” of the village. I agree with this view and I have recommended earlier in my report that “*small-scale rounding-off*” is acceptable as long as it satisfies the criteria of Policy HOUS9. This adds weight to my conclusion that the objection site should be included within the Llanbethery residential settlement boundary

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified:

REC.4.58 to include the land at ‘The Wild Goose’ PH within the Llanbethery residential settlement boundary.

C12 Llancarfan

Maintained Objections
316.1

Liscombe, R.G

{Amend Llancarfan settlement boundary to include land
adj to circular Rd.}

ISSUE

C12.1 Whether land opposite the Llancarfan Primary School should be included within the residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C12.2 The objection site lies to the east of Llancarfan on the south eastern side of the circular road that runs around the heart of the village. It is irregular in shape and slopes steeply upwards from west to east measuring approximately 0.4ha. It lies some distance from the nearest residential properties to the west and north and lies within the Llancarfan Conservation Area .

C12.3 Whilst the objector states that: *“the site does not have any significant visual impact from within the village or outside of it”* this was not borne out at my site visit and by previous Inspectors when dismissing appeals on this site. A previous Inspector stated: *“The site is clearly exposed across open country to the north and particularly from the County Road leading to Pancross and the steeply rising grounds to the west of the river.”* I agree with this observation and consider the site both to be clearly divorced from the residential part of the village and to lie within open countryside.

C12.4 The development of this site would neither constitute *“infilling”* nor would it be, as the Council indicates *“a rounding-off of the village”* but would constitute an unwarranted intrusion into open countryside which forms an important backdrop to the village. Consequently it should not be included within the residential settlement boundary.

C12.5 In reaching such a conclusion I have had regard to parking problems at the school and the objector’s view that the land adjacent to the tennis court could be used for further leisure activities. However, such matters are not relevant to the delineation of the settlement boundary and cannot override the need to protect open countryside from development.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.59 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C13 Llandough

C13.0 General

C13.0.1 My conclusions with regard to site specific objections associated with Llandough have to be read together with my conclusions and recommendations concerning the general objections made to Policies ENV1, ENV3 at Chapter 3. I have recommended that the area surrounding Llandough, outside the settlement boundary, should be designated Green Belt. This would avert the need for Green Wedges to be designated under Policy ENV3 for this area.

C13.0.2 The area is clearly subject to considerable development pressures and problems common to the urban fringe. In this respect I share the council's concern about the prospect of coalescence with Penarth, Sully and Llandough and the further loss of countryside between Dinas Powys and Barry. Its close proximity to Cardiff City Centre and Cardiff Bay and the need to ensure the protection of the landscape of the Leckwith Escarpment, is another factor which has led to my conclusion that a restrictive housing policy is essential in this area.

C13.0.3 Consequently, I consider that the essential long-term protection of this area from inappropriate development in the countryside would be better served by its designation as Green Belt. Any further residential development of Llandough should be strictly limited to the area within its settlement boundary. Therefore the essential issue, in each of the site specific objections below associated with Llandough, is whether the objection site should be included within the residential settlement boundary and allocated for housing under Policy HOUS1.

C13.1 Llandough - Cogan Pill Road

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Llandough.

Maintained Objections
29.1

Welsh Water

{Llandough Settlement Boundary}

ISSUE

C13.1.1 Whether land at Cogan Pill Road should be included within the residential settlement boundary and allocated for housing under Policy HOUS1.

CONCLUSIONS:

C13.1.2 The objection site is located to east of Llandough and constitutes an unused and covered reservoir with an associated building and grassland to the remaining half of the area. It is bounded to the north-east by the Penarth Road which is set below the reservoir, to the south of the site is residential development and to the north west is a large area of woodland and fields. Given the elevation of the reservoir its development would be conspicuous and intrusive in the landscape of the Leckwith Escarpment.

C13.1.3 I have previously concluded that the Leckwith Escarpment plays a major part in the provision of a distinctive landscape setting to Cardiff. As such it should be protected from further development. Despite the fact that the site could be classed as a brownfield site, para.9.1.5 of PGW indicates: "*Policies which seek to make the maximum use of vacant urban land for housing will need to distinguish between site which need to be retained for recreation, amenity or conservation purposes, and areas which are genuinely suitable for housing development.*" In this case the need to protect the amenity of the Leckwith Escarpment is overriding.

C13.1.3 Notwithstanding the above, the Council refers to the fact that access issues are also of concern in respect of both the intensification of use of the narrow and substandard lane known as Cogan Pill Road, and the amount of traffic on the A4160 Penarth Road. This adds weight to my conclusion that this site should be protected from development.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.60 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C13.2 Llandough - Corbett Road

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Llandough.

Maintained Objections

112.1	Jones & El-Khatib, Mr
112.2	Jones & El-Khatib, Mr

ISSUE

C13.2.1 Whether land adjacent to Corbett Road should be included within the residential settlement boundary and allocated for housing under Policy HOUS1.

CONCLUSIONS:

C13.2.2 The objection site is located to the west of Llandough and comprises an area of scrub woodland. It is bounded to the north by residential development on Corbett Road. To the south of the site are fields, to the west allotments and to the east an area of tarmac fronting the A4055 and B4267 roads. Notwithstanding its unkempt and degraded appearance, the site is clearly within the countryside which forms the open gap between Llandough and Dinas Powys.

C13.2.4 Development of the objection site would not only encroach into an area of countryside but would result in an unacceptably loss of the openness of the area that lies between Dinas Powys and Llandough. Moreover it would also increase the risk of coalescence occurring between Dinas Powys and Llandough and compromise what is already a fragile area of the urban fringe.

C13.2.5 I have had regard to the objectors concern about the implications of Policy COMM1 upon this site. However, at the inquiry, it was made clear by the Council, and accepted by the objector, that the policies of the plan would permit the construction of a new access to Llandough Hospital should it be required. As a result objection 112.4 was Unconditionally Withdrawn.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.61 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C13.3 Llandough - Sites at Leckwith Road and Llandough Hill

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Llandough.

Maintained Objections
232.4

Land Division, Welsh Development Agency

ISSUE

C13.3.1 Whether sites at Leckwith Road and Llandough Hill should be included within the residential settlement boundary and allocated for housing under Policy HOUS1.

CONCLUSIONS:

Leckwith Road

C13.3.2 The objection site is an area of land measuring about 0.74ha and located on the northern fringe of Llandough. It comprises a sloping area of pasture land with sporadic tree cover and abuts Leckwith Road and a residential property to the east. To the north-west the site is banded by woodland whilst the north eastern boundary is formed by the upper lip of a former quarry/brickworks site now occupied by the Llandough trading estate. The site slopes away from the Leckwith Road towards the steeply sloping Leckwith Escarpment.

C13.3.3 Whilst the objector considers that the development of the objection site would complement the existing form and character of the settlement which is felt to be typified by individual properties along the road frontage, I disagree. Any development of the objection site would result in the loss of an open and elevated area of countryside and involve the creation of unacceptable ribbon development along Leckwith Road within the rural area to the west of the urban area of Llandough.

C13.3.4 The existence of a garage and car sales business on the opposite side of Leckwith Road does not justify the extension of a ribbon form of development on the objection site nor does it provide suitable justification for acceptable “small-scale rounding-off” of the settlement boundary in this instance. Such “rounding-off” is only acceptable if the scale, form and character of the proposed development is sympathetic to the environs of the site. In this case the character of site clearly relates to that of the countryside. A previous Inspector also reached a similar conclusion when dismissing an appeal on this site in 1992.

C13.3.5 Moreover, given the elevation of the site, its development would be conspicuous and intrusive in the landscape of the Leckwith Escarpment even taking into account the landscape mitigation measures proposed. I have already concluded that the Leckwith Escarpment plays a major part in the provision of a distinctive landscape setting to Cardiff. As such it should be protected from further development.

Llandough Hill

C13.3.6 This objection site is a linear area of pasture land fronting both Llandough Hill and Penarth Road and measuring about 1.0ha. It is bounded on all sides by mature hedgerows and trees. Existing development adjacent to the objection site comprises sporadic ribbon development along Llandough Hill and the mixed industrial area running along Penarth Road. The site is removed from the settlement of Llandough by intervening fields.

C13.3.7 Contrary to the view of the objector, development of the objection site would neither maintain the mixed uses character of the surrounding area nor contribute to the strengthening of the urban fringe. It would also result in the creation of a fragmented development pattern and contribute to the visual coalescence of the urban areas of Llandough and Penarth.

C13.3.8 Moreover, even taking into account the landscape mitigation measures proposed, development of the site would be conspicuous and intrusive in the lower landscape of the Leckwith Escarpment which forms an important backdrop to the site. It would also result in the unacceptable loss of a visually important area of countryside along a busy transport corridor. I have previously concluded that the Leckwith Escarpment plays a major part in the provision of a distinctive landscape setting to Cardiff. It should be protected from further development.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.62 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C13.4 Llandough - Llandough Fields

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Llandough.

Maintained Objections

217.5	Cardiff Bay Development Corporation	{Residential development at Llandough fields}
217.8	Cardiff Bay Development Corporation	{Housing at Llandough Fields}

ISSUE

C13.4.1 Whether land at Llandough Fields should be included within the residential settlement boundary and allocated for housing under Policy HOUS1.

CONCLUSIONS:

C13.4.2 The objection site lies between the River Ely and the Cardiff-Vale of Glamorgan railway line and has an area of some 3.4ha. The site was previously partly occupied by railway sidings, is covered by scrub trees and I noted that a considerable amount of fly tipping has taken place on the site. The elevated Grangetown Link Road and the Cogan Spur bound the site to the north and south respectively. Also to the north of the objection site is West Point Industrial Estate and beyond the railway line to the east is Penarth Road. The residential area of Llandough beyond the Penarth Road is some distance away due to the topography of The Leckwith Escarpment. The site clearly has the characteristics of a brownfield site and its development for an appropriate urban use is accepted by the Council.

C13.4.3 The site is allocated in the plan for employment use under Policy EMP(18) and is located outside the Llandough residential settlement boundary. A recreation route is proposed to run through the site under FPCN003. It is also significant that the site was proposed for housing under Ferry Road Planning Brief in 1992 and was not objected to by the then Vale of Glamorgan Council, notwithstanding that it was allocated for industrial purposes in the adopted East Vale Local Plan (1987). The proposal in the development brief was to create a waterside development for waterside housing on both the objection site and on the opposite riverbank. The area of housing opposite the objection site was being developed at the time of my site visits.

C13.4.4 The objection site is visually an important riverside development site incorporated within the western part of the designated area for the regeneration of Cardiff Bay. The development potential of the area within which the objection site is situated was described as being “*visually of great importance*” and a “*superb setting for both urban development and parkland*”. From observation at my site visit I agree with this view and consider that the visual impact of development associated with general industrial use and warehousing is inappropriate in such a location. I do not accept that the impact of noisy, unattractive and unsightly service and storage areas can be sufficiently ameliorated to make them acceptable in such an important riverside situation, whether associated with water related developments or not. Such a situation is also especially significant having regard to the environmental impact on the already implemented and long planned residential development on the opposite riverbank and the fact that more appropriate sites for water related employment are also available elsewhere within Cardiff Bay.

C13.4.5 The Council considers that the development of the site for residential purposes would be “*fragmented*” and could result in the creation of a “*ribbon*” development pattern along the railway line. However, housing on this site would be complementary to similar housing development at Penarth Haven and its location along a riverside frontage, as with other riverside sites, clearly involves development of an acceptable ribbon form. Consequently I take the view that the visual qualities of any improvement and use of the site should be given greater weight in this instance,

taking into account the need to preserve the improved visual qualities of the area created by the impounded water of the River Ely.

C13.4.6 It is clear, from the illustrative plans submitted on behalf of the objector, that although a narrow site, residential development could be provided to mirror the new residential development on the opposite riverbank in a form that makes effective use of the visual quality of an improved waterfront. In reaching this conclusion I have also had regard to the fact that the site is well related to public transport facilities. It is also close to shopping facilities, well placed in terms of leisure facilities associated with the water based activities and the Cogan Leisure Centre and would also be compatible with the promotion of the proposed recreation route. Development of the site would also be consistent with the regeneration strategy of the plan and could make a contribution to the required additional housing supply figures of about 65 dwellings within the plan period.

C13.4.7 The Council refers to the importance of the site being allocated for employment use. I do not share this view in that development of the objection site for housing will only reduce the allocation in the plan for B1, B2, and B8 uses from 160.4ha to 158.01ha. Given also that the plan contains a further allocation of 65.8ha for special employment uses such a reduction is insignificant. Moreover, both the objection site and Penarth town are well placed to take advantage of the substantial employment facilities being provided as part of the regeneration of the Cardiff Bay area. In this respect the Council accepts, in relation to the development of Cardiff Bay and the south-western part of Cardiff, that relatively extensive areas of employment land remain available.

C13.4.8 In conclusion, the Council also recognise that there are difficulties of financing the development of this site for employment purposes. This indicates to me that the most realistic prospect for its development is housing. Consequently, I consider the loss of what is recognised as a modest provision of employment land for Penarth is insignificant. This is especially so, when compared to the damage that could be caused to the overall regeneration of the area by the unrealistic promotion of, what would be in any case, a visually inappropriate use of the objection site.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.63 the deletion of Policy EMP1(18), the re-allocation of the Llandough Fields site to housing under Policy HOUS1, and its inclusion within the residential settlement boundary for Llandough with consequential amendments made to the explanatory text.

C14.1 Llandow - Land to the West of the Railway Line, OS0626

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions concerning Policies HOUS2 and HOUS3 at Section.....

Maintained Objections

125.1

Edwards, Mrs M.E.

{Llandow village - residential allocations.}

125.2

Edwards, Mrs M.E.

{Llandow village - residential allocations.}

ISSUE

C14.1.1 Whether:

- (i) the settlement of Llandow should be defined as having a designated residential settlement boundary; and whether
- (ii) the objection site should be included within such boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

Issue (i)

C14.1.2 The Council does not set out the criteria by which it has judged the village of Llandow, or any other settlement, to have insufficient form and capacity to assimilate new residential development. The objector points to the fact that the village has a church, a village hall, a community post office and a bus service. Moreover, I observed that a number of modern dwellings exist within the village and consider that its size and form, when taken together with the facilities mentioned by the objector, compare well with several other villages in the Rural Vale that have been designated as Policy HOUS2 villages.

C14.1.3 In this respect the objector points to Siginstone, East Aberthaw, Eglwys Brewis and Treos. As well as these, villages such as Trerhyngyll, Penllyne, Llanbethery and Broughton are seemingly similar in size, form and character as Llandow. Whilst I accept that large-scale development of the village would be unacceptable the Council give no reason how “infilling” or “small-scale rounding-off” on suitable sites would impact on its character and environment. As such I consider it should be defined as a Policy HOUS2 village and that a residential settlement boundary be defined on the Proposals Map.

Issue (ii)

C14.1.4 The objection site has an area of approximately 0.312ha and is located immediately to the west of the railway line. To the east, immediately on the other side of the railway is the major part of the settlement of Llandow. To the west the site is separated from open countryside by a raised bank that forms part of flood prevention works carried out in 1999.

C14.1.5 The site itself is unkempt and unused and the Council do not dispute that it is of little agricultural value. This is confirmed by the assessment made in 1989 by the Ministry of Agriculture which indicates it is Grade IV land with severe limitations which restrict use to permanent pasture such that it would not be economically viable for a commercial farmer to use for agricultural purposes. I also consider it significant that the land surveyor states: *“It is also possible that the land is damaged to a greater extent than is apparent, due to its former ownership by British Rail.”*

C14.1.6 Whilst the site is located on the opposite side of the railway to the main part of the village, it lies immediately adjacent to the railway bridge and fronts the main village road which ends at the entrance to “The Lodge”. Moreover, the site is very much enclosed and divorced from the agricultural land to the west by the low embankment of the flood prevention works. Given the strengthening of the existing boundaries by additional landscaping, the visual effect of any development on the site on the countryside would also be minimal. Also, the site does not lie within the Llandow Conservation Area, neither would its development cause any harm to its character and

appearance.

C14.1.7 I give little weight to the historical evidence put forward by the objector or the limited views likely to be obtained from the railway line, in that I consider such criteria to be of limited use in defining settlement boundaries when considering such a small site. I am satisfied therefore, having regard to the above, that there is sufficient and exceptional reason for this land to be considered as a brownfield site and as part of the village. Moreover, the Council has described the residential development of the site as “*rounding-off*” rather than “*infill*” and I have previously concluded that such “*small-scale rounding-off*” should be acceptable within Policy HOUS2 villages subject to the criteria attached to Policy HOUS9. The Council refers to the development of the site as likely to create a fragmented development in the countryside, but I am also satisfied, given the special circumstances of the site and its close proximity to the main part of the village, that development of it would be acceptable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that the plan should be modified by:

REC.4.64 the delineation of a residential settlement boundary for the village of Llandow and the inclusion of the objection site within the defined residential settlement boundary.

C14.2 Llandow - New Village Proposal

Explanatory note: The omission of a policy on new settlements is dealt with under the objections to Policy HOUS4 where I examine general issues on the matter and recommend that that Policy be retained subject to the adoption of PCE019.

Maintained objection

331.1

Marcross Holdings Limited

{Proposal for new settlement at Llandow airfield.}

331.4

Marcross Holdings Limited

{Proposal for new settlement at Llandow airfield.}

ISSUE

C14.2.1 Whether the objection land should be identified as a new mixed-use village site with a defined settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS

C14.2.2 The Council accepts that the site of the former Llandow airfield is brownfield. I note that it has been developed in an unsatisfactorily piecemeal way and consider it would undoubtedly benefit from a comprehensive comparatively long term planning scheme which would present a worthwhile challenge to ingenious planning design. I concur with the objector that the scale of the proposal is such that it would be likely to involve development beyond the end of the Plan period. However, to my mind the salient question is whether it is appropriate to bring it forward in the UDP now. In my view that depends on the one hand whether there is a need to allocate additional housing and on the other the effect of the objector's proposal on the fundamental strategy of the Plan.

C14.2.3 Notwithstanding the Council's assertion that 5800 dwellings are required during the Plan period I have concluded in my appraisal of Policy 3 that provision be made for 1104 dwellings additional to the allocations under Policy HOUS1 of the deposit Plan and for a total supply of 6079 dwellings for the period 1998-2011. Nevertheless, in my consideration of the objections to Policy HOUS4 I have found no justification for new settlements in the countryside since the requisite sites can be found through the logical expansion of existing settlements and the regeneration of brownfield sites in proportions broadly consistent with the distribution of population. That strategy is based on sustainability considerations,

C14.2.4 With regard to the second question it seems to me that the fact that the site can be regarded as brownfield is not an automatic justification for its immediate redevelopment. In my view the urgent planning problems of the Waterfront Strip clearly require more immediate resolution by reason of their impact on the most densely populated part of the Borough. While I believe the redevelopment of Llandow airfield should be reviewed later in the Plan's life I consider the 1700 dwellings inherent in the objection proposal could lead to a glut of development and prejudice the regeneration of the Waterfront Strip which is fundamental to the strategy of the Plan as a whole. To define a new settlement at the objection site at this stage would be premature.

C14.2.5 Land for employment use is allocated within the objection site at the Llandow Trading Estate and Vale Business Park. I have no reason to believe that any problems of site drainage and incompatibility of uses to which the Council refers could not be overcome. More problematic would be the possibility of a rail service at Llandow and the effect of traffic flows on the village of Llysworney. However, notwithstanding site specific objections of that nature I consider the major issue is the question of whether a new settlement would fit into the overall strategy of the Plan. I do not consider that to be the case at the present time.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.65 I recommend that no modification be made to the Plan.

C15 Llanmaes

C15.0 General

C15.0.1 Llanmaes is not one of the 22 villages having a residential settlement boundary which are subject to Policy HOUS 2 . It is therefore regarded as part of the open countryside where any development is subject to the criteria of Policy ENV1, HOUS3, HOUS5, and HOUS7. My conclusions with regard to site specific objections associated with Llanmaes should be read together with my conclusions and recommendations concerning the general objections made to Policies ENV1, ENV3 at Chapter 3.

C15.1 Llanmaes – land north of the village

Maintained objections		
93.1	Thomas, Mr & Mrs D.W.	{Policy HOUS 02- Omission of Llanmaes.}
337.1	Thomas, Mr D W	{Proposed inclusion of land north of Llanmaes within the settlement limit.}
337.2	Thomas, Mr D W	{Proposed inclusion of land north of Llanmaes within the settlement limit.}

ISSUE

C15.1.1 Whether

- (i) Llanmaes should be defined as a Policy HOUS 2 settlement.
- (ii) Land north of Llanmaes should be listed under Policy HOUS1.

CONCLUSIONS

Issue (i)

C15.1.2 The object of Policy HOUS2 is to identify settlements which have an adequate representation of services and are appropriate for infilling development. In accordance with my general conclusions on housing I consider that, notwithstanding its limited community facilities, Llanmaes is a village which could sustain modest further development, including limited rounding-off, and a residential settlement boundary should be devised accordingly. However, the fact that a large part of the village falls within the designated Conservation Area determines its predominant character. I consider it important that to protect that character the boundary should not be so generously drawn as to invite the possibility of estate development of a suburban nature.

Issue (ii)

C15.1.3 As Llanmaes is not a Policy H2 village the Plan does not propose a residential settlement boundary. However, as I consider such a delineation should be made I have treated the objection in relation to the modest village expansion I suggest.

C15.1.4 The objection site, an open field of Grade 2 agricultural land status, has a frontage to St Marychurch Road of some 135m and average depth of the order of over 60m. There is limited development of a sporadic nature fronting St Marychurch Road, otherwise the dwelling adjoining the southern corner of the site at the Siginstone Road/St Marychurch road junction marks the end of the built-up village. Residential development both of the site and of a part of it have previously been refused on appeal on the ground of intrusion into the open countryside. While the site should clearly be reviewed in the process of defining a settlement boundary it is in my view too extensive to be regarded as rounding-off and its development as a whole would be too detrimental to the character of the village to justify its identification as a Policy HOUS1 site.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Plan be modified by:

REC.4.66 the identification of Llanmaes in my recommended Policy H2/H8 and the accompanying addition of a residential settlement boundary.

C15.2 Llanmaes – land north east of the village

Maintained objection

115.1

Leer, Mr A G

{Allocation of land for residential development}

ISSUES

C15.2.1 Whether:

- (i) Llanmaes should be defined as a Policy HOUS2 settlement.
- (ii) Land north of Llanmaes should be included within the settlement limit

CONCLUSIONS

Issue (i)

C15.2.2 As Llanmaes is not a Policy HOUS2 village the plan does not propose a residential settlement boundary. However as I consider such a delineation should be made I have treated the objection in relation to the modest village expansion I suggest.

Issue (ii)

C15.2.3 The objection land is a narrow plot located on the north west side of St Marychurch Road, east of the Conservation Area, and beyond the continuously built-up area of the village. It is in the area of the Colwinston Lias plateau where the restriction of development because of the intervisibility of rural development is integral to the Plan's strategy. Planning permission for residential development by the conversion of existing buildings has twice been refused on appeal on the ground that such development would be beyond the reasonable confines of the village and add to the sporadic development along the road to the detriment of the character of the countryside. In my view there has been no material change of circumstances since the 1998 decision which could justify changing the settlement boundary and allocating the objection site for residential development.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that:

REC.4.67 notwithstanding my recommendation that the Plan be modified by the identification of Llanmaes in my recommended Policy H2/H8 and the accompanying addition of a residential settlement boundary, the objection site be not included within such boundary.

C15.3 Llanmaes – land west of the village

Maintained objection

281.3 The Representative Body of The Church in Wales {Site at Llanmaes proposed for residential development}

ISSUE

C15.3.1 Whether

- (i) Llanmaes should be defined as a Policy HOUS1 settlement.
- (ii) Land west of Llanmaes should be allocated for residential development and included within a residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS

Issue (i)

C15.3.2 My conclusions on this issue are identical with those on the site north of the village

Issue (ii)

C15.3.3 The objection site, a grass field about 2.59 ha in extent, is in the open countryside where, as in the built-up area of the village, development is subject to Policy ENV1. It is immediately west of the modern development at West Acre and south of the Rectory and forms a conspicuous part of the open rural landscape surrounding the village. Its development would be a substantial encroachment into the countryside and would further dilute the nature of the village which is still predominantly characterised by the older buildings within the Conservation Area. In my view the site is much too extensive to regard as a modest ‘rounding-off’ of the village and would be likely to stimulate further development of a suburban type such as already exists to its east.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Plan be modified by:

REC.4.68 The identification of Llanmaes in my recommended Policy H2/H8 and the accompanying addition of a residential settlement boundary.

C16 Llantwit Major/Boverton

C16.0 General

C16.0.1 The approved Structure Plan Alteration No.1 (1989) states that limited housing development will be favoured within and adjoining Llantwit Major, subject to a number of criteria being met. It was clear to me however, from observation at my site visits, that large-scale development of the settlement has taken place beyond that which can be regarded as limited.

C16.0.2 The scale of such development is well illustrated by its population growth which when taken together with Boverton shows that the settlement has grown from 3,200 in 1961 to 8,030 in 1991 up to an estimated 9,750 in 1978. Moreover there has been a significant increase in the number of new houses completed over the first three years of the plan period with 373 dwellings completed since 1996. Such a scale of building and population growth does not constitute a limited form of development that was previously envisaged as being suitable to be accommodated within this settlement. Furthermore, there were, at the time of the inquiry, an additional 62 dwellings not started (60), under construction (1) or completed but vacant (1). Although representing a slower rate of development than has occurred in the recent past, I still consider there are sufficient sites available to ensure the continuing well being of the settlement in the plan period.

C16.0.3 Having regard to the above, the settlements of Llantwit Major and Boverton, when taken together, now form the largest town in the Rural Vale and provide a full range of social and physical infrastructure. However this scale of development has also led to the consolidation of development within and between both “village” centres which has spread outwards beyond the railway line to the bypass in a more suburban style. Although the core of the older parts of both of these settlements still retain much of the character of smaller villages, and are included within conservation areas, it is clear that their individual and small-scale character is under considerable development pressure.

C16.0.4 Consequently, if the distinct characters of these two settlements, and their conservation areas, are to be preserved or enhanced I take the view that development beyond “infilling” and “small-scale rounding-off” of the tightly defined settlement boundary should be resisted. In reaching such a conclusion I have taken into account that the settlement is well placed with regard to employment centres at the Llandow Trading estate and Vale Business Park. However, the need to restrict development in the Rural Vale is overriding and consistent with the plan’s overall strategy. This seeks to accommodate as much development as possible on the brownfield sites located within the urban areas of the Waterfront Strip. If such a strategy is to be positively promoted, it must take clear precedence over the unjustified release of further greenfield sites for larger-scale housing in the Rural Vale. As such I am satisfied that the Llantwit Major/Boverton Area would be appropriately covered under the designation of a new Policy HOUS2.

C16.1 Llantwit Major - Land at Eglwys Brewis Road/Llantwit Major Bypass

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Llantwit Major and Boverton.

Maintained Objections
264.1

Barratt South Wales

{Boverton}

ISSUE

C16.1.1 Whether land adjacent Eglwys Brewis Road/Llantwit Major Bypass should be allocated for housing.

CONCLUSIONS:

C16.1.2 Whilst the objector considers that the objections site would represent a logical “*rounding-off*” of the settlement I fail to see how such a conclusion can be drawn. The site, which is approximately 2.4ha in area is a greenfield site, is currently used for the grazing of horses and is surrounded by mature hedgerows. It is some 90 metres from the settlement of Boverton and separated from it by the B4265 Llantwit Major Bypass and open fields. Additionally the railway line forms a logical and strong physical boundary to the housing development at St Athan to the north-east of the objection site.

C16.1.3 The site is clearly within an area of countryside which forms an important green corridor between the settlements of Llantwit Major and Boverton to the south of the B4265, and RAF St.Athan and Eglwys Brewis to the north. Consequently, the development of the objection site, far from constituting a “*small-scale rounding-off*” of either Boverton or St.Athan, would lead to an unacceptable consolidation of these settlements.

C16.1.4 Matters concerning the suitability of the proposed access are overridden by my conclusions above and would only need further consideration at a planning application stage. As such, I have not taken this matter into account in formulating my recommendation on this site.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.69 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C16.2 Llantwit Major/Boverton - OS Field 3759

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out in above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Llantwit Major and Boverton.

Maintained Objections
308.1

Jones, Mr Evan

{ residential use on site.}

ISSUE

C16.2.1 Whether land comprising O.S Field 3759 should be allocated in the plan for housing.

CONCLUSIONS:

C16.2.2 The objection site is bounded by the B4265 Llantwit Major By-Pass to the north, Boverton Road to the south and east, and residential development to the west. It lies within the Boverton Conservation Area and, with other parcels of land to the south, constitutes an important constituent of the distinctive open landscape setting to this area as a whole and to the door and walls of gardens to the west of Boverton House, a Grade 2 Listed building. Development of this site would, apart from being unnecessary to meet the plan's housing requirement, unacceptably harm the open character and appearance of this part of the Conservation area. This reason alone is sufficient for me to conclude that this land should remain as countryside and its development for housing resisted.

C16.2.3 However, the site is also clearly within an area of countryside which forms an important green corridor between the settlements of Llantwit Major and Boverton to the south of the B4265 and RAF St.Athan and Eglwys Brewis to the north. Consequently the development of the objection site, far from constituting a "*small-scale rounding-off*" of Boverton, would lead to an unacceptable consolidation of these settlements.

C16.2.4 Although the objector indicates in his initial objection that the development of the site has been restricted for at least 20 years by a proposed inner improvement road, I have concluded that Policy TRAN2(iii) The Boverton Relief Road should be retained in the plan. Notwithstanding this conclusion, the reasons I have set out above override any consequences of Policy TRAN2(iii) on the development of this site.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.70 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C16.3 Llantwit Major/Boverton- Land to south of the Boverton settlement boundary

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning general matters involving the delineation of residential settlement boundaries.

Maintained Objections		
346.1	Colston, Mr I E	{Proposed extension to Boverton settlement limit.}
169.1	Thomas Esq., O.W.	{Omission of land surrounding Orchard House from Proposals Map 3.}
224.2	Williams, Mrs K	
307.1	Williams, Mrs J.K.	{Amendment to settlement boundary to include properties in Boverton.}

ISSUE

C16.3.1 Whether the Llantwit Major and Boverton residential settlement boundary on the south side of Boverton should be amended to reflect a more logical line

CONCLUSIONS:

C16.3.2 I have previously concluded that the Council has attributed a wider than necessary policy basis to the definition of residential settlement boundaries, which not only lacks reasoning in the plan but is also unjustified. The settlement boundary for Boverton illustrates this well. The Council indicate that the settlement boundary for Llantwit Major and Boverton has three purposes. These purposes are not set out in the plan but are all covered by other policies of the plan.

C16.3.3 I share the view of the Council that Boverton still retains its character as a quiet rural backwater which is partly due to the open spaces around Boverton Place and opposite Boverton House all of which are vitally important to the character of the Conservation Area. However I am not of the view that the inclusion of the areas suggested by the objector within the residential settlement boundary would imply that residential development on this land would be acceptable. The area involved has a village character and is included within the Conservation Area where the effect of any proposal on its character and appearance would and should override any settlement boundary consideration under the provisions of Policy HOUS9(iii). Similarly it is not the function of residential settlement boundaries to override any other policy of the plan such as, for example, the policies covering The Heritage Coast. Such a policy would also be covered by the provisions of Policy HOUS9(iii).

C16.3.4 Consequently, I consider the Council's approach to residential settlement boundaries is misplaced and confused and denies the existence of the many important development control policies in the plan. As I have concluded earlier in my report, residential settlement boundaries should have only the one function, which is to determine the relationship of individual settlements to the countryside. As a result I am sympathetic to the objection made that the settlement boundaries should be amended to reflect the existing residential development and its curtilages. Consequently I consider that the objector's proposed amendment to the Boverton residential settlement boundary is justified and that the plan should be amended accordingly. Such an amendment would also encompass amendments suggested under objections 169.1 and 224.2 and PCN013.

C16.3.5 My conclusions do not however encompass O.S field No. 4834, part of objections 307.1 and 307.2, which lies to the south of the curtilages of Orchard House and Orchard Farm House. This field is Grade 2 agricultural land and is clearly open countryside that also forms part of the setting of the Conservation Area. Consequently it should be protected from development and remain defined as open countryside. Also, I do not share the view that the dwelling known as "The Fields" should be included within such an amended boundary. This property is more properly defined as an

isolated dwelling in the countryside which if included would result in an unwarranted extension of the settlement boundary.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified:

REC.4.70 to include the amendment to the residential settlement boundary of Boverton as proposed under objection numbered 346.1.

C16.4 Llantwit Major/Boverton - Land to the South

Explanatory Note: Objections 271.2 and 271.3 are considered by the Council to refer to the land subject of objection 192.12 and I have considered these objections on that basis. Matters concerning the overall development of Llantwit Major are dealt with above.

Maintained Objections 192.12	Persimmon Homes (Wales) Ltd.	{Non allocation of land at south Llantwit Major/Boverton under Policy Hous 01.}
271.2	Llantwit Major Chamber of Trade	{Non allocation of land at south Llantwit Major/Boverton under Policy Hous 01.}
271.3	Llantwit Major Chamber of Trade	{exclusion from Polliicy HOUS8}

ISSUE

C16.4.1 Whether land to the south of Llantwit Major/Boverton should be allocated for housing.

CONCLUSIONS:

C16.4.2 My conclusions on the main principle involved in this objection are as set out above concerning general matters about development at Llantwit Major and Boverton. I have concluded that further new housing development beyond “*infilling*” and “*small-scale rounding-off*” is neither required nor appropriate at Llantwit Major/Boverton within the plan period. The objection site does not represent such a site and, whilst requested by one objector to draw no site-specific conclusions with regard to that objection, the other objector has made site specific comments which I have to address. Consequently my conclusions on the site-specific aspects are only drawn in relation to the evidence given by objector 271.

C16.4.3 The site is situated on the south-eastern boundary of the settlement linking Llantwit Major and Boverton where I observed that the site is highly visible, it being located just below the skyline when viewed from Ham Lane East between Boverton and Llantwit Major. Moreover given its location on the valley slopes of the Hoddnant Valley its development would be unduly separated from the main town area and would involve a large-scale extension of development into the open countryside of the Heritage Coast. Taking into account my conclusions with regard to the overall development of Llantwit Major/Boverton I do not consider it an appropriate site for inclusion under Policy HOUS1.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.71 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C16.5 Llantwit Major/Boverton - Field 3968

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Llantwit Major and Boverton. My conclusions with regard to the recreational aspects of this objection are set out at Chapter 8.

Maintained Objections
277.1

Davies, Gareth

{Residential development in Llantwit Major.}

ISSUE

C16.5.1 Whether the western side of the Llantwit Major residential settlement boundary should be amended to reflect a more logical line

CONCLUSIONS:

C16.5.2 The objection site, which is located on the western extremities of Llantwit Major to the north west of the Grade 1 Listed Parish Church, forms an important open setting to the Conservation Area. The Llantwit Major - Conservation Area Study clearly indicates that the individual character of Llantwit is largely a product of the contrast between the between fields that constitute a rural backcloth and the tightly developed town. The objection site is part of this rural backcloth formed by the valley fields and the ridgeline to the west and clearly forms part of the countryside which should be protected from development.

C16.5.3 The Council accepts that a deficit in playing field provision exists in the locality and it is agreed that the ancient monument could provide a non-residential tourist attraction. However such facilities should not be provided by the allocation of an important open site in a Conservation Area for residential development. Such development would, notwithstanding its intended high standard of design and layout, have an unacceptable impact of the openness of this area which significantly contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of a Grade I Listed Building. Consequently, I find no reason to recommend the alteration of the residential settlement boundary to include the objection site.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.72 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C16.6 Llantwit Major/Boverton - Land to the north of Boverton

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Llantwit Major and Boverton.

Maintained Objections		
286.2	Llanmoor Homes	{Proposed residential development on land NE corner of Boverton / Llantwit Major.}
286.5	Llanmoor Homes	{Proposed residential development at Boverton / Llantwit Major.}
286.6	Llanmoor Homes	{Proposed residential development at Boverton / Llantwit Major.}
286.7	Llanmoor Homes	{Proposal for additional residential land at Llantwit Major.}
286.8	Llanmoor Homes	{Proposal for additional residential land at Llantwit Major.}
286.9	Llanmoor Homes	{Proposed residential land at Llantwit Major}
286.10	Llanmoor Homes	{Proposed allocation of residential land at Llantwit Major.}

ISSUE

C16.6.1 Whether land to the east of Boverton should be included within the residential settlement boundary and allocated for housing.

CONCLUSIONS:

C16.6.2 The objection site is bounded by the B4265 Llantwit Major By-Pass to the north, to the north west by the access link road to Boverton, to the south and south west by residential development, and to the south east by a field boundary. It lies within the Boverton Conservation Area and with other parcels of land to the north west and south east constitutes an important constituent of the distinctive open landscape setting to this area which still retains its character as a quiet rural backwater.

C16.6.3 Development of this site would, apart from being unnecessary to meet the plan's housing requirement, constitute a significant extension of Boverton that cannot be described as "*small-scale rounding-off*". As a consequence it would unacceptably harm the rural setting, and hence the character and appearance, of the Conservation area. This reason alone is sufficient for me to conclude that this land should remain as countryside and its development for housing resisted.

C16.6.4 However, the site is also clearly within an area of countryside which forms an important green corridor between the settlements of Llantwit Major and Boverton to the south of the B4265 and RAF St.Athan and Eglwys Brewis to the north. Consequently the development of the objection site, far from constituting a small-scale rounding-off of Boverton, would lead to an unacceptable consolidation of these settlements.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.73 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C16.7 Llantwit Major/Boverton- Plasnewydd Farm

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Llantwit Major and Boverton.

Maintained Objections		
127.1	Jones, Mr Brian	{Llantwit Major - proposed additional housing allocations.}
127.2	Jones, Mr Brian	{Llantwit Major - restrictive settlement boundary.}

ISSUE

C16.7.1 Whether land at Plasnewydd Farm should be included within the residential settlement boundary and allocated for housing.

CONCLUSIONS:

C16.7.2 The objection site comprises agricultural land to the north west of Llantwit Major, lying between the Llantwit Major by-pass to the north; the Barry-Bridgend railway line to the south and west and Llantwit Major Road to the east. It is some 4.25ha in area, triangular in shape, used as pasture and projects over 350 metres westwards from the existing boundary of the built up area.

C16.7.3 Whilst it is well screened from the majority of its surroundings by established hedgerows it is still countryside and clearly forms part of a rural view obtained from B4265 roundabout and from between the rural buildings situated on the Llantwit Major Road frontage. In this respect the Llantwit Major Road forms a strong north/south boundary to the residential settlement boundary where a distinct change in character between the urban area and the countryside is noticeable. Such a clear demarcation between settlement and countryside should be protected. Whilst the objector considers that the site is well related to existing built development on the east side of the Llantwit Major Road its development would in my view result in an unwarranted extension of the urban area into the open countryside notwithstanding its moderate landscape quality.

C16.7.4 The fact that the site is Grade 2 agricultural land adds weight to the above conclusion. Although the site is land that has been severed from a larger area of agricultural land by the by-pass, it is clearly still large enough to be used for some grazing. Moreover, land covered by such an agricultural grading should only be developed exceptionally if there is an overriding need for such development, and sufficient land in lower grades is unavailable. I have found no such an overriding need in this case.

C16.7.5 Matters concerning the suitability of a proposed access are overridden by my conclusions above and would only need further consideration at a planning application stage. As such, I have not taken this matter into account in formulating my recommendation on this site.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.74 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C17 Michaelston-le-Pitt

Explanatory Note: My conclusion with regard to the site specific objection associated with Michaelston le Pit has to be read together with my conclusions and recommendations concerning the general objections made to Policies ENV1, ENV3 at Chapter 3. For the reasons I have set out there I have recommended that an area to the north and west of Barry, Penarth, Dinas Powis, and St Fagans be designated a Green Belt within which there would be a strong presumption against development. The designation would ‘wash over’ Michaelston le Pit, where further development would be restricted to that appropriate to a Green Belt.

Maintained objection
282.1

Trustees of The Stewart Memorial Trust {Site proposed for residential development}

ISSUE

C17.1 Whether the objection site should be allocated for residential development under Policy HOUS1.

CONCLUSIONS

C17.2 Within the Rural Vale Michaelston le Pit is a somewhat isolated linear hamlet and Conservation Area in the Cwrt yr Ala valley. The very limited community facilities and lack of opportunity for infilling militate against its definition as a HOUS2 settlement. Still less is it one of the major settlements having a good range of services and meriting the allocation of residential development sites under Policy HOUS1. Since the Green Belt designation which I recommend would ‘wash over’ the village it is inappropriate to indicate a residential settlement boundary or to allocate the objection site for housing.

C17.3 In the light of the Green Belt designation the only permissible types of development in Michaelston le Pit would be those allowed under recommended new Green Belt Policy. They would nevertheless also be subject to the criteria of whether they preserved or enhanced the character of the Conservation Area.

C17.4 The objection site consists of various agricultural buildings and land located about 90m immediately east of and at a lower level than the village spine and is accessed by a track. The village is at the head of a narrow cul-de-sac road, has no community facilities other than the church and a telephone call box, and there is no bus service. I note that an appeal decision in 1999 to refuse planning permission for development elsewhere in the village concluded that the village might have reached the acceptable limit of its natural growth. I concur with that view since by extending into backland the development proposed would inappropriately extend the village to the detriment of the appearance of the Conservation Area.

C17.5 As to the claim that the allocation of the site would extend the range of choice I consider that, together with the amendments I recommend in Chapter 1 of this report, sufficient provision has been made in the Plan for residential development in the Rural Vale without incursion into this Conservation Area and the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.75 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C18 Ogmore-by-Sea

Maintained Objections

349.3	Trustees of Dunraven Estates	{Proposed expansion of Ogmore By Sea settlement boundary.}
349.4	Trustees of Dunraven Estates	{Proposed expansion of Ogmore By Sea settlement boundary.}
349.5	Trustees of Dunraven Estates	{Proposed amendment to eastern Southerndown settlement boundary.}

ISSUE

C18.1 Whether land to the south east of Ogmore-by-Sea should be included within the residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C18.2 The objection site comprises a large area of open land to the south east of the village which is used as pasture. It lies entirely within the Heritage Coast area which is, under Policy ENV4, to be treated as a remote zone with priority being given to agriculture, landscape and nature conservation.

C18.3 Contrary to the view of the objector I consider that the site is not well related to the existing built form being a large area of open land opposite an existing ribbon of housing development. The development of the site, even if only part of it, would lead to an unacceptable consolidation of this ribbon development and an unwarranted encroachment into the openness of this part of the sensitive landscape of the Heritage Coast.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.76 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C19 Rhoose

C19.0 General

C19.0.1 The strategy of the plan seeks to concentrate development opportunities in the major areas of Barry, Penarth and Rhoose with emphasis being placed on the redevelopment of three large brownfield sites at the Waterfront, Barry, Penarth Haven, and Rhoose Point. This area has the largest concentration of population in the Vale of Glamorgan, has good access by public transport to surrounding areas including Cardiff and has a full range of community and utility services such as shops and health facilities. Rhoose itself has seen considerable growth of housing since 1981 with some 739 houses being completed of which 291 have been added since the start of the plan period. It is significant that, apart from the allocation at Rhoose Point, only some 16 individual dwellings remained to be started or completed at April 99.

C19.0.2 The centre of the village has shops and a small conservation area, and residential estates exist on both sides of the coast road which divides the settlement in two. Recent development extends north from the coast road towards the rural settlement of Fonmon and the airfield. South from the coast road the land slopes towards the railway beyond which it continues to fall to Rhoose Point, a former quarry which is an allocated housing site under Policy HOUS1(13).

C19.0.3 The proposed residential and employment sites of the Rhoose Point development, which is a brownfield site, is included within the settlement boundary of Rhoose. This major development is a key element in support of Strategic Policy 2 and includes a landholding of some 97ha of which it is proposed that some 20ha is to be allocated for residential purposes and 2.9ha for employment. It is envisaged that some 500 dwellings will be provided on a phased basis. A further 6.9ha site is allocated for employment purposes is allocated under Policy EMP1(21) on land to the north of Rhoose. However, although defined as lying within the settlement boundary, the whole area of development appears as little more than a large but isolated appendage to the major part of the settlement.

C19.0.4 The Council's reliance on the development of such a large single development is not without risk and could, if the development is not fully implemented, lead to a considerable shortfall in the achievement of the housing target of the plan as a whole. Moreover, such a large development in single ownership does not allow for the range and choice that is inherent in a greater number of individual and smaller sites.

C19.0.5 Major development at Rhoose is not only consistent with the promotion of the Waterfront Strip but with the proposed strategic development of the Cardiff International Airport (CIA) and the settlement is particularly suitable to accommodate housing for the employment related to the airport. Policy EMP1(5), wrongly referenced on the Proposals Map as EMP1(15), proposes a development of a Cardiff International Airport Business Park of some 58.9ha. I have previously concluded that there is insufficient allocation of housing land made within the plan and, in that development at Rhoose would be consistent with the overall strategy of the plan, a further appropriate allocation of housing land could be made.

C19.1 Rhoose - Fonmon Road, Font-y-gary

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Rhoose. Matters concerning the development of land for employment purposes are dealt with at Chapter 5.

Maintained Objections
227.5

Thomas, Mr & Mrs D

ISSUE

C19.1.1 Whether land to the north of Rhoose at the junction of Fonmon Road and Port North Road should be allocated for housing under Policy HOUS1.

CONCLUSIONS:

C19.1.2 The objection site, which comprises 5ha of agricultural land, lies in the area between Rhoose, the airport and the village of Fonmon and is immediately adjacent to the Font-y-gary development which presents a hard urban edge to it.

C19.1.3 Notwithstanding the hard urban edge formed by the adjacent housing, the site is open and rural and is clearly open countryside where its allocation for residential use is inappropriate. Given the openness of the site, any development of it would constitute an intrusive element into what is an open rural landscape of pleasant visual quality. The fact that additional landscaping may lead to the softening of the existing hard urban edge of Rhoose is not sufficient reason, even when taken together with the likely Grade 3b agricultural land value of the site, to justify such an incursion.

C19.1.4 The Council refers to an appeal decision concerning a proposed residential development to the south/south-east of the objection site. That Inspector concluded: *“My view is that it would erode the open rural aspect between that development...(Celtic Way) ... and the airport perimeter to the east. The airport itself contains few buildings on its western side, so that an open rural landscape of pleasant visual quality exists to the north and east of the site. ...”*

C19.1.5 The objection site clearly lies within the landscape being referred to by that Inspector. I agree with the conclusions drawn concerning that landscape. I do not consider, therefore, that the development of the site for housing would satisfy criteria (i) and (iii) of Policy HOUS9, as recommended to be modified. Moreover, from observation at my site visit, it was clear to me that the proposed development would extend the development of Rhoose northerly along Fonmon Road. This would result in a form of development that that would be likely to promote the unacceptable coalescence of Rhoose and the rural settlement of Fonmon. As such, I conclude that development of the objection site would be contrary to the objectives of the plan..

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.77 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C19.3 Rhose - Land between Porthkerry Road and Rhose Point.

Explanatory Note : The objections considered here are made by two individual objectors and involve the proposed allocation for housing of the area between Porthkerry Road, Rhose Point and the access road proposed for inclusion on the Proposals Map under PCN013. They involve similar considerations. My conclusions on these objections have to be taken together with my conclusions above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Rhose. In addition to the objections made concerning the allocation of the area for housing I also deal with the site-specific aspects of objection made to Policy ENV5 concerning the revision of the coastal zone boundary.

Maintained Objections

57.1B	Blue Circle Industries plc	
126.4	Bellway Estates	
126.5	Bellway Estates	{Rhosse-additional residential allocations.}
126.6	Bellway Estates	{Rhosse - additional residential allocations.}
126.7	Bellway Estates	{Rhosse settlement boundary.}
126.8	Bellway Estates	{Rhosse settlement boundary.}
232.3	Land Division, Welsh Development Agency	
232.10	Land Division, Welsh Development Agency	

ISSUE

C19.3.1 Whether land between Porthkerry Road and Rhose Point should be excluded from the coastal zone, allocated for housing and included within the Rhose residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C19.3.2 The area covered by both objections involves two parcels of land which are both in agricultural use. The objectors indicate that the westerly site has an area of 11.4ha and the easterly site an area of 12ha, the Council however, states that the whole area is some 25.9ha. Whilst the area is open countryside, it is bounded to the north by residential development and to the south by the railway, beyond which is land allocated for housing at Rhose Point under Policy HOUS1(13). To the west, the area is bounded by housing whilst, to the east, the boundary of the easterly objection site is formed by the access road to the proposed Rhose Point development. Under PCN013, this access is, rightly, to be included on the Proposals Map.

C19.3.3 In my view, the line of the proposed access road provides a more appropriate, defensible and logical boundary for the residential settlement boundary of Rhose. The development of Rhose Point will clearly urbanise the character of this part of Rhose 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 Rhose. Moreover, I observed at my site visit that this area enjoys a close physical and visual relationship with the existing built development in Rhose and that the development of Rhose Point would further extend this enclosure to the south. Development of the area would, as a consequence, further the Council's stated objective for Rhose Point of integrating the settlement of Rhose with its coastline.

C19.3.4 The area is also well located to meet the objective of locating development close to public transport, shopping and leisure facilities together with employment opportunities. It adjoins a rail corridor where it is the Council's intention to develop new rail facilities including re-opening to passengers of the Vale of Glamorgan railway line between Barry and Bridgend. The site also has potentially good access to Cardiff and Barry and is close to the main employment areas of the CIA.

C19.3.5 Whilst the area lies within an area defined as part of the Coastal Zone, the Council makes no distinction on the Proposals Map between its developed and undeveloped areas. I have concluded with regard to Policy ENV5 that such a clear distinction should be made on the Proposal

Map and also consider that such a distinction should take into account any proposals for development made in the plan. When viewed from the coast, the objection sites are set against a backdrop of existing housing and after Rhose Point has been developed they will be surrounded on three sides by housing. As such, I consider that their development would have no significant detrimental visual impact on the coast. I further consider 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 Rhose Point should be designated as part of the developed coast, as should be other developed areas in Rhose.

C19.3.6 I have had regard to the fact that development of Rhose Point, in itself, constitutes a major housing development of some 500 dwellings on some 20ha of the regenerated site. Consequently, the development of the objection sites, taking into account the need for informal open space and related infrastructure, would result in a development of a similar scale to Rhose Point. Such a development could not be implemented at the same time as Rhose Point if the regeneration objectives of that development are to be given priority in accordance with the overall strategy of the plan.

C19.3.7 Accordingly, I consider that a development brief should be prepared for the area in association with the prospective developers. This would ensure not only that the appropriate design considerations would be made clear and that the necessary infrastructure would be provided but that an appropriate phasing of the whole development could be achieved. However, I see no reason why the development of both sites should not be started on a small scale before the last 5 years of the plan. Such phasing, consisting of about 100 dwellings between the two sites, would enable development at Rhose Point to become established and provide a range and choice of sites more appropriate for a settlement having such an important part to play in the implementation of the overall strategy of the plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.78 the acceptance of PCN013;

REC.4.79 the inclusion of the objection sites within the residential settlement boundary of Rhose, referenced under Policy HOUS1;

REC.4.80 the preparation of an overall development brief and phasing plan for the sites and referred to in the explanatory text to ensure that their development does not prejudice the implementation of the regeneration of Site HOUS1(13) at Rhose Point;

REC.4.81 the removal of the Coastal Zone designation for land to the north of the railway line at Rhose and that the proposed development area be designated as part of the developed coast.

C19.4 Rhoose - Lower Farm

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Rhoose. The Council in a letter dated 1 December 1999 to the objector indicates that the settlement boundary in the vicinity of the objection site was incorrectly drawn on the Proposals Map. It indicates that the boundary should be redrawn to the fence that runs along the residential development permitted under planning permission 92/00320/OUT.

Maintained Objections

113.1	Reader, J & R
113.2	Reader, J & R

ISSUE

C19.4.1 Whether land at Lower Farm should be allocated for housing and included within the residential settlement boundary of Rhoose.

CONCLUSIONS:

C19.4.2 The objection site comprises some 6.7ha of agricultural land and lies directly to the north of the residential settlement boundary for Rhoose and a recently completed housing estate. Immediately to the east of the site is the perimeter fence of the Cardiff International Airport (CIA). From observation at my site visit it was clear that the Council's suggested amendment of the residential settlement boundary represents the correct interpretation of the Rhoose settlement boundary.

C19.4.3 Notwithstanding the hard urban edge formed by the adjacent housing, the site is open and rural and is clearly open countryside where its allocation for residential use is inappropriate. Given the openness of the environs of the site to the north, west and east, any development on the site would constitute an intrusive element into what is an open rural landscape of pleasant visual quality.

C19.4.4 The Council refers to an appeal decision concerning a proposed residential development to the west of the objection site. That Inspector concluded: *"My view is that it would erode the open rural aspect between that development...(Celtic Way) ... and the airport perimeter to the east. The airport itself contains few buildings on its western side, so that an open rural landscape of pleasant visual quality exists to the north and east of the site. .."*

C19.4.5 The objection site clearly lies within the landscape being referred to by that Inspector. I agree with the conclusions drawn concerning that landscape and do not, therefore, consider that the development of the site for housing would satisfy criteria (i) and (iii) of Policy HOUS9 as recommended to be modified.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.82 the settlement boundary for Rhoose being redrawn to the line of the fence that runs along the boundary of the residential development permitted under planning permission 92/00320/OUT.

C20 Siginstone – Part OS 1848

Explanatory Note: Whilst objection 246.14 refers to the delineation of the settlement boundary being too loosely drawn the Council indicates that this is a result of the fact that the Proposals map does not show the existing dwellings that are encompassed by the settlement boundary. Consequently the objection is misplaced. Objection 293.4 is withdrawn.

Maintained objection

220.1

246.14

Mr A W Morgan
Llandow Community Council

{Extend settlement boundary of Siginstone}
(settlement boundary)

ISSUE

C20.1 Whether the inclusion of the objection site within the settlement boundary of Siginstone would affect the character and appearance of the village.

CONCLUSIONS

C20.2 Siginstone is a Policy HOUS2 village. By far the major part of the settlement lies north of the east-west road passing through it. The objection site consists of open grazing land in the southwest quadrant of the area adjoining the junction of the unclassified roads leading westwards and southwards out of the village. It is about 0.61ha in extent and of Grade 3a agricultural quality. Houses face the site across the road on its northern boundary and there are further dwellings across the road on its eastern boundary.

C20.3 Two isolated dwellings further south on the west side of the road to Llanmaes are clear examples of sporadic development in the countryside. Permission for residential development between them and between the northern dwelling, Kelmscote, and the objection site was refused in the past on the grounds of intrusion into the countryside and the need to prevent incipient ribbon development.

C20.4 I am in no doubt that the inclusion of the objection site within the residential development boundary of the village would patently represent an unwarranted extension of the village rather than infilling, contrary to Policy HOUS 2. Although the objector claims the site's development would reflect the housing opposite to my mind it is its openness in contrast to the housing to its north and east which achieves the marked distinction between the built-up area and the open countryside which characterises this corner of the village. Contrary to the objector's assertion, the site is clearly part of the open countryside and its inclusion within the village settlement boundary would in my view be neither accurate nor logical.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.83 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C21 Southerndown

C21.1 Southerndown - Land East of Southerndown House

Maintained Objections
358.1

Minns, William David

{Proposed revision of Southerndown settlement boundary.}

ISSUE

C21.1.1 Whether land to the east of Southerndown House should be included within the residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C21.1.2 I observed at my site visit that a tennis court and swimming pool were located on the objection site which lies adjacent to Southerndown House which is a large detached residential property. A new detached dwelling was under construction to the rear of Southerndown House and access to it is obtained via South Terrace and a new access drive along the western edge of the objection site. To the east and south, the site is bounded by fields.

C21.1.3 Whilst I have taken into account that the objection site lies outside the settlement boundary defined in the Ogwr Borough Local Plan it clearly has the character and appearance of part of the residential curtilage of Southerndown house and the new dwelling to its rear. I have previously concluded that residential curtilages of properties within settlement boundaries should also be included within such boundaries. The objection site, being originally part of a large residential curtilage, clearly has a residential use and is not open countryside. The fact that an access to the new dwelling at the rear of Southerndown House now crosses the site confirms my view.

C21.1.4 The Council point to two appeal decisions given in 1988 and 1990 and I note that the application for a new dwelling to the rear of Southerndown House was first approved in 1998. The Inspector in 1988 stated that: "... *It is not uncommon for a side garden to adjoin countryside, and I do not consider that a present use as a garden would necessarily justify putting a separate dwelling on it, and thus extending built development. ..*". I am in agreement with the conclusion of that Inspector especially having regard to the fact that the site lies within the Heritage Coast where the special qualities of the area should be conserved and enhanced. Notwithstanding my conclusion that the site should be included within the settlement boundary, any development of it could clearly be resisted under Policy HOUS9 given the open environs of the site to the south and east, and its location within the Heritage Coast.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.84 the inclusion of the land to the east of Southerndown House within the residential settlement boundary.

C21.2 Southerndown - Great House Yard

Maintained Objections
349.2

Trustees of Dunraven Estates

{Proposed expansion of southern settlement boundary
of Ogmore By Sea.}

ISSUE

C21.2.1 Whether land at Great House Yard should be included within the residential settlement boundary of Southerndown.

CONCLUSIONS:

C21.2.2 The objection site is located on the eastern fringes of Southerndown. It comprises Southerndown House Farm, a residential property known as Tymawr, buildings with planning permission for conversion to residential use to the north of Southerndown House Farm, vacant workshops and an unkempt paddock area.

C21.2.3 Notwithstanding that the site lies outside the settlement boundary as identified in the Ogwr Borough Local Plan, when viewed from Beach Road the buildings on it visually form part of the settlement of Southerndown. Also, there have been considerable changes in the function of the various buildings and parcels of land which comprise the site, with residential conversions having been allowed for some of the buildings. In that the Council also considers those proposals for the conversion or reuse of the old workshop buildings to be acceptable I consider that there is sufficient justification for the buildings to be included within the residential settlement boundary.

C21.2.4 However, I do not share the objector's view that the paddock has a similar relationship to the settlement of Southerndown. This area of land although unkempt is clearly open in character and entirely related to the open countryside, forming an important constituent of the open approach to the settlement along Beach Road. As such I do not consider that the paddock to be appropriately included within the residential settlement boundary of Southerndown. Given the open environs of the paddock, and its surroundings to the east and south, I consider development of it would not only be contrary to the criteria attached to Policy HOUS9 but would be inconsistent with the need to protect the Heritage Coast from inappropriate development.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.85 the inclusion of the buildings, together with their immediate curtilages, comprising Southerndown House Farm, "Tymawr", the buildings with planning permission for conversion to residential use and the vacant workshops, within the residential settlement boundary of Southerndown, but excluding the paddock area on the eastern side of the objection site.

C22 St Andrew's Major –

Explanatory Note: My conclusion with regard to the site specific objection associated with St Andrew's Major has to be read together with my conclusions and recommendations concerning the general objections made to Policies ENV1, ENV3. For the reasons I have set out there I have recommended that an area to the north and west of Barry, Penarth, Dinas Powis, and St Fagans be designated a Green Belt within which there would be a strong presumption against development. The designation would 'wash over', St Andrew's Major where further development would be restricted to that permissible under new Green Belt Policies.

Maintained objection
281.2

The Representative Body of The Church in Wales {Site at St. Andrews Major proposed for residential development}

ISSUE

C22.1 Whether the objection site should be allocated for residential development under Policy HOUS1.

CONCLUSIONS

C22.1 In spite of the low density sporadic ribbon of development between Dinas Powis and the area at and immediately adjoining St Andrew's church the undeveloped open nature of the objection site helps to define the core of a small but visually distinctive hamlet.

C22.2 The limited community facilities and lack of opportunity for infilling militate against the definition of St Andrew's Major as a HOUS2 settlement. Still less is it one of the major settlements having a good range of services and meriting for sustainable reasons the allocation of residential development sites under Policy HOUS1. Since the Green Belt designation which I recommend would 'wash over' the village it is inappropriate to indicate a residential settlement boundary or to allocate the objection site for housing. In any case, taking into account the provision of the 10% of additional sites which I recommend above the borough-wide figure proposed in the Plan, there is no residual housing requirement to be met.

C22.3 In the light of the Green Belt designation the only permissible types of development in St Andrew's Major would be restricted to that appropriate to a Green Belt as set out in PGW.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.86 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C23 St.Athan

C23.1 St.Athan - Allotments - Eglwys Brewis

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions concerning Site HOUS1(17). I have taken into account that the objection site has been the subject of a recent dismissed appeal in respect of an outline proposal for residential development. That Inspector concluded, for the reasons set out in his letter reference APP/Z6950/A/99/513363 dated 24.11.99, that new development on the objection site should only be considered, if warranted, in the context of the wider emerging UDP context. I am in agreement with the detailed conclusions drawn by that Inspector. The objector, in accepting that the Inspector's conclusions are clearly made, now considers that there are 3 issues which need to be addressed in respect of the objections made to the plan. I have taken these into account.

Maintained Objections

196.1	Annington Property Ltd.	{Land at St. Athan}
196.2	Annington Property Ltd.	{Land at St. Athan}

ISSUES

C23.1.1 Whether:

- (i) there is a need for additional housing land to be allocated within the plan;
and, if so,
- (ii) whether the objection site represents an appropriate opportunity to contribute to the accommodation of any such additional need when compared with all other available options;
and, if not,
- (iii) whether a compromise development proposal would be appropriate and acceptable.

CONCLUSIONS:

Issue (i)

C23.1.2 I have previously determined that there is a need for additional housing land over and above that provided in the plan.

Issue (ii)

C23.1.3 I consider that there is an overriding need to ensure that proposals made in the plan do not compromise its overall strategy. I have also concluded, in that St Athan does not lie within the strategy area, that Site HOUS1(17) should be deleted. As such I consider that the majority of the additional allocations made should be restricted as far as possible to The Waterfront Strip and to the town of Cowbridge which already has a wide range of community facilities and a function of a major service centre for the Rural Vale.

C23.1.4 Moreover, the Inspector considering the 1999 appeal concluded, that development of the objection site could not reasonably be regarded as a minor extension/logical "*rounding-off*" of the existing Eglwys Brewis settlement pattern. I agree with such a conclusion and have previously concluded that development at settlements defined under a new Policy HOUS2 should be restricted to "*small-scale rounding-off*" which I have defined as being, up to about 5 dwellings and subject to the criteria of Policy HOUS9. Development of the objection site cannot satisfy such criteria in that it would represent a large-scale extension of the settlement into the open landscape of its environs. Consequently, I conclude that the objection site should not be included within the residential

settlement boundary of Eglwys Brewis.

Issue (iii)

C23.1.5 The objectors revised proposal, shown on a plan entitled “Sketch Scheme Concept”, clearly addresses the conclusions drawn by the previous Inspector and would only represent a “*small-scale rounding-off*” the settlement boundary. In that the development proposed would be closely associated with development on Cedar Road and Elm Grove I am satisfied that it would be of a scale and form in keeping with the immediate environs of the site thereby satisfying the criteria attached to Policy HOUS9. Moreover, the intention of the objector to ensure remedial action with regard to the remainder of the unsightly allotment land, by “gifting” its ownership, would enable the openness of the greater majority of the objection site to be conserved.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.87 including the area, delineated as proposed new houses and private driveway on the objector’s plan entitled “Sketch Scheme Concept”, within the residential settlement boundary of Eglwys Brewis.

C23.2 St.Athan - West House Farm

Maintained Objections
268.1

James, Mr John

{Inclusion of West Farm, St. Athan within settlement boundary.}

ISSUE

C23.2.1 Whether West House Farm buildings should be included within the residential settlement boundary of St.Athan.

CONCLUSIONS:

C23.2.2 The objection site lies on the western edge of a ribbon of houses, within the settlement boundary, extending westwards out of the village along Llantwit Road. It comprises a farmhouse and a yard and various outbuildings all enclosed by the enclosed walled area of an original farmyard. One of the outbuildings had recently been used as a veterinary surgery.

C23.2.3 The Council accepts that a number of unsightly buildings exist on the site, that West House Farm has not been a working farm for some 20 years, and that it was removed from the listing and farm holding registration 10 years ago. Whilst it is accepted by the Council that the removal of the redundant buildings may improve the appearance of the site, it is considered that any additional built urban development on the site would be unacceptable.

C23.2.4 The site is clearly not countryside and is clearly seen as being within the urban building limits of the settlement when leaving the village along Llantwit Road. As such I consider it would be appropriately included within the residential settlement boundary of St.Athan. Although the Council considers the site would be more appropriately developed in accord with Policies ENV1, ENV7, ENV8, EMP8 and EMP9, such development is normally associated with the open countryside. Also, the buildings on the site already form part of the existing ribbon of development along Llantwit Road and their redevelopment for residential use would neither unacceptably affect the character of the village nor lead to the further extension of built development into the countryside. Given attention to its design, the small-scale redevelopment of the site could make a positive contribution to the village by the removal of its existing unsightly buildings.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.88 the inclusion of the objection site within the residential settlement boundary of St.Athan.

C24 St Brides Major

C24.0 General

C24.0.1 St.Brides Major is large village consisting of about 250 dwellings and located in the west of the Vale. It is situated within a narrow valley surrounded by several farms and is distinctly rural in character. It has a number of community facilities including a shop/post office, a craft shop, two churches, funeral directors, a primary school and two community halls.

C24.0.2 The current adopted plan for the area is the Ogwr Borough Local Plan 1995 which has a timescale of 1991 to 2006 and the residential settlement boundary is as defined in that plan. The Council's April 1999 land availability records indicate that there are some 4 dwelling units either under construction or with planning permission.

C24.1 St Brides Major - Area to the South

Maintained Objections
349.7

Trustees of Dunraven Estates

{Proposed revision of St. Brides Major settlement limit.}

ISSUE

C24.1.1 Whether the area to the south of the residential settlement boundary should be included.

CONCLUSIONS:

C24.1.2 The objection site comprises a large area to the south of the defined settlement boundary extending along the Wick Road including the village pond and "The Farmers Arms" public house. The whole area is included within the St.Brides Major Conservation Area and the area to the west of Wick Road lies within the Glamorgan Heritage Coast.

C24.1.3 Whilst I do not consider that residential settlement boundaries should do more than delineate the boundary of countryside around settlements, in this case neither do I consider the objection site should be included within a settlement boundary. Notwithstanding that the objection site includes within it a variety of built development, its character is that of a very loose knit form and is consistent with a countryside designation. The fact that the village pond and "The Farmers Arms" public house are attractive amenities closely associated with the village does not justify their inclusion within such a settlement boundary. Such facilities serve to emphasise the rural character of this area and would not be appropriately included along with the more urban form of the defined settlement boundary.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.89 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C24.2 St Brides Major - New Vicarage and adjoining land

Explanatory note: My conclusions with regard to this site-specific objection associated with St Bride's Major Nicholas should be read together with my conclusions and recommendations concerning the general objections made to Policies ENV1 and ENV3

Maintained objection
195.1

Mr C Davies

{Extend settlement boundary of St Bride's Major to
south west}

ISSUE

C24.2.1 Whether the settlement boundary of St Bride's Major should be revised to include the New Vicarage and land adjoining it.

CONCLUSIONS

C24.2.2 The objection site, which includes the 0.24ha site of the dwelling known as the New Vicarage and an area of 0.11ha of land comprising a non-residential building adjoining the road and a triangular-shaped area to the rear of both buildings, adjoins the southern tip of the settlement boundary of St Bride's Major, a Policy H2 village, at Southerndown Road. Any development of the site would therefore be subject to Policy ENV1. The planning permission for the new Vicarage predated the designation of the Heritage Coast. Planning permission has been refused on 2 occasions for the residential development of the rest of the site, broadly on the ground of its unacceptability in the countryside when unrelated to the permissible types of residential building. The new Vicarage is not in the objector's ownership, nor has any objection been received in respect of that property. The remainder of the objection site is part of a larger land holding used by the objector for agriculture, though that is stated to be secondary to his ground maintenance business operated from the site.

C24.2.3 Without doubt the undeveloped portion of the objection site is part of the setting of this fairly large village. For the most part it consists of backland with no obvious natural rear boundary and, save for the New Vicarage itself, would initiate a new direction of expansion for the village. While in view of my general recommendations on housing it may be acceptable to provide for infilling within and for small scale rounding-off of the village, the undeveloped rear part of the objection site is so clearly an essential part of the rural surroundings of the village and the open land of the Heritage Coast area that its development should be avoided.

C24.2.4 The objector's intention is to redevelop and extend the existing long-standing building adjoining the road in his portion of the site with a mixed residential and business development, which would include the additional operation of a tree and shrub nursery. The conversion of rural buildings, development associated with agriculture, and small scale farm diversification is permissible, subject to compliance with stated criteria, under various policies in the Plan. However, the balance of activities on the site is unlikely to justify an agricultural justification for a dwelling, as the objector admits and it is appropriate that any proposal for development of the objector's part of the site be determined with reference to policies relevant to the countryside.

C24.2.5 Notwithstanding my conclusions on the objector's property I consider it would be logical for any modification of the settlement boundary to include the curtilage of the New Vicarage. I do not share the Council's concern that development in the narrow area between that building and the village hall would be detrimental to the character of the open countryside or the Heritage Coast.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified to:

REC.4.90 include the curtilage of the New Vicarage in the settlement boundary.

C24.3 St Brides Major - Penylan Farm

Maintained Objections
349.6

Trustees of Dunraven Estates

{Proposed revision of St. Brides Major settlement limit.}

ISSUE

C24.3.1 Whether land and buildings at Penylan Farm should be included within the residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C24.3.2 The objection site comprises a mix of agricultural buildings. These include, to the front of the site, a farmhouse that is no longer in agricultural use and redundant stone buildings that have the benefit of planning permission for residential conversion. To the rear of the site at a higher level, extending to the crest of the valley slope, is the balance of the farm buildings. These consist of more modern and substantial farm buildings which are, I understand, being rented out for farming storage purposes.

C24.3.3 Penylan Farm is no longer an active farming base and given the fact that residential permission has been given by the Council, the conversion of existing buildings to the front of the site are clearly associated with the residential form of the village. The Council are concerned to ensure that the existing farm character of the site is retained and to ensure a greater level of certainty with regard to the suitable development of the site. However, I do not consider the farm buildings to the rear of the site add anything to the rural character of the site, its immediate area or the village as a whole.

C24.3.4 The redevelopment of the rear part of the site, if carried out in an appropriate and sensitive manner and in local materials, would positively add to the visual quality of the area. It would also constitute only a “small-scale rounding-off” of the settlement boundary which I have deemed appropriate in terms of a revised Policy HOUS2. Although the Council indicates that adequate opportunity is provided for further sensitive infill development I am not convinced. The fact that there are only some 4 dwelling sites available for development within the village indicates to me that such sites are in short supply in such a large village.

C24.3.5 I have had regard to the fact that the site extends to the valley crest but consider, given the large scale of the existing unattractive farm buildings, that such development would be acceptable. It would have no significant affect on the landscape of either the area within which it is situated or of the Glamorgan Heritage Coast which it is outside. Indeed, the removal of such unattractive buildings and their replacement with two smaller scale residential properties clearly would not only represent a considerable visual improvement but would lessen the impact currently caused by the farm buildings on the crest of village slope.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified:

REC.4.91 to include the objection site within the residential settlement boundary of St.Brides Major.

C25 St Nicholas

C25.0 General

C25.0.1 My conclusions with regard to the site-specific objections associated with St Nicholas should be read together with my conclusions and recommendations concerning the general objections made to Policies ENV1 and ENV3. For the reasons I have set out there I have recommended that an area to the north and west of Barry, Penarth, Dinas Powis, and St Fagans be designated a Green Belt within which there would be a strong presumption against development. St Nicholas would remain a Policy HOUS2 village within the Green Belt, which would surround its identified settlement boundaries. I have recommended in respect of the effect of Policy ENV3 on the village that further residential development be restricted to infilling only within the identified settlement boundary.

C25.1 St Nicholas - Land off Ger y Llan

Maintained objection

192.9 Persimmon Homes (Wales) Ltd {Settlement boundary of St Nicholas}

ISSUE

C25.1.1 Whether the settlement boundary of St Nicholas under Policy HOUS2 should be modified to include the allocation of the objection site for residential development under Policy HOUS1.

CONCLUSIONS

C25.1.2 The objection site is a relatively level open area of Grade 2 agricultural land about 1.5ha in extent located immediately north east of the village. The village is a designated Conservation Area and the objection site is outside but contiguous with it.

C25.1.3 Planning permission for the development of the objection site for executive homes was refused in 1988 and 1991, broadly on the grounds of the then current policies for the protection of the countryside and of the character of the Conservation Area. Those decisions remain in my opinion consistent with the rural strategy of the UDP and I discern no material change in circumstances which could justify an alternative conclusion. While I note the objector's claim that because the site is screened to the north and east there would be no significant loss of views of the Conservation Area I regard that as an argument that could be endlessly deployed in favour of expansion wherever screening could be provided. At heart, the objection runs counter to the overall strategy of the plan to encourage the major part of future residential development to take place within the Waterfront Strip.

C25.1.4 On the question of the range and choice of sites in the Plan I consider that, together with the amendments I have recommended elsewhere, sufficient provision has been made in the Plan for residential development in the Rural Vale. I consequently consider that the residential development boundary of St Nicholas should not be extended to include the objection site.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.92 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C25.2 St Nicholas - Part OS 0913 and 1415, Duffryn Lane

Maintained objection

225.1

Mr and Mrs M Charles

{Settlement boundary of St Nicholas}

225.2

Mr and Mrs M Charles

{Settlement boundary of St Nicholas}

ISSUES

C25.2.1 Whether the settlement boundary of St Nicholas under Policy HOUS2 should be modified to include the objection site

CONCLUSIONS

C25.2.2 The objection site consists of an area of Grade 3b agricultural land on the west side of Dyffryn Lane. In this quadrant of the village there is only one existing dwelling, which is at the junction of the lane with the A48. Various trees within the site are the subject of Tree Preservation Orders. On casual inspection the long-standing Conservation Area boundary appears a generous one, being more widely drawn than the residential settlement boundary and including the objection site together with other open land about the village. Consequently, while St Nicholas is a Policy HOUS2 village the objection site is subject to Policy ENV1.

C25.2.3 The site is in my view clearly part of the rural setting of the village and more particularly that of the built-up part of the Conservation Area. Its inclusion in the Conservation Area should not in my view be interpreted as an admission of the acceptability of residential development. Indeed, its location is such that its development would patently constitute rounding-off rather than infilling and its function as a foil to the village would be lost. Planning permission for the development of the site has been refused on 2 previous occasions, including in each case the ground that it would involve a relatively large scale expansion of the village contrary to the then current draft planning policies for the protection of the countryside.

C25.2.4 On the question of the range and choice of sites in the Plan I consider that, together with the amendments I recommend in Chapter 1 of this report, sufficient provision has been made in the Plan for residential development in the Rural Vale and that the residential development boundary of St Nicholas should not be extended to include the objection site.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.93 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C26 Sully

C26.0 General

C26.0.1 My conclusions with regard to the site-specific objections associated with Sully should be read together with my conclusions and recommendations concerning the general objections made to Policies ENV1 and ENV3 together with those concerning Strategic Policy 3. For the reasons I have set out there I have recommended (i) that an area to the north and west of Barry, Penarth, Dinas Powis, and St Fagans be designated a Green Belt within which there would be a strong presumption against development and (ii) an increase in the overall housing figures for the Borough.

C26.1 Sully – Land east of Swanbridge Road and north of Lavernock Road

Explanatory note: Both of these sets of objections relate to the same parcel of the owner's land. Although the ground of objection is more limited in the second case the first objection is maintained and I therefore deal with all of the points raised in both.

Maintained objections

121.1	Clarke, Mr T. H.	{Allocate objection site under Policy HOUS1}
121.2	Clarke, Mr T. H.	{Proposed alteration to Sully Settlement Boundary}
336.1	Clarke, Mr T. H.	{Allocate objection site under Policy HOUS1}
336.2	Clarke, Mr T H	{Proposed alteration to Sully settlement boundary}

ISSUES

C26.1.1 Whether

- (i) The settlement boundary of Sully be extended to include the objection site.
- (ii) The objection site should be defined under Policy HOUS1.

CONCLUSIONS

Issue (i)

C26.1.2 The objection site, a wedge-shaped level plot which, save for an existing dwelling in its north west corner, is used for horse grazing and is in the open countryside subject to Policy ENV1. It is the subject of a previous refusal of planning permission for a community hall and residential development on the ground of countryside policies. The objector claims that the settlement boundary of Sully is illogical on the ground that the site is contained between Lavernock Road and the line of the former Penarth – Barry railway and is 'directly adjacent to existing residential areas of Sully/Swanbridge'.. However, in my view Swanbridge Road provides a highly defensible boundary to the eastward growth of Sully, marking a very clear distinction between the built-up area and the open countryside of which the site is part. At the same time the nearest dwelling in Swanbridge is some Its shape and location are such that it could not be considered a rounding-off of Sully and I find no justification to include it within the settlement boundary.

Issue (ii)

C26.1.3 I have concluded in my general discussion of housing supply that the Plan should be modified to allow a modest increase in housing provision. However, bearing in mind the overall strategy of the Plan I consider that can be met without allocating the objection site.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.94 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C26.2 Sully – Beach Road

Maintained objection
167.1

Miss J Davidson

{Establish Sully settlement boundary and
allocate land at Beach Road}

ISSUES

C26.2.1 Whether:

- (i) Swanbridge should be a Policy H2 settlement and a settlement boundary be defined;
- (ii) land at Beach Road should be allocated for residential development under Policy H1.

CONCLUSIONS

Issue (i)

C26.2.2 Swanbridge is a very small coastal settlement clearly separated from Sully. It does not have the potential for infilling which is a requirement for Policy H2 villages. The objector claims that ‘Swanbridge extends to the north across the crossroads as far as the disused railway line where Swanbridge station used to be located’ and that Swanbridge also extends west along South Road to the western edge of the sports ground and includes all of the houses in the north side of South Road as far as a line projected north from the western boundary of the playing fields ... shown on the Proposals Map as being part of Sully’. In my view that denies the reality of the extent of the existing coherent built-up area of Sully and the limits of the area recognisable as Swanbridge, where Treboeth in Beach Road marks the northernmost extent of the hamlet. Against that background I see no justification for a settlement boundary encompassing both Sully and Swanbridge together with large areas of open land.

C26.2.3 That interpretation is clearly consistent with the history of refusals of planning permission for the development of land both west and east of Beach Road north of Swanbridge on the grounds of intrusion into this coastal area and the prevention of the coalescence of Swanbridge with Sully. Notwithstanding the passage of time I find the objectives underlying the previous decisions robust. The Plan maintains them and I find no change in circumstances which could justify a different outcome now.

Issue (ii)

C26.2.4 The objection site, which includes the objector’s and other land, is on the east side of Beach Road and has an area of about 0.81ha and average depth of about 45.7m. I consider that, against the conventional definition of the term, to claim that the proposed allocation of housing land would be minor infilling is erroneous in both fact and degree. Apart from the question of Swanbridge not being a settlement where infilling is permissible, the cross road junction of Beach Road with South Road, Lavernock Road, and Swanbridge Road is clearly well separated from Treboeth, the nearest dwelling in Swanbridge. The only developed area adjoining the road junction is in its northwest quadrant and is part of the continuous built-up area of Sully. Development of the objection site would therefore be a clear incursion of ribbon development into the countryside, blurring the clear distinction which exists between Sully and Swanbridge.

C26.2.5 While the objector has produced considerable material supporting a claimed shortfall of housing provision in the Plan I have concluded in my general discussion of housing supply that the Plan should be modified to allow a modest increase. However, bearing in mind the overall strategy of the Plan I consider that can be met without allocating the objection site.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.95 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C26.3 Sully - Land East of Sully Road

Maintained Objections
288.1

Smith, Mr W.G.

{Proposed housing site east of Sully Road.}

ISSUE

C26.3.1 Whether land to the east of Sully Road should be allocated for residential purposes under Policy HOUS1.

CONCLUSIONS:

C26.3.2 The objection site is located to the west of Penarth and east of Sully Road which runs north-south between Llandough and Sully. To the north it is bounded by a school and its playing fields and to the south by two residential dwellings. The site is currently overgrown with trees and vegetation. Although I have recommended the omission of Policy ENV3 Green Wedges for this area I have also, for the reasons I set out in that section, recommended that this area should form part of a designated Green Belt.

C26.3.3 Notwithstanding that the site lies between the proposed line of the Barry Waterfront - Cardiff Link Road and the settlement of Penarth it forms an important constituent of the fragile open gap between the built-up areas of Penarth and Dinas Powys. The objector points to fact that there have been a number of allocations in the area surrounding the site which include four schools, ten houses and a country club. Such allocations make it all the more important that the remaining sensitive areas between these two settlements are protected from further development.

C26.3.4 Whilst it is considered by the objector that the circumstances of an appeal dismissed in 1986 have materially altered I consider that the Inspector's major conclusions are still relevant. In this respect I am satisfied that the appeal site still lies beyond the built-up settlement limits of Penarth in an area of predominantly open countryside which separates the built-up areas of Penarth and Dinas Powys. Consequently, I do not consider Sully Road to form a logical boundary to development in this area.

C26.3.5 Far from representing appropriate "infill", I consider development of the objection site would promote unacceptable coalescence of Penarth and Dinas Powys and is rightly excluded from the Penarth residential settlement boundary. Consequently I consider that development of this site should continue to be resisted.

RECOMMENDATION:

REC.4.96 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C27 Tair Onen – New Village Proposal

Explanatory Note: I examine above under Policy HOUS 4 the general issue of new settlements and recommend that the Policy be retained subject to the adoption of PCE019.

Maintained objection
264.1

Barratt South Wales

{New settlements./Tair Onen}

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.97 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C28 The Downs

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions concerning Policies ENV1 and ENV3 set out in Section.....

Maintained Objections

210.5	Traherne, Lt.Col. R L	{Exclusion of site at The Downs from settlement}
210.6	Traherne, Lt.Col. R L	{Settlement of The Downs}

ISSUE

C28.1 Whether the settlement of The Downs should be included within a designated residential settlement boundary and the objection site allocated for housing.

CONCLUSIONS:

C28.2 I observed at my site visit that the settlement of The Downs is a hamlet in the countryside having few community services apart from a nearby public house and a bus service. It is therefore lacking in the community facilities necessary to support further development and also lies within an area of open countryside that I have recommended should be designated as Green Belt and within the Green Wedge defined by the Council.

C28.3 The proximity of the hamlet to Culverhouse Cross clearly makes the location attractive from a residential point of view. This, however, is not good reason for allowing for the further development of a hamlet where the openness of the area should be protected from development. I conclude that it would be inappropriate for the settlement of The Downs to be included within a designated residential settlement boundary.

C28.4 The objection site itself is an area of open undeveloped land in the countryside notwithstanding that it has housing development on two sides. Its development would not only involve the unacceptable loss of countryside but would also involve the unacceptable urbanisation of the rural hamlet of The Downs. In reaching this conclusion I am satisfied that the importance of protecting this site from development outweighs any improvements that may be able to be made to the local highway network through its development.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.98 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C29 Tre-Aubrey

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions concerning objections to the housing requirement and to Policy ENV1. Whilst the objector has made reference to the unsuitability of several Policy HOUS1 sites these sites are all in the main committed for development. An exception to this is Site HOUS1(17) which I have recommended should be deleted.

Maintained Objections
251.4

FairFax, Mr John Alan

{Housing in villages}

ISSUE

C29.1 Whether land at Tre Aubrey near Llantrithyd should be allocated for housing.

CONCLUSIONS:

C29.2 I observed at my site visit that the objection site is located adjacent to the small hamlet of Tre-Aubrey in the countryside to the south west of Llantrithyd and has an area of approximately 0.52ha. Tre-Aubrey has no community facilities and Llantrithyd has a church and telephone. Both are accessed by narrow rural lanes, one of which fronts the objection site. Tre-Aubrey is therefore a settlement which is lacking in the community facilities necessary to support further development and clearly lies, as does the objection site, within an area of open countryside.

C29.3 Having regard to the above, I conclude that there are insufficient services available within the two settlements of Tre-Aubrey and Llantrithyd to justify their inclusion under Policy HOUS2. Moreover, the loosely knit form of the area illustrates a lack of capacity to assimilate residential development without having a detrimental impact on its markedly rural character. Residential development in such rural areas is largely unsustainable in that, similar to the objection site, it often requires the development of greenfield sites and increases the need to travel by car for work, school or shopping trips.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.99 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C30 Treoes - Ty Mawr Farm

Maintained Objections
11.2

J.C.W. Construction

{Proposed expansion Treoes Village Boundary}

ISSUE

C30.1 Whether the objection site should be included within the designated residential settlement boundary of Treoes.

CONCLUSIONS:

C30.2 The objection site comprises 0.4ha of land that was formerly a farmyard and buildings of a now defunct farming enterprise. It is bounded to the north by trees and a stream, to the west by trees and partly by the remains of the flank wall of an old breeze-block farm building. To the south there are new houses and to the east the site fronts the road. On the eastern frontage is a pumping station and landscaping associated with the housing development to the south.

C30.3 Although the Council indicates that adequate opportunity is provided for further sensitive “infill” development in such villages I am not so convinced in this case. Moreover the nature of the objection site is such that it is divorced from the countryside by the trees and stream on its northern boundary. Enclosure is also provided by the other boundaries of the site such that the overall character of its environs is of an urban nature. Development of the site for housing would not only be consistent with this character but would, given the poor existing condition of the site, represent an acceptable “small-scale rounding-off” of the village without resulting in any significant loss of countryside.

C30.4 I have had regard to the fact that a section 106 agreement exists which is leading to some improvements being made to the site. I am mindful, however, that the Section 106 agreement only refers to the use of the land and does not ensure that it is brought back into such use. As such, given its condition, this appears to be very unlikely to happen and adds some weight to my conclusions above.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.100 the inclusion of the objection site within the Treoes settlement boundary.

C31 Trerhyngyll – OS 7084, 7100, and 7200

Maintained objection
160.1

Griffiths, L R

{Exclusion of land near Trerhyngyll from UDP housing
land allocations.}

ISSUE

C31.1 Whether the settlement boundary of the village should be extended to include an allocation of land for residential development.

CONCLUSIONS

C31.2 Trerhyngyll is a small village in which infilling, but not rounding-off, development is permissible under Policy HOUS2. The objection site, about 2.4 ha in extent, adjoins the village immediately to the east and comprises open grazing land subject to Policy ENV 1. The site and a smaller portion of it were the subject of previous refusals of planning permission on the ground of policies concerned with the protection of the open countryside. The policies then current are essentially carried forward in Policy ENV 1 of the draft Plan. In my view, far from being the ‘modest expansion’ claimed by the objector the expansion proposed is so excessive in relation to the size of the village that it would inevitably change its character to an even greater degree than has already taken place in the form of recently-built dwellings. It clearly could not be regarded as infilling in the accepted sense of that term. Save for 2 houses in a cul-de-sac bordering the site to its west, all of the existing development within the village envelope lies along its established through rural roads. Development in depth would in my view bring about a substantial and undesirable change in the nature of the village and its open rural setting.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.101 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C32 Twyn-yr-Odyn

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions concerning both, Site EMP1(20), and Policy ENV3.

Maintained Objections
12.1

Mr B C Thomas

ISSUE

C32.1 Whether the settlement of Twyn-yr-Odyn should be included within a designated residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C32.2 The objector accepts that Twyn-yr-Odyn is only a hamlet and this was obvious to me at my site visit. It is a settlement which is lacking in the community facilities necessary to support further development and lies within an area of open countryside that I have recommended should be designated as Green Belt. The proximity of the hamlet to Culverhouse Cross clearly makes the location attractive from a residential point of view. This, however, is not good reason for allowing for the further development of the hamlet where the openness of the area should be protected from development. I conclude that it would be inappropriate for the settlement of Twyn-yr-Odyn to be included within a designated residential settlement boundary.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.102 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C33 Welsh St Donats

Maintained objection 257.1	Messrs N & M England		
257.2	Messrs N & M England	Policy HOUS2 settlement	{Welsh St Donats should be a {Amend Policy OUS2}

ISSUES

C33.1 Whether

- (i) Welsh St Donats should be identified as a HOUS2 settlement.
- (ii) Policy HOUS2 should be amended.

CONCLUSIONS

Issue (i)

C33.2 Welsh St Donats is a small and compact village of little more than 30 dwellings fronting a circuit of lanes, having minimal community facilities and only a twice-daily bus service to Cowbridge. As such, the Plan regards it as a rural settlement subject to Policies ENV1 and HOUS3. I agree with the Council that this village has insufficient capacity to accommodate infill development; any other form of development would be strongly detrimental to the firm contrast between the village and the open countryside around it; and the inevitable reliance on services elsewhere would make it unsustainable.

C33.3 At the same time, the settlement boundary suggested by the objector, while following an engagingly smooth line on the map, on the one hand suffers from uncertainty in that it follows no obvious boundaries on the ground and on the other clearly indicates intrusions onto the undeveloped open countryside around the village.

Issue (ii)

C33.4 The objector considers Policy HOUS2 should be amended to permit development other than infilling in the settlements identified in the Plan. My general recommendation that a new policy replace Policies HOUS2 and HOUS8 meets that objection and I do not consider the matter further here.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.103 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C34 Wenvoe

C34.0 General

C34.0.1 My conclusions with regard to site specific objections associated with Wenvoe have to be read together with my conclusions and recommendations concerning the general objections made to Policies ENV1 and ENV3. I have recommended there that the area surrounding Wenvoe, outside the settlement boundary, should be designated Green Belt. This would avert the need for Green Wedges to be designated under Policy ENV3 for this area and provide a greater level of control over inappropriate development in an area which is under considerable development pressure.

C34.0.2 The old village core centred around Wenvoe Church is long established and forms the designated Conservation Area. In 1947 the village was small with 45 dwellings. The Council indicates that the village has grown consistently over the past 40 years and that, since the start of the plan period, a further 21 dwellings have been completed. It is now estimated that there are 433 dwellings within the designated settlement boundary. Notwithstanding that it is one of the larger settlements in the Vale, has a good range of community facilities and is close to employment at Culverhouse Cross, Wenvoe is a dormitory village located alongside the A4050 (Port Road) between Barry and Cardiff and lies outside the plan's Strategy area. It does not and will not be able to offer the range of public transport services as an alternative to the private car that are, or will be, available in the Waterfront Strip which is the main focus of the residential allocations in the plan. Consequently, its function as a dormitory village should not be further promoted through the development of further large-scale housing sites.

C34.0.3 The growth of Wenvoe has taken place in response to demand for private housing on greenfield sites in a rural location within a reasonable commuting distance by car to Cardiff and Barry. The area is clearly subject to considerable development pressures and problems common to the urban fringe. Pressure for growth has been northwards and southwards and the Council expresses considerable concern about the prospect of coalescence between the western suburbs of Cardiff, and the erosion of the area round Wenvoe. I share that concern and consider that the essential long-term protection of the surrounding area from inappropriate development in the countryside would be better served by its early designation as Green Belt.

C34.0.4 Any further residential development of Wenvoe should be strictly limited to the area within its settlement boundary. I reach such a conclusion notwithstanding its identification within previous plans, and the now outdated South Glamorgan Structure Plan Alterations No.1, as a settlement suitable for expansion. Such an approach is also essential to ensure that the environmental effects of the Airport Access Road on the openness of the surrounding area is not exacerbated by the development of the open land remaining between Wenvoe and its proposed alignment.

C34.0.5 Having regard to the above I consider that the essential issue, in each of the site specific objections below associated with Wenvoe, is whether the objection sites should be included within the Wenvoe residential settlement boundary.

C34.1 Wenvoe - Land to the North of the Residential Settlement Boundary

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on these objections have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Wenvoe and my conclusions concerning Site EMP1(20).

Maintained Objections

19.3	Randolph, Mr&Mrs D	{Wenvoe- unreasonable village boundary.}
19.6	Randolph, Mr&Mrs D	{ Housing development proposals north of Wenvoe.}

ISSUE

C34.1.1 Whether land to the north of the defined residential settlement boundary should be included within it and allocated for housing.

CONCLUSIONS:

C34.1.2 The objection site comprises 5.1ha of agricultural land and is separated from the village by Walston Road which I observed clearly defines the northern edge of the residential settlement boundary. It forms an integral part of the St.Nicholas and Bonvilston ridge slopes and is clearly visible from vantage-points within and outside the village. Contrary to the views of the objector I consider, even taking into account the trees and hedges on its boundaries, that the site is conspicuous and that its open countryside character contributes significantly to the setting of the village.

C34.1.3 The objector acknowledges that development of the objection site would result in a reduction of the gap between settlements. However, the argument is put forward that the extension of the residential boundary northwards to point coincident with land owned by the Council could effectively prevent any future proposals for northward expansion of the village. Such an argument is inappropriate and erroneous having regard to the need, not only to prevent the coalescence of settlements but to prevent the encroachment of development into the openness of this area of open countryside.

C34.1.3 For the above reasons I conclude 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. As such I do not consider it appropriate for inclusion within the residential settlement boundary.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.104 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C34.2 Wenvoe - Land between Port Road and Old Port Road

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on these objections have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Wenvoe.

Maintained Objections

347.1 Cole, Mr J
347.2 Cole, Mr J

{Proposed deletion from Green Wedge}
{Proposed revision of Wenvoe settlement limit .}

ISSUE

C34.2.1 Whether land to the north of the defined residential settlement boundary should be included within it and allocated for housing.

CONCLUSIONS:

C34.2.2 The objection site comprises two linear shaped areas of woodland enclosed on all sides by means of mature hedgerows and trees which extend northwards along Port Road towards Culverhouse Cross. It forms an integral part of the St.Nicholas and Bonvilston ridge slopes and is clearly visible from vantage-points within and outside the village. The trees and hedges on its boundaries give the site its open countryside character and contribute significantly to the setting and approach to the village.

C34.2.3 Development of the objection site would result in a reduction of the open gap between Culverhouse Cross and Wenvoe. As such it would be inappropriate having regard to the need not only to prevent the coalescence of settlements but to prevent the encroachment of development into the openness of this area of open countryside.

C34.2.4 For the above reasons I conclude 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. As such I do not consider it appropriate for inclusion within the residential settlement boundary.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.105 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C34.3 Wenvoe - Land to the South of the Residential Settlement Boundary

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on these objections have to be taken together with my conclusions set out above concerning the general implications of matters involved with development at Wenvoe.

Maintained Objections

342.1	Anstee Trustees	{ southern boundary of Wenvoe settlement limit.}
342.2	Anstee Trustees	{ southern boundary of Wenvoe settlement limit.}
342.3	Anstee Trustees	{ Wenvoe settlement limit.}
126.14	Bellway Estates	{ Wenvoe settlement limit.}
126.14	Bellway Estates	{ Wenvoe settlement limit.}

ISSUE

C34.3.1 Whether land to the south of the defined residential settlement boundary should be included within it and allocated for housing.

CONCLUSIONS:

C34.3.2 The objection site comprises some 6.5ha of agricultural land located on the southern outskirts of the built up area of Wenvoe. South of the site is a garden centre served by an access of Burdonshill Road. The site is fairly flat but rises on its western side to adjoin open fields with woodland beyond and is situated at the foot of a ridge referred to as the St.Nicholas and Bonvilston Ridge Slopes in the Council's Landscapes Study.

C34.3.3 It is accepted that the land could be provided with the access and all the necessary utility services and amenities that would enable its development for housing. However, the site clearly lies in an area where I consider that the openness of the countryside should be protected from development. Contrary to the objector's view, that development of the site would comprise a modest housing allocation that would increase the range and choice of available sites, I consider it would represent a significant and unacceptable extension of the urban area of Wenvoe into open countryside.

C34.3.4 In reaching this conclusion I have had regard to the fact that the site is not prominent and is visually enclosed in landscape terms. Also, I have taken into account that the site is well related to the built form of the settlement and that the Council accepts that the site is less of a problem than in other locations around Wenvoe. This cannot, however, outweigh the harm caused by the loss of a significant area of openness within the sensitive area of countryside between Wenvoe and Barry.

C34.3.5 For the above reasons I conclude that 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. As such I do not consider it appropriate for inclusion within the residential settlement boundary.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.106 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C35 West Aberthaw - The Boys Club of Wales Site

Explanatory Note : My conclusions on this objection have to be taken together with my conclusions concerning the objections made by the objector to Policies ENV5 and ENV7.

Maintained Objections
242.4

Thomas, R. & Mooney, R., Messrs {Allocation of housing at the Boys Club of Wales site}

ISSUE

C35.1 Whether the objection site should be allocated for housing under Policy HOUS1.

CONCLUSIONS:

C35.2 The objection site does not clearly form part of any recognised settlement and comprises a number of disused buildings and a field located on a narrow lane that leads to the small hamlet of West Aberthaw to the south west of the site. It is situated adjacent to a number of overhead power lines and a cement works to the east, a power station to the west and the B4265 to the north. The site is within the open countryside and the nearest community facilities are located about 1.2km away in the village of St.Athan. It is also located within the defined Coastal Zone where Policy ENV5 applies.

C35.3 Whilst the objector wishes to see this brownfield site allocated redeveloped for housing under Policy HOUS1 it is not only outside the Strategy Area of the plan but is clearly unrelated to any existing settlement and community facilities or public transport facilities. I consider, as did a previous Inspector in 1990, that its proposed use for housing would have the effect of consolidating an existing pocket of development within what is still open countryside. Moreover residential development of the site would lead to the need for additional travel by car as well as resulting in the promotion of a fragmented development pattern. Consequently I am satisfied that the objection site is inappropriate for allocation as part of the housing requirement as a Policy HOUS1 site.

C35.4 In reaching this conclusion I am mindful that the site is of a brownfield nature and that the policies of the plan do not specifically accommodate the redevelopment of such isolated sites for housing outside the Waterfront Strip. Whilst I accept that such a strategy is appropriate I consider that the efficient use of building resources must allow, exceptionally, for the change of use or conversion of buildings of the type existing on the objection site for other uses. I note that an application for the change of use of the site for a residential care home currently remains undetermined awaiting further information.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.107 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C36 Wick

C36.0 General

C36.0.1 It is suggested that as Wick is a settlement, which has a good level of local services, it is surprising that a suitable development opportunity has not, been identified. Whilst I have concluded that there is a requirement for additional housing provision, Wick is a village that lies outside the strategy area. As such I do not consider it appropriately located to accommodate development other than “*infilling*” or “*small-scale rounding-off*”. Although larger scale exceptions would be allowed for affordable housing under Policy HOUS14 such an exception would need to be fully demonstrated as part of the Rural Housing Needs Survey being undertaken by the Council.

C36.1 Wick - Sites to the south and north of Green Isaf

Explanatory Note : These objections cover two sites adjacent to Green Isaf. As the central issue with regard to these objections concerns whether the area including and adjacent to Green Isaf should be included within the Wick residential settlement boundary I have dealt with them together.

Maintained Objections

190.1	Richardson, Mr S J	{Wick settlement boundary.}
190.2	Richardson, Mr S J	{Wick settlement boundary.}
339.2	Perons, Roderick	{Proposed expansion of Wick settlement boundary (land adj to B4265)}

ISSUES

C36.1.1 Whether the residential settlement boundary encompasses the recognised settlement of Wick.

CONCLUSIONS:

C36.1.2 Objectors suggests that the residential settlement boundary should be extended to the south east to include Green Isaf, Green Isha and Brooklands Farm and the two dwellings along Llantwit Road. It is contended that that such an extension would help enclose Green Isaf and repeat the nature of development that has taken place at Green Uchaf to the west of the village. However, I am not so convinced given that the sporadic nature of development surrounding Green Isaf and the open environs of the area allies the area more to the definition of countryside rather than of settlement.

C36.1.3 The objection site located to the south of Green Isaf comprises about 1.0ha of pasture land and a small compound which houses plant, machinery and equipment. It lies between Brooklands farm and the development within the village at Windmill Close. As did a previous Inspector when dismissing an appeal on the site, I consider its development would constitute an undesirable large-scale extension of development into the countryside surrounding the village of Wick that would detract from the character of a sensitive rural landscape. The need to resist such harmful development clearly outweighs any benefit that may be obtained through the relocation of the existing plant storage compound.

C36.1.4 Having regard to the above, I conclude that development of this objection site would not constitute acceptable “*small-scale rounding-off*” of the settlement boundary. Moreover, it would lead to the unacceptable creation and consolidation of a ribbon of development along Llantwit Road between the defined settlement boundary and the barn conversion development at Brooklands Farm.

C36.1.5 The objection site to the north of Green Isaf is situated on the east side of the Llantwit Road and comprises approximately 0.27ha of pasture land located between Green Isaf Farm and a residential property fronting the B4265 called “Cartref”. These two properties have the character of sporadic development in the countryside and, as such, the objection site neither constitutes an acceptable “*infill*” site nor “*small-scale rounding-off*”. Development of the site would not only lead to an unacceptable loss of countryside but would lead to an unacceptable consolidation of existing development of a sporadic nature.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.108 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C36.2 Wick- Lilla Cottage

Maintained Objections
345.2

Hodges, Mr D T

{Proposed revision of eastern settlement boundary of Wick.}

ISSUE

C36.2.1 Whether the objection site should be included within the Wick residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C36.2.2 The objection site is land currently used for grazing and is situated to the east of the village of Wick. It is bounded to the east by fields and to the west by St Brides Road which in the vicinity of the objection site clearly marks the edge of the settlement.

C36.2.3 As did a previous Inspector when considering an appeal on this area of land I consider that the site is part of the pleasant and rural landscape which provides the setting of the village on this side. Moreover, given the openness of its environs and the wide gaps that exist between existing development on this side of St Brides Road I consider that its development would neither constitute “*infilling*” or a “*small-scale rounding-off*” of the village.

C36.2.4 I conclude that any development of the site would be an intrusive and illogical extension into the countryside notwithstanding the objector’s view that it could be adequately screened. As such, the site is not appropriate for inclusion within the residential settlement boundary.

RECOMMENDATION

REC.4.109 I recommend that no modification be made to the plan.

C36.3 Wick - Land adjacent to the North-Western Boundary

Maintained Objections
194.1

Llewelyn, Mr G

{Wick settlement boundary}

ISSUE

C36.3.1 Whether the objection site should be included within the Wick residential settlement boundary.

CONCLUSIONS:

C36.3.2 The objection site is located at the north western edge of the village and comprises an existing detached single storey dwelling known as “The Paddocks” and associated land which includes a lawn and a stables block at the north west of the site.

C36.3.3 I have concluded in relation to Policy ENV1 that the Council has attributed a wider than necessary policy basis to the definition of residential settlement boundaries, which not only lacks reasoning in the plan but is also unjustified. In the Council’s view the inclusion of the objection site within the settlement boundary may imply that development would be acceptable. However, I do not share this view and consider that settlement boundaries should have only the one function of delineating the boundary of settlement and countryside.

C36.3.4 Notwithstanding that the Council consider that the objection site has a more rural/small holding appearance to the stable block, I am of the view that it clearly forms part of the residential curtilage of the dwelling even though it is not a formally laid out garden area. Having regard to the above I do not consider it appropriate for the settlement boundary to be defined as running through the middle of the existing rear curtilage of the property.

C36.3.5 In reaching such a conclusion I am mindful, however, that the site is situated on the edge of the village, at the end of a ribbon of houses where additional development of the site would lead to an inappropriate consolidation of development, given the openness of its environs. Such a situation does not, however, justify its exclusion from the settlement boundary.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the plan be modified by:

REC.4.110 the inclusion of the objection site within the residential settlement boundary of Wick.