

Meeting of:	Cabinet
Date of Meeting:	Monday, 14 March 2022
Relevant Scrutiny Committee:	Environment and Regeneration
Report Title:	Vale of Glamorgan Replacement Local Development Plan 2021 - 2036: Draft Review Report and Draft Delivery Agreement Public Consultation Responses
Purpose of Report:	To report to Cabinet the results of the public consultation on the draft Review Report and draft Delivery Agreement for the Replacement Local Development Plan and to seek approval to submit the amended documents to the Welsh Government.
Report Owner:	Cabinet Member for Legal, Regulatory and Planning Services
Responsible Officer:	Rob Thomas, Chief Executive
Elected Member and Officer Consultation:	<p>Cabinet Member for Legal, Regulatory and Planning Services</p> <p>Head of Regeneration and Planning</p> <p>Operational Manager for Planning and Building Control</p> <p>Lawyer - Legal Division</p> <p>Operational Manager Accountancy</p> <p>Corporate Equalities Officer</p> <p>Communications Manager</p> <p>Head of Strategy, Community Learning and Resources</p> <p>Strategy and Partnership Manager</p> <p>Section 106 Officer</p> <p>Operational Manager Strategy and Resources</p> <p>21st Century Schools Programme Manager</p> <p>Housing and Strategic Projects Team Leader</p> <p>Operational Manager Neighbourhood Services, Healthy Living and Performance</p> <p>Operational Manager Engineering</p> <p>Group Manager Transport Services</p>

	<p style="text-align: center;">Principal Regeneration Officer Operational Manager for Regeneration Team Leader Countryside Services Ecologist Arts Development Officer Principal Tourism & Marketing Officer Major Projects Manager, Regeneration and Planning Engineering Manager Conservation and Design Officer Energy Manager</p>
<p>Policy Framework:</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">This is a matter for consideration and approval by Cabinet and reference on to full Council for final decision in April 2022</p>
<p>Executive Summary:</p> <p>In September 2021, Cabinet considered and approved the draft Review Report and the draft Delivery Agreement for public consultation purposes (Minute C675 refers). This report sets out the findings of the public consultation exercise held between 5th November 2021 and 31st January 2022 together with proposed amendments to both documents. Cabinet is asked to endorse the changes prior to submitting them to the Welsh Government. The Council will be required to prepare the Replacement Local Development Plan in accordance the approved Delivery Agreement in line with the LDP Regulations 2005 (as amended).</p>	

Recommendations

1. That the responses to the representations on the draft Delivery Agreement and draft Review Report as set out in Appendices A and B respectively to this report are considered and referred to Council in April 2022 for approval.
2. That the proposed changes as set out in Appendix C to this report are endorsed and referred to Council and the draft Delivery Agreement and draft Review Report are updated accordingly.
3. That in pursuance of recommendations 1 and 2, the amended Delivery Agreement and Review Report are submitted to Council for consideration and subject to ratification, to the Welsh Government for approval.
4. That following Welsh Government approval of the Delivery Agreement and Review Report, copies are made available for inspection at the Council's principal office during normal office hours and published on the Council's web site.
5. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Regeneration and Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Legal, Regulatory and Planning Services to make any further typographical or other minor amendments as required by the Welsh Government.
6. That the letter attached at Appendix D is sent to all specific and general consultees, respondents to the public consultation and those who have asked to be kept informed of progress on the Replacement LDP.
7. That a further report on the Replacement LDP 'Vision, Issues and Objectives' is prepared and considered by Cabinet in due course.

Reasons for Recommendations

1. To reflect feedback from the public consultation and enable officers to finalise the Delivery Agreement and Review Report for submission to the Welsh Government.
2. To reflect feedback from the public consultation and enable officers to finalise the Delivery Agreement and Review Report for submission to the Welsh Government.
3. To comply with the Council's statutory duty under Section 69 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Regulation 9 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development Plan) (Wales) Regulations 2005 (as amended).
4. To comply with Section 69 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Regulation 10 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development Plan) (Wales) Regulations 2005 (as amended).
5. To make typographical or minor changes as necessary without the need to seek Cabinet approval.
6. To provide clarification on how some of the matters raised during the consultation will be considered as part of the Replacement LDP process.
7. To build consensus and inform the development of the Draft Preferred Strategy.

1. Background

- 1.1** The Vale of Glamorgan Local Development Plan 2011-2026 (LDP) was adopted in June 2017. The LDP sets out the Council's planning policy framework for the development and use of land in the Vale of Glamorgan. The LDP forms the basis for consistent and rational decision-making and ensures the most efficient use of land and other limited resources.
- 1.2** Section 69 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires a Local Planning Authority to undertake a full review of a LDP at least once every four years following plan adoption unless the findings of the Annual Monitoring Report indicate significant concerns with the Plan's implementation, which warrant an earlier review. In respect of the adopted LDP, the first and second Annual Monitoring Reports concluded that an early review was not necessary. On the 19th October 2020, Cabinet endorsed a recommendation to commence a full review of the adopted LDP before the 28th June 2021 in line with LDP Regulation 41. The same recommendation was included in the 3rd Annual Monitoring Report (October 2021) to ensure the LDP remains up to date and responds to the new challenges and opportunities facing the authority over the next 15 years.
- 1.3** The Review Report forms a key part of the evidence base for the Replacement LDP and sets out the significant legislative, national and local policy changes that have occurred since the adoption of the LDP in 2017. It also contains a review of the current policies to establish which ones are still relevant and effective. National planning guidance states that to maximise the robustness of the Review Report and to justify its findings, Local Planning Authorities should consult on its findings and conclusions. The final Review Report should be submitted to the Welsh Government and published in accordance with the prescribed requirements.
- 1.4** The first stage in preparing a Replacement LDP is the production of a Delivery Agreement. The Delivery Agreement is an essential project management tool that contains the timetable for preparing the Replacement LDP together with the Community Involvement Scheme which sets out how and when stakeholders and the community can engage in the plan making process. The LDP Regulations require Local Planning Authorities to engage with stakeholders in the formulation of the Delivery Agreement.
- 1.5** On 27th September 2021, Cabinet considered and endorsed the Council's draft Delivery Agreement and draft Review Report for public consultation purposes. A public consultation on both documents was subsequently undertaken between the 5th November 2021 and 31st January 2022. The consultation was originally due to end on 17th December 2021 but was extended due to the Christmas and the New Year break. This report sets out the main findings of the public consultation and where appropriate, proposes amendments to the draft documents.

- 1.6** Provided Cabinet and Council accept the proposed changes to the documents as set out in Appendix C to this report, they will be amended accordingly, and submitted to the Welsh Government for approval in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development Plan) (Wales) Regulations 2005 (as amended). Once formally agreed by Welsh Government, copies of the documents must be made available for inspection at the Council's principal office during normal office hours and published on the Council's web site. In accordance with LDP Regulation 9(4), the specific and general consultation bodies should be notified of any subsequent revisions to the Delivery Agreement following Welsh Government's approval.
- 1.7** The agreement of the Delivery Agreement marks formal start of the Replacement LDP process, and the Council is committed to the timescales and consultation processes contained within it. The preparation of the Replacement LDP is due to formally commence in May 2022 and it is anticipated that it will be adopted by October 2025 which is in accordance with the three-and-a-half-year timescale referred to in the Development Plans Manual (March 2020). The approved Delivery Agreement must be kept under regular review by the Local planning Authority and only one 3-month slippage period is permitted.

2. Key Issues for Consideration

- 2.1** Hard copies of the draft documents together with comment forms, were made available at the Council's Civic Office, Barry (principal office), the Council's Dock Office, Barry and at all Vale of Glamorgan Council operated libraries during the consultation period. Digital copies of the draft documents and comment forms were also made available on the Council's web site. Comments could be made directly through the Council's web site (which hosted dedicated on-line comment forms), via email, or on paper comment forms. Most representations were made electronically which reflects changes in technology and current ways of working. All specific and general consultation bodies detailed within the draft Delivery Agreement together with those who had registered an interest in the Replacement LDP were advised of the consultations and how to make comments. Vale Viewpoint Citizens Panel members were also directly notified. In addition, the consultations were advertised on the Council's social media channels, the Consultation web page and a press release was issued.

Draft Review Report Consultation Feedback

- 2.2** A total of 52 stakeholders commented on the draft Review Report. These comments have been considered and are set out in full in Appendix B to this report. Appendix B also includes the Council's response to the comments together with proposed amendments to the draft Review Report where appropriate. The majority of respondents agreed that the existing LDP vision objectives and strategy needs to be reviewed. However, there were mixed opinions on the findings of the policy review and the identification of the

contextual issues. Most people agreed that the LDP Review should be undertaken individually as opposed to jointly with an adjoining local authority.

2.3 Other matters raised by respondents in respect of the draft Review Report are set out below:

- Climate Change / Climate Emergency
- Environmental protection / Nature Emergency
- Model Farm, Rhose planning application references and strategic employment allocation in the adopted LDP
- Flooding
- Development of brownfield sites
- Previous housing growth levels / affordable housing / elderly persons accommodation
- Land at Upper Cosmeston Farm allocation in adopted LDP
- Traffic / Sustainable transport
- COVID 19 impacts
- Engagement
- Land at Hensol
- Protection of rural areas
- Infrastructure capacity
- Cardiff Airport
- Aberthaw Power Station site
- Minerals
- Waste
- Gypsy and traveller site in Llangan

2.4 It should be noted that many comments related to specific adopted LDP policies and allocations as opposed to the draft Review Report and draft Delivery Agreement. Matters such as the retention or deletion of existing undeveloped LDP allocations and the identification of new sites will be considered as part of the Replacement LDP process in due course. The letter attached at Appendix D seeks to clarify this and will be sent to all specific and general consultation bodies, respondents to the consultation and those who have asked to be kept informed of progress on the Replacement LDP.

2.5 In light of the consultation responses, a number of minor changes including factual updates have been proposed to the draft Review Report (see Appendix C). Reference to the Coronavirus Act 2020 has been added to the legislation section and amendments have been made to the national planning policy section in relation to the Technical Advice Notes. References to the Model Farm

planning application have been amended to reflect the current position. In addition, reference has been made to the need to consider the future use of the Aberthaw Power Station site in the Replacement LDP. Updates have also been made in relation to the status of the Council's Well Being Assessment / Plan and the conclusion amended to acknowledge the important role the Replacement LDP will have in tackling the Climate Change and Nature Emergencies.

- 2.6** It is considered that the updated Review Report contains a clear and robust overview of the issues that need to be considered in the emerging Replacement LDP. There is a need to review the vision and strategy as well as the matters raised in the policy review section of the report. The draft Review Report concluded that a full revision of the adopted LDP is required, and this remains the conclusion following the consultation process.

Draft Delivery Agreement Consultation Feedback

- 2.7** A total of 17 respondents provided comments on the draft Delivery Agreement. These comments are set out in full in Appendix A to this report. Appendix A also includes the Council's response to the comments together with proposed amendments to the draft Delivery Agreement where appropriate.
- 2.8** The majority of comments received were in relation to community engagement. Most respondents agreed with the general principles for engagement but there were mixed views on the engagement methods. However, the engagement methods set out in the draft Delivery Agreement are regarded as the most effective and efficient forms of engagement for the Replacement LDP. There was also some uncertainty regarding when and how people could get involved in the plan preparation process. Nevertheless, it is considered that this is clearly set out in Appendix 2 of the draft Delivery Agreement.
- 2.9** Some respondents were also unsure whether the Delivery Agreement defined all of the main stages in the Replacement LDP process and whether the timetable was realistic and achievable. The key stages set out in the draft Delivery Agreement reflect those in the Development Plans Manual (Edition 3, 2020). However, the period for reviewing / updating the evidence base (including ISA /SEA baseline and framework) and the timeframe for preparing the candidate site register and undertaking the assessments have both been extended to February 2024. These revised timescales are more realistic given the resources available and do not result in any change to the anticipated adoption date.
- 2.10** Other matters raised by respondents are set out below:
- Environmental protection
 - Climate Change / Climate Emergency
 - Development of brownfield sites
 - Model Farm, Rhoose (strategic employment allocation in the adopted LDP)
 - Heritage
 - Infrastructure capacity
 - Traffic / sustainable transport
 - Waste
 - Drainage / flooding

- Land at Hensol

- 2.11** No significant changes have been made to the draft Delivery Agreement as a result of the comments received. In terms of engagement, a number of people commented on the length of the consultation documents and their technical nature. Both documents contain introductory sections outlining their purpose and contents. However, as stated in paragraph 2.4.5 of the draft Delivery Agreement, the Council intends to prepare 'easy read' versions of some Replacement LDP technical documents which should help to address this issue in the future. Comments were also made in respect of engagement with young people and the use of digital technology. In terms of transparency, the Council is required to prepare a consultation report as part of the Replacement LDP process which will set out how representations have influenced the Plan. It is considered that the updated Delivery Agreement is robust, realistic and covers the main plan preparation requirements.
- 2.12** It should be noted that several of the specific consultation bodies submitted an overarching response covering both consultation documents. Where this is the case, the representation detailed in the appendix has been marked with an asterisk (*) and has not been repeated in both appendices. The specific consultation bodies generally welcomed the opportunity to engage with the Council and contribute to the preparation of the Replacement LDP.

Next Steps

- 2.13** Following endorsement of the updated Review Report and Delivery Agreement by Cabinet and Council, the next step will be to formally submit the documents to the Welsh Government. Approval of the Delivery Agreement by Welsh Government marks the formal start of the Replacement LDP process, and the Council must adhere to the timetable and consultation process contained within it. The agreed Delivery Agreement must be made available for inspection in the Council's principal office (Civic Office, Barry) during normal office hours and published on the Council's web site in accordance with the LDP Regulations. The agreed Delivery Agreement must be kept under regular review and any slippage to the timetable (beyond 3 months) must be agreed by the Welsh Government. The table below shows the key stages and anticipated timescales for the preparation of the Replacement LDP:

Key Stages		Definitive Timescales
Stage 1 Delivery Agreement	Public consultation	November 2021 – January 2022
	Political Approval and Submission to Welsh Government	March 2022 – April 2022
	Approval from Welsh Government	May 2022

Stage 2 Pre-Deposit	Candidate Site call	June 2022 – August 2022
	Consultation on Integrated Sustainability Appraisal	August 2022 - September 2022
	Vision and Objectives/Growth Options	May 2022 – November 2022
	Consultation Preferred Strategy	April 2023 – May 2023
	Political approval of Preferred Strategy	September 2023
Stage 3 Deposit	Public Consultation	April 2024 – May 2024
	Political approval for submission to Welsh Government	November 2024 – December 2024
Indicative Timescales		
Stage 4	Submission	December 2024
Stage 5	Examination	March 2025 – April 2025
Stage 6	Inspector’s Report preparation and publication	May 2025 – September 2025
Stage 7	Adoption	October 2025

3. How do proposals evidence the Five Ways of Working and contribute to our Well-being Objectives?

- 3.1 Long Term** - The Replacement LDP sets out a long-term vision for how the authority is expected to change in land use terms over the plan period and provides certainty for developers and the public. The Delivery Agreement sets out the stages for the Replacement LDP and identifies when and how stakeholders and the general public can engage in the plan making process.
- 3.2 Prevention** - The Replacement LDP will contain policies that seek to ensure that new development has a positive impact on the economy, the built and natural environment as well as the social and cultural well-being of the Vale of Glamorgan.

- 3.3 Integration** - the Replacement LDP will have regard to the Well-Being Plan and other relevant corporate strategies and policies that have been adopted by the Council. The influence of the Replacement LDP covers numerous service areas and external organisations. Accordingly, it is recognised that they will play an important role in the preparation of the Replacement LDP.
- 3.4 Collaboration** - the Replacement LDP will be subject to extensive statutory consultation in accordance with the Development Plans Manual and LDP Regulations. To meet the objectives and targets set out in the Replacement LDP, the Council will work in collaboration with external partners and agencies to ensure their successful delivery. The Replacement LDP must also consider the impact on neighbouring local authorities and the Council is involved in several regional working groups which will inform the evidence base and influence policies.
- 3.5 Involvement** - Engagement is a key aspect of the Replacement LDP preparation process and details of this are contained within the Community Involvement Scheme section of the Delivery Agreement which the Council must adhere to.

4. Resources and Legal Considerations

Financial

- 4.1** A dedicated budget is in place to fund the work required to prepare and adopt the Replacement LDP as stated in the Delivery Agreement.

Employment

- 4.2** The Review Report and Delivery Agreement have been prepared by officers within the Regeneration and Planning division. The Delivery Agreement sets out the proposed staff resources for delivering the Replacement LDP. Consultants will be required to undertake some specialist work in association with the Replacement LDP.

Legal (Including Equalities)

- 4.3** The Council is legally required to review its LDP pursuant to Section 69 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Regulation 41 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development Plan) (Wales) Regulations 2005 (as amended).
- 4.4** The Well Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 seeks to improve the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of Wales. Public bodies should ensure that decisions consider the impact they could have on people living in Wales in the future. The planning system is key to delivering sustainable development and the 5 ways of working are an intrinsic part of the planning system. A plan led approach is the most effective way of securing sustainable development.

- 4.5** The Community Involvement Scheme section of the Delivery Agreement sets out how the Council will engage with stakeholders including hard to reach groups to enable all interested parties to participate in the Plan preparation process e.g. use of plain English and non-technical versions of reports, availability of documents in Welsh and large print versions of documents on request.

5. Background Papers

[Development Plans Manuals Manual \(Edition 3 - March 2020\)](#)

[Cabinet Meeting 27th September 2021 - Vale of Glamorgan Replacement Local Development Plan 2021 - 2036: Consultation on draft Review Report and draft Delivery Agreement.](#)

Appendix A: Draft Delivery Agreement Comments, Council Responses and Proposed Amendments.

Delivery Agreement					
Question 1: Do you agree with the general principles for community engagement? (Sections 2.2 and 2.3)					
Question 2: Are the engagement methods appropriate for each stage? (Sections 2.4 and Appendix 2)					
Question 3: Is it clear when people will have an opportunity to get involved in the plan preparation process? (Section 3.2 and Appendix 2)					
Question 4: Is it clear how people can get involved in the plan preparation process? (Section 2.4 and Appendix 2)					
Question 5: Does the draft Delivery Agreement clearly define all the main stages of the plan preparation process? (Table 1 and Section 3.2)					
Question 6: Is the timetable realistic and deliverable? (Table 1 and Appendix 3)					
No.	Organisation / Individual	Question	Comment	Council Response	Proposed Amendments/Action
1*	ID No: 3	Q1	<p>Thank you for referring us to the consultation on the Vale of Glamorgan LDP Draft Review Report and Vale of Glamorgan Delivery Agreement, which we received on 5 November 2021.</p> <p>We acknowledge the conclusion of the Draft Review Report that the revision procedure is considered the most appropriate form of review and that a replacement LDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.</p> <p>We note your Authority will have regard to the Wellbeing of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015, the Environment (Wales) Act 2016 and Area Statements in the context of the review. We advise your Authority that the Area Profiles our colleagues are developing might also be a useful tool to feed into the LDP Review. We also note as part of the Evidence Based Assessments an updated/replacement Strategic Flood Consequences Assessment (SFCA) may be required; we agree a review of the SFCA would be appropriate.</p> <p>We acknowledge the proposed timetable for plan preparation within the Delivery Agreement and we would like to take the opportunity to offer our support, including informal engagement, throughout the LDP review and plan preparation process.</p>	<p>The comments are noted, and the offer of support is welcomed.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
	Q2				
	Q3				
	Q4				
	Q5				
	Q6				
		Further comments			

			We hope these comments are of assistance. If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact us.		
2*	ID No: 390	Q1	Thank you for consulting us on these documents, we are responding as a regular consultee and in our remit as advised by Welsh Government/Cadw concerning the Historic Environment and the archaeological resource.	The comments and the advisory information in respect of updated legislative changes in respect of the historic environment are welcomed. This information will be reflected in the content of the RLDP as it progresses, and further consultation will be undertaken as set out in the draft DA to ensure that the RLDP continues to protect the historic environment of the Vale of Glamorgan.	No change required.
		Q2			
		Q3			
		Q4			
		Q5			
		Q6			
		Further comments	As we have noted previously in our responses concerning the historic environment in the Vale of Glamorgan, this is an important part of the Council's area, and includes statutorily designated historic assets of both areas and structures, as well as non-designated historic assets. The range of these includes the Llancarfan Registered Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest, and part of the Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows Registered Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest; the Register of Parks and Gardens, which will become statutory in early 2022; as well as the physical remains of archaeological sites, both buried and upstanding, and isolated finds of all periods, all of which contribute to the distinctive heritage and current form of the area. The greater part of these are not statutorily protected, and are recorded in the Historic Environment Record to which your authority contributes. These should not be seen as any constraint to development but viewed with the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act, contribute substantially to the well-being goals relating to culture and community, and by understanding and enhancement to the remaining goals.		
	The Draft Delivery Agreement is helpful and the charts for the key stages allow us to be aware of upcoming consultations, and we note that [REDACTED] remains on the list of consultees.				
	Legislative changes have occurred since the last LDP, as noted in the Draft Review Report, and these include the Historic Environment (Wales) Act 2016, TAN24:				

			<p>The Historic Environment, and Planning Policy Wales Edition 11, 2021. The LDP Objective 4; To Protect and enhance the Vale of Glamorgan's historic, built and natural environment: relates to the built environment and is measured through MD8 Historic Environment and the AMR evidence indicates the policy is functioning effectively. It should also be noted that the historic environment is not limited to the built heritage, and includes buried remains, and remains surviving as low earthworks.</p> <p>If you have any questions or require further advice on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>		
3*	ID No: 413	<p>Q1</p> <p>Q2</p> <p>Q3</p> <p>Q4</p> <p>Q5</p> <p>Q6</p> <p>Further comments</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting [REDACTED] on the Vale of Glamorgan Draft Review Report and Draft Replacement Local Development Plan Delivery Agreement. This email forms the basis of our response.</p> <p>[REDACTED] is a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the country's railway infrastructure and associated estate. [REDACTED] owns, operates, maintains and develops the main rail network. This includes the railway tracks, stations, signalling systems, bridges, tunnels, level crossings and viaducts. The preparation of development plan policy is important in relation to the protection and enhancement of [REDACTED] infrastructure.</p> <p>Level Crossings - Any development of land which would result in a material increase or significant change in the character of traffic using rail crossings should be refused unless, in consultation with [REDACTED], it can either be demonstrated that they safety will not be compromised, or where safety is compromised serious mitigation measures would be incorporated to prevent any increased safety risk as a requirement of any permission.</p> <p>[REDACTED] has a strong policy to guide and improve</p>	<p>Comments noted. This information will be taken into account as the RLDP progresses and further consultation will be undertaken as set out in the draft DA to ensure that the RLDP continues to reflect statutory requirements in relation to safety and the rail network. Specific matters in relation to planning applications will be considered through the planning application process.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

			<p>its management of level crossings, which aims to; reduce risk at level crossings, reduce the number and types of level crossings, ensure level crossings are fit for purpose, ensure [REDACTED] works with users / stakeholders and supports enforcement initiatives. Without significant consultation with [REDACTED] and if proved as required, approved mitigation measures, [REDACTED] would be extremely concerned if any future development impacts on the safety and operation of any of the level crossings listed above. The safety of the operational railway and of those crossing it is of the highest importance to [REDACTED].</p> <p>Level crossings can be impacted in a variety of ways by planning proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• By a proposal being directly next to a level crossing• By the cumulative effect of development added over time• By the type of crossing involved• By the construction of large developments (commercial and residential) where road access to and from site includes a level crossing• By developments that might impede pedestrian's ability to hear approaching trains• By proposals that may interfere with pedestrian and vehicle users' ability to see level crossing warning signs• By any developments for schools, colleges or nurseries where minors in numbers may be using a level crossing• By any development or enhancement of the public rights of way <p>It is [REDACTED] and indeed the [REDACTED] policy to reduce risk at level crossings not to increase risk as could be the case with an increase in usage at the four level crossings in question. The [REDACTED], in their policy, hold [REDACTED] accountable under the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999, and</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>that risk control should, where practicable, be achieved through the elimination of level crossings in favour of bridges or diversions.</p> <p>The Council have a statutory responsibility under planning legislation to consult the statutory rail undertaker where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the rail volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Schedule 4 (j) of the Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order, 2015) requires that "...development which is likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway" (public footpath, public or private road) the Planning Authority's Highway Engineer must submit details to both the Secretary of State for Transport and [REDACTED] for separate approval. <p>We would appreciate the Parish Council providing [REDACTED] with an opportunity to comment on any future planning policy documents. We look forward to continuing to work with you to maintain consistency between local and rail network planning strategy.</p> <p>We trust these comments will be considered in your preparation of the forthcoming Plan documents.</p>		
4*	ID No: 16	<p>Q1</p> <p>Q2</p> <p>Q3</p> <p>Q4</p> <p>Q5</p> <p>Q6</p> <p>Further comments</p>	<p>It is understood that Vale of Glamorgan Council are undertaking a review of their Local Development Plan. The [REDACTED] represents the [REDACTED] as a statutory consultee in the UK planning system to ensure designated zones around key operational defence sites such as aerodromes, explosives storage sites, air weapon ranges, and technical sites are not adversely affected by development outside the [REDACTED]. For clarity, this</p>	<p>The comments in respect of Safeguarding concerns are noted as is the offer to provide GIS mapping information if required. The points raised will be considered in greater detail as the RLDP progresses.</p> <p>Issues raised regarding safeguarding will also be addressed through the formal planning application process and your organisation will be consulted on schemes that may impact on</p>	No change required.

		<p>response relates to [REDACTED] Safeguarding concerns only and should be read in conjunction with any other submissions that might be provided by other [REDACTED] sites or departments.</p> <p>The Welsh Government's Development Management Manual identifies, at figure 7, that a number of non-site specific directions are currently in force, the list includes the Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded aerodromes, technical sites and military explosives storage areas) Direction 2002 (ODPM/DfT/NAFW Circular 01/2003). Through this direction the [REDACTED] may be involved in the planning system both as a statutory and non-statutory consultee. Statutory consultation occurs as a result of the provisions of the Direction and the plans issued to Local Planning Authorities by the Welsh Government which are provided by [REDACTED]. Copies of these plans, in both GIS shapefile and .pdf format, can be provided on request through the email address above.</p> <p>The aerodrome at St Athan is safeguarded by [REDACTED] and plans have been issued to communicate the extent of safeguarding zones and their associated criteria to preserve obstacle free airspace, to identify and address potential bird strike risk, and to identify and mitigate development that might impact on the capability and operation of technical assets sited at the airfield and at MOD St Athan.</p> <p>The aerodrome height and technical safeguarding zones serve to protect the airspace above and around aerodromes to maintain an assured, obstacle free environment for aircraft manoeuvre and ensure that line of sight navigational aids and transmitter/receivers are not impeded. The designation provides a means to ensure that airspace is kept free of obstruction from tall structures to ensure that aircraft transiting to and from or circuiting the aerodrome can do so safely.</p> <p>Within the statutory consultation areas associated with aerodromes are zones that are designed to allow bird strike risk to be identified and mitigated. The creation of</p>	<p>operational defence sites.</p>	
--	--	---	-----------------------------------	--

		<p>environments attractive to those large and flocking bird species that pose a hazard to aviation safety can have a significant effect. This can include landscaping schemes associated with large developments as well as the creation of new waterbodies. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) additionally provide an opportunity for habitats within and around a development. The incorporation of open water, both permanent and temporary, and associated reed beds, wetlands ponds and ditches provide a range of habitats for wildlife, including potentially increasing the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation.</p> <p>Should any [REDACTED] operational site or asset cease to be operational and/or no longer require the benefit of a designated Statutory Safeguarding Zone, the [REDACTED] will notify the Welsh Government to initiate the withdrawal of those plans.</p> <p>The [REDACTED] may also have interest in development outside designated safeguarding zones, particularly where the development is of a type likely to have an impact on operational capability. Examples of this type of development are the installation of renewable energy generation systems and their associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The [REDACTED] has, in principle, no issue or objection to renewable energy development though some methods of renewable energy generation, for example wind turbine generators or solar photo voltaic panels can, by virtue of their physical dimensions and properties, impact upon military aviation activities, cause obstruction to protected critical airspace encompassing military aerodromes, and impede the operation of safeguarded defence technical installations. In addition, where turbines are erected in line of sight to defence radars and other types of defence technical installations, the rotating motion of their blades can degrade and cause interference to the effective operation of these types of installations with associated impacts upon aviation safety and operational capability.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>The Welsh Government's Planning for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy – A Toolkit for Planners (2015) identifies this potential effect of wind turbine generators and advises consultation with [REDACTED], similarly, Planning Practice Guidance published on the Gov.uk website directs developers and Local Planning Authorities to consult the [REDACTED] where a proposed turbine has a tip height of or exceeding 11m or has a rotor diameter of 2m or more.</p> <p>The Draft Review Report (November 2021) provides an overview of the adopted Vale of Glamorgan Local Development Plan 2011-2026 (June 2017), the implications of both new legislation and policy, and a detailed assessment of the policies adopted through that Local Development Plan. The report concludes that, in line with the statutory requirement, a Replacement Local Development Plan is to be prepared. A Draft Delivery Agreement has also been published which outlines the process and timescale for preparing the Replacement Local Development Plan, [REDACTED] welcome being listed as specific consultation body in Appendix 1 of the Draft Delivery Agreement and will provide representations as and when appropriate in the drafting and consultation stages. I trust this clearly explains our position on this update. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to consider these points further.</p>		
5*	ID No: 62	Q1	<p>Thank you for giving us an opportunity to review your initial proposals. The only comment that [REDACTED] has was to ensure that when you make your proposals you do not plan for development in the area north of Cowbridge on the assumption that a transport corridor will be opened via the Pontyclun area as we do not believe that this will be forthcoming</p>	<p>Comments noted. At this stage of the RLDP process no development sites have been considered. However, future development sites included in the RLDP will be subject to a full site assessment and have due regard to existing constraints, opportunities and land availability.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
		Q2			
		Q3			
		Q4			
		Q5			
		Q6			
		Further comments			
6*	ID No: 51	Q1	<p>[REDACTED] has no further comments to make on this consultation but appreciates the opportunity to do so.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
		Q2			
		Q3			
		Q4			
		Q5			

		Q6			
		Further comments			
7*	ID No: 28	Q1	Vale of Glamorgan Local Development Plan section.	Comment noted. As a 'Specific' consultation body under the LDP Regulations, this organisation will continue to be advised and have the opportunity to comment on all future consultation stages on the RLDP.	No change required.
		Q2			
		Q3	Thank you for consulting [REDACTED] on the draft Review Report and Draft Delivery Agreement report.		
		Q4			
		Q5			
		Q6			
		Further comments	<p>The documents were discussed at [REDACTED] and it was resolved to offer the following comments;</p> <p>[REDACTED] has the following comments;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] thanks the Vale of Glamorgan Council Planning department for consultation opportunity. • [REDACTED] looks forward in working in partnership with The Vale of Glamorgan Council Planning department and others in the preparation of the Replacement Local Development Plan. • [REDACTED] considers the draft Delivery Agreement and Draft LDP Review document to be well written; robust and extensive in content. • [REDACTED] request that officers of The Vale of Glamorgan Planning department meet regularly with [REDACTED] to discuss the progress and proposals within the Replacement Local Development Plan. • [REDACTED] suggests that there is a short summary of the documents as a pre-amble within the opening text. This would give the reader an instant idea of what the draft report includes and hopes to achieve. <p>I hope the above comments are useful and if there any queries please do not hesitate to contact me. Could you please confirm the safe receipt of this email.</p>	<p>The Council is unable to commit to regular meetings with this organisation. However, the LDP team are available to assist with any future queries that this organisation may have regarding the RLDP.</p> <p>As the RLDP progresses, it is the Council's intention to prepare Easy Read versions of some documents to assist with the consultation as set out under paragraph 2.4.5 of the Draft Delivery agreement.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that the introductory paragraphs of the Draft Delivery Agreement and Review Report documents provide an outline the purpose of each document.</p>	
8	ID No: 31	Q1	The Development Plans Manual (DPM) notes "It is also essential that members of the community and stakeholders are proactive to ensure they involved". We hope the comments below assist.	Comments noted.	Amend paragraph 2.3.13 as set out in Appendix C.

			<p>Similarly, to the Delivery Agreements of other Councils you have followed DPM advice in recognising that the Community Involvement Scheme should: "Create the conditions for early involvement and feedback at a stage when people can shape and influence the plan". The DPM also recognises that.</p> <p>'A one size fits all approach will not be appropriate (Pare 3.17)'</p> <p><u>As in other Delivery Agreements, you have identified Community and Town Councils (CTC's) in a separate paragraph and reflecting the Regulations defined Specific and General Consultation bodies. Some County Councils go a little further than dissemination of information in describing the role and engagement of CTC's e.g. Town and Community Council Forum's – Cardiff CC, Torfaen CC, and identifying local information and priorities e.g. Newport and Torfaen.</u></p>		
		Q2	<p>You note "2.4.6. The Council will be providing a wide range of opportunities for stakeholders and interested parties to access information and get involved in the RLDP process. However, there are resource limitations to the extent of engagement that is possible. Additionally, it is important that all consultees are dealt with in a fair and equal manner. In view of this, it is not proposed that officers attend meetings organised by individual groups."</p> <p>█ appreciate the resource limitations and the planned use of digital opportunities. There is mention of dialogue in several places in the Delivery Agreement. Whilst the use of digital platforms has had a mixed impact, they are increasingly used for meetings. When dealing with █ we hope that this will be used when it is most appropriate; distinguishing the need to adopt a wide forum approach when dealing with a focus on Strategic issues and general objectives and on a one-to-one basis when considering local issues. Whilst you have identified the stages at which Government advice indicates engagement. In some</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council welcomes the organisation's comments in respect of engagement via digital platforms. The Council considers that Appendix 2 of the DA 'Summary of Community Involvement in RLDP Key Stages' adequately sets out how and when such organisations will be engaged throughout the process.</p> <p>The preparation of the RLDP will be in accordance with national planning policy including Future Wales: The National Plan 2040 and the emerging SDP.</p>	No change required.

		<p>instances in Appendix 2 you could have been more specific than the promise of a variety of methods with a strong reliance on digital platforms.</p> <p>This Agreement does not mention the existing "Future Wales (The National Plan)" and that there will be higher level plans produced by the Corporate Joint Committees-Strategic Development Plans. Both Future Wales and emerging SDPs should shape the response of the County and Stakeholders. It is not presently clear how engagement between CJC'S/Counties with [REDACTED] will be arranged. Will this LDP ignore the emerging SDP, whilst still picking up the relevant Polices in Future Wales?</p> <p>Town Councils already figure in Future Wales (The National Plan), which presumably a policy in Strategic Development Plans will reflect, through the Town Centres First Policy (Policy 6). This Replacement Plan should ideally consider the extent they are identified as key centres in any settlement hierarchy and policies defining their function and the relationship with centres in Adjoining Authorities.</p>		
	Q3	<p>Opportunities are clearly defined in accordance with LDP Regulations. In relation to Town and Community Council involvement you identify Regulation 14 which points to the involvement of Specific and General Stakeholders. It is encouraging that you highlight the importance of the Pre-Deposit Stage giving a commitment to involvement at this crucial Stage (paragraphs 3.2.5-3.3.6).</p>	Comments noted and welcomed.	No change required.
	Q4	<p>We have covered some of general issues above but as far as [REDACTED] is concerned, we would seek involvement on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •candidates' sites-not only on location and sustainability but the viability process especially related to housing. Recognising future allocations maybe outside the administrative boundary of the town but reliant on the town facilities 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Candidate Sites submitted for consideration during the Call for Candidate Sites will be subject to an approved Candidate Site Assessment methodology as required by the Development Plans Manual. All sites submitted will be published in the Candidate Sites Register</p>	No change required.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •local priorities-measures to secure the resilience of the Town Centre opportunities for the intensification of residential density where appropriate •looking at the opportunity of a Place Plan which should insofar as possible be reflected in the LDP policy for the town recognising formal adoption relies on an Adopted LDP. 	<p>and made publicly available. Proposed RLDP allocations will be subject to public consultation as set out in the draft DA.</p> <p>The role and function of town centres will be reviewed as part of the RLDP evidence base.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.3.14 of the draft DA addresses Place Plans and identifies that these must be in accordance with the adopted Plan if they are to be adopted as SPG. Place Plans should be prepared at a local level.</p>	
		Q5	Largely, as qualified above.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q6	It is realistic if consensus can be achieved early on. It means communicating the context in which the LDP has to be formulated-e.g. in a region defined in the Future Wales National Plan as a Growth Area. And address those controversial issues normally encountered in plan preparation e.g. –growth in housing/employment without adequate infrastructure.	Comments noted. The timetable set out in the Draft Delivery Agreement is considered to be realistic and achievable. The RLDP will be prepared in the context of national planning policy.	No change required.
		Further comments	None.	No response required.	No change required.
9	ID No: 652	Q1	Yes - Whilst I agree with them, finding out how to view past participation and outcomes appears impossible on the website and the very process of engagement for those wishing to do so isn't clearly defined or visible to users	<p>The Draft DA clearly sets out the stages of engagement for the RLDP process, identifying when, how and who will be engaged in accordance with the LDP Regulations. Inter alia Section 2.9 of the Draft DA outlines how documentation will be made available for consultation and Figure 3 and Table 1 provide an overview of the RLDP process and when consultation will occur. More detail is provided under sections 3.2 and Appendix 2.</p> <p>The Consultation Report will provide details of the issues raised during consultation and how these have influenced the RLDP.</p>	No change required.
		Q2	Don't know - The words and process look fine but in practical terms I can't find evidence to support the words.	See above.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - The words and process look fine but in practical	See above.	No change required.

			terms I can't find evidence to support the words		
		Q4	Yes - The words and process look fine but in practical terms I can't find evidence to support the words	See above.	No change required.
		Q5	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q6	Don't know – No specific comments made.	Comments noted. The timetable set out in the Draft DA has been prepared in accordance with the Development Plans Manual and is considered to be realistic and achievable.	No change required.
		Further comments	<p>There are many and varied groups listed in appendix 2 but what isn't clear in the document is any process relating to the views and opinions of local residents who, foot the bill for such matters.</p> <p>I can see nothing which shows how the views of these bodies or individuals are treated and for transparency, the details of how, when or where the council has actually made decisions using such views.</p> <p>There should be a clearly defined process for this.</p> <p>Also, there should be a clear statement showing the process steps and outcomes for those council employees, officers and councillors who act outside of these processes especially where it has influenced decisions."</p>	The Specific and General consultation bodies detailed in the Draft DA represent those agencies and organisations set out and defined in the LDP Regulations. The Consultation Report will provide details of the issues raised during consultation and how these have influenced the RLDP.	No change required.
10	ID No: 651	Q1	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q2	No – No specific comments made.	The engagement methods detailed within the Draft DA take account of guidance contained in the Development Plans Manual and are considered to be appropriate.	No change required.
		Q3	No – No specific comments made.	The Draft DA clearly sets out the stages of engagement for the RLDP process, identifying when, how and who will be engaged in accordance with the LDP Regulations. Inter alia Section 2.9 of the Draft DA outlines how documentation will be made available for consultation and Figure 3 and Table 1 provide an overview of the RLDP process and when consultation will occur. More detail is provided under sections 3.2 and Appendix 2.	No change required.
		Q4	No – No specific comments made.	See above.	No change required.

		Q5	No – No specific comments made.	See above.	No change required.
		Q6	No – No specific comments made.	The timetable set out in the Draft DA has been prepared in accordance with the Development Plans Manual and is considered to be realistic and achievable.	No change required.
		Further comments	<p>"- There are misleading and incorrect factual errors in the report – you state that planning permission has been granted for the Industrial Estate, at Model Farm Rhoose, when it has not been.</p> <p>- The report is overly positive in stating what the Council has achieved – for example you state that 2,000 jobs have ALREADY been created at the Model Farm industrial estate.</p> <p>- you fail to see the importance of concreting over a productive working farm – more consideration of the environment should be given to protect farmland and ancient woodland in Wales.</p> <p>- Traffic congestion between Rhoose, Llantwit Major and Barry is a huge problem that the Council fails to understand.</p> <p>- Planning Officers getting away with failing to apply the Council's own Supplementary Planning Guidance without anyone being challenged by the ruling administration.</p> <p>- The Council are willing to subsidise Developers over the objections of local people.</p> <p>- There is plenty of land available for industrial estates at Junction 34 of the M4 - Hensol – which is for sale and ready to be developed. It has better road and rail links and should be the priority first.</p> <p>- We do not need additional housing until the road network is improved."</p>	The comments made relate to a planning application that is currently under consideration by the Council and do not relate to the Draft DA.	No change required.
11	ID No: 650	Q1	No - "These questions on engagement are severely restricting even though the issue of engagement is key to the review process. I fully participated in the build up to the current LDP over several years, submitting my thoughts and comments over 22 pages and 8,207 words. The formal response from the Council was illogical, dismissive, pathetic, and demoralising. It was	The questions on the consultation form(s) are intended to give stakeholders the opportunity to provide targeted comments on the consultation documents. Additionally, a 'Further Comments' section is available to enable general comments on the documents to be made. All comments received are fully considered and where relevant	No change required.

			<p>contained in a Cabinet report, page 445 of the 3,386 paged Appendix 2. The response was that infrastructure is 'not considered to be a key constraining factor'.</p> <p>The principles of participation are very similar to those set out in the last LDP process but what assurance can the public have; that there is "a real chance to influence policy"; that views will be "respected and valued"; it will be communicated in a way that "is easy to understand"; it "will be jargon free, appropriate and understandable"; will develop the "confidence of all participants", and "Timely feedback is given to all participants". Splendid words but what confidence can the public have in them?"</p>	<p>will result in amendments to the consultation documents. All comments and proposed amendments are reported in full to elected members for their consideration and made publicly available.</p> <p>The Consultation Report will provide details of the issues raised during the consultations and how these have influenced the RLDP.</p>	
		Q2	No - Not on previous experience.	The engagement methods detailed within the Draft DA take account of guidance contained in the Development Plans Manual and are considered to be appropriate.	No change required.
		Q3	Don't know – No specific comments made.	The Draft DA sets out the stages of engagement for the RLDP process, identifying when, how and who will be engaged in accordance with the LDP Regulations. Inter alia Section 2.9 of the Draft DA outlines how documentation will be made available for consultation and Figure 3 and Table 1 provide an overview of the RLDP process and when consultation will occur. More detail is provided under sections 3.2 and Appendix 2.	No change required.
		Q4	Don't know – No specific comments made.	See above response to Q2 and Q3.	No change required.
		Q5	Don't know – Presumably.	See above.	No change required.
		Q6	No – No specific comments made.	The timetable set out in the Draft DA has been prepared in accordance with the Development Plans Manual and is considered to be realistic and achievable.	No change required.
		Further comments	None.	None.	No change required.
12	ID No: 696	Q1	Yes - Totally agree that the Vale of Glamorgan Council should engage with local communities when it comes to decisions effecting their everyday lives. It is far more important that the council and their officers take the	Comments noted.	No change required.

			results of these engagements seriously and not ignore them out of hand or for profit over quality of life.		
		Q2	No - No, it's a one sided approach with a flow of information regarding issues going into the council but limited I for coming out.	The Consultation Report will provide details of the issues raised during consultation and how these have influenced the RLDP.	No change required.
		Q3	No - Lack of information and expected delivery of planning applications, especially large projects, give limited time for local opposition to organise to fight these actions when strength of the objections are identified.	The Draft DA clearly sets out the stages of engagement for the RLDP process, identifying when, how and who will be engaged in accordance with the LDP Regulations. Inter alia Section 2.9 of the Draft DA outlines how documentation will be made available for consultation and Figure 3 and Table 1 provide an overview of the RLDP process and when consultation will occur. More detail is provided under sections 3.2 and Appendix 2. Issues in respect of planning applications will be considered through the planning application process.	No change required.
		Q4	No - Check out your website and try and do a simple search on the main search box for a planning application. You will find that nothing is found on the search. How are people expected to get involved when they get frustrated at carrying out searches on various projects.	Comments noted. The Council's web site 'Planning pages' enable planning application searches to be undertaken.	No change required.
		Q5	No - "The plan contains a great deal of information that requires people to sift through and then disseminate aspects that may impact on their particular area. Some of the information in the plan is already incorrect and has not been updated even when these errors have been identified to the council. The suggested aims already conflict with the councils other commitments regarding climate change, biodiversity, TAN issues, drainage and life style expectations for Vale residents. Areas being removed from the identified green wedge without correct consultation and on the whim of the	The Draft DA clearly sets out the stages of the RLDP process in accordance with the LDP Regulations. The land use issues raised will be considered as a part of the RLDP process. The findings of previous Annual Monitoring Reports will also be taken into consideration.	No change required.

			<p>council under pressure from Welsh Government is totally unacceptable and has already caused issues with regards to the last LDP and Model Farm.</p> <p>The revised LDP should highlight actions to better use brown field sites and already derelict buildings to promote their use over productive green field sites which are undoubtedly target by large developers as easier and cheaper to utilise than such brown field areas.</p> <p>Before the LDP is reviewed the current LDP should be audited to identified if it has achieved all the goals that were set out in it. For example the Bro St Athans site still has not reached the capacity of use it was aimed to achieve. Why then are productive greenfield farms being targeted for use that could be directed towards this under developed area? With regards to the housing aspect the development to the West of Cowbridge is still struggling to attract sales and yet more housing is being planned throughout the Vale?"</p>		
		Q6	Don't know - The plan	The timetable set out in the Draft DA has been prepared in accordance with the Development Plans Manual and is considered to be realistic and achievable.	No change required.
		Further comments	When you have residents up in arms over proposed developments such as Cosmeston Fields, The Barry Incinerator and Model Farm you do no justice to your commitment to listen to the community when you obviously apply the 'we know best' approach often being pushed by your Planning Department who obviously have their own agenda for the Vale.	The Council fully considers the comments made in respect of public consultations. Relevant amendments are made to the consultation documents when appropriate.	No change required.
13	ID No: 697	Q1	Yes - The draft LDP goes completely against the current legislation on environmental protection - strongly proclaimed and endorsed by both the Vale of Glamorgan Council and Welsh Assembly Government. There are numerous brownfield sites available for proposed and potential development (as deemed necessary)	<p>The CIS contained within the draft DA sets out how and when the Council will actively involve stakeholders and the wider community in the preparation of the RLDP.</p> <p>The RLDP will be prepared in accordance with national planning policy. In addition, the Council</p>	No change required.

				has declared Climate Change and Nature Emergencies which will be considered through the RLDP process.	
		Q2	Yes - "The draft LDP goes completely against the current legislation on environmental protection - strongly proclaimed and endorsed by both the Vale of Glamorgan Council and Welsh Assembly Government. There are numerous brownfield sites available for proposed and potential development (as deemed necessary)"	See above.	No change required.
		Q3	No - "The draft LDP goes completely against the current legislation on environmental protection - strongly proclaimed and endorsed by both the Vale of Glamorgan Council and Welsh Assembly Government. There are numerous brownfield sites available for proposed and potential development (as deemed necessary)"	The Draft DA clearly sets out the stages of engagement for the RLDP process, identifying when, how and who will be engaged in accordance with the LDP Regulations. Inter alia Section 2.9 of the Draft DA outlines how documentation will be made available for consultation and Figure 3 and Table 1 provide an overview of the RLDP process and when consultation will occur. More detail is provided under sections 3.2 and Appendix 2.	No change required.
		Q4	No - "The draft LDP goes completely against the current legislation on environmental protection - strongly proclaimed and endorsed by both the Vale of Glamorgan Council and Welsh Assembly Government. There are numerous brownfield sites available for proposed and potential development (as deemed necessary)"	The Draft DA clearly sets out the stages of engagement for the RLDP process, identifying when, how and who will be engaged in accordance with the LDP Regulations. Inter alia Section 2.9 of the Draft DA outlines how documentation will be made available for consultation and Figure 3 and Table 1 provide an overview of the RLDP process and when consultation will occur. More detail is provided under sections 3.2 and Appendix 2.	No change required.
		Q5	No - "The draft LDP goes completely against the current legislation on environmental protection - strongly proclaimed and endorsed by both the Vale of Glamorgan Council and Welsh Assembly Government. There are numerous brownfield sites available for proposed and potential development (as deemed necessary)"	The Draft DA clearly sets out the stages of the RLDP process in accordance with the LDP Regulations.	No change required.
		Q6	"The draft LDP goes completely against the current legislation on environmental protection - strongly	The timetable set out in the Draft DA has been prepared in accordance with the Development	No change required.

			proclaimed and endorsed by both the Vale of Glamorgan Council and Welsh Assembly Government. There are numerous brownfield sites available for proposed and potential development (as deemed necessary)"	Plans Manual and is considered to be realistic and achievable.	
		Further comments	"The draft LDP goes completely against the current legislation on environmental protection - strongly proclaimed and endorsed by both the Vale of Glamorgan Council and Welsh Assembly Government. There are numerous brownfield sites available for proposed and potential development (as deemed necessary)"	See Q1 response above.	No change required.
14	ID No: 698	Q1	Yes - Engagement responses are ignored as not material considerations and the public become despondent and annoyed at constant bombardment on the environment and impact on their living spaces	The Consultation Report will provide details of the issues raised during consultation and how these have influenced the RLDP.	No response required.
		Q2	No - There should be local public engagement or accessible overviews on the website not complicated elongated jargon is tic spiel	The engagement methods detailed within the Draft DA take account of guidance contained in the Development Plans Manual and are considered to be appropriate. As identified in the Draft DA, at key stages of the RLDP process, the Council will prepare Easy Read versions of documents to help people engage in the process. Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that the Executive Summary outlines the purpose of the document, and the recommendations are set out in the conclusion and next steps sections.	No change required
		Q3	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q4	No - It's not clear if public views will be considered as historically they are ignored	The Consultation Report will provide details of the issues raised during consultation and how these have influenced the RLDP.	No change required.
		Q5	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q6	No - You will go with your own timetable no matter what	The timetable set out in the Draft DA has been prepared in accordance with the Development Plans Manual and is considered to be realistic and achievable.	No change required.
		Further comments	"Address the climate crisis and nature crisis; cut back development and prioritise natural sites	The land use issues raised in the comments such as employment, transport, retail and	No change required.

			<p>Accept that VoG infrastructure is inadequate for flooding, sewage treatment and car-transport, new housing sites to be restricted to Metro linked sites and small developments within settlements for local need (the previous LDP paid no regard to Metro plans). Investment in flood mitigation, sewage treatment and sustainable transport to focus on building resilient communities.</p> <p>Review and curtail the Airport-St Athan enterprise zone (6.3.19) accepting the uncertain future of the airport (largest decline in any UK airport 6.3.47), cut out the Model farm development and plan for potential downgrading to a local airport.</p> <p>Boost local shops and facilities in local settlements to reduce the needs for travel, including rejuvenation of the five town centres.</p> <p>No developments in the coastal strip apart from facilities that need a coastal location,</p> <p>Promote tourist opportunities and facilities, restore beaches to Blue Flag standards</p> <p>Tidal /renewable energy</p> <p>Retail strategy the current retail strategy has NOT worked well; empty premises in Holton Rd have remained at ~15%. A strategy for reducing shop numbers and conversion to housing</p> <p>Housing allocations: some have stalled – pretence that the big numbers at Darren Farm and Cosmeston are going ahead.</p> <p>Review these stalled sites, for compliance with policies in the plan, not as 6.3.15 only review sites that have not progressed.</p> <p>Cosmeston – car-dependent, far from facilities; in the coastal zone; toxic landfill; access is vulnerable to floods; first planned to be Green Wedge; archaeological find/listed farmhouse</p> <p>Darren Farm – cut back as limited market demand; too big for sustainable development and Cowbridge to absorb</p>	<p>housing will be considered through the RLDP process as will the impact of climate change in accordance with national planning policy.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Hayes Wood – remote from facilities; not part of a sustainable settlement; poor bus services</p> <p>Llandough Hill – land vulnerable to flooding from soakways in developments above which discharge rapidly through the permeable rock (limestone). Past permissions of soakaways and discharge into Llandough stream ('drain') have to be corrected. Llandough is not a sustainable settlement – this would be a car-borne extension of Cardiff.</p> <p>Assess Sewage Treatment capacity for the purposes of new development</p> <p>Dwr Cymru assurances cannot be accepted as they are unlawfully discharging untreated sewage to rivers and the sea</p> <p>The assurances with the 2009 UV installation that they'd meet Blue-flag bathing water standards at Barry beaches has proved untrue. This is important for tourism, so must be reviewed.</p> <p>Review Sewage Treatment capacity</p> <p>Widely known that many sewage works are discharging untreated sewage frequently, at times when weather conditions are not "exceptional" and therefore unlawfully. The VoG cannot claim not to know, as effluent from Cog Moors pollutes Barrey Island waters</p> <p># summertime sampling is showing Whitmore Bay does not comply with Blue Flag standard</p> <p># data disclosed by DCWW shows untreated discharge ~80 times a year, more frequently in the winter months</p> <p># the UV disinfection is switched off during the winter months, so Whitmore Bay sea bacteria are likely to be many times worse than summertime.</p> <p>The LDP should assess the excess flow over the treatment capacity and conclude there is no leeway for</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>additional sewage in the system as at present. Accepting assurances from DCWW that they can take the sewage from further connections amounts to collusion with criminals who take payments for dealing with your waste then dis[pose of it unlawfully. It breaches the duty of care to accept assurances when you have reason to believe their disposal is (in part) unlawful.</p> <p>As the Vale wants to promote tourism and leisure use of the sea, the LDP should get assurances on</p> <p># use of UV disinfection at all times of the year when immersion activities take place</p> <p># specify DCWW has to invest in further treatment capacity to relieve overloading of Cog Moors STW and meet the Blue Flag standard"</p>		
15	ID No: 708	Q1	Don't know – No specific comments made.	The CIS contained within the draft DA sets out how and when the Council will actively involve stakeholders and the wider community in the preparation of the RLDP.	No change required.
		Q2	No - "Children have right to be consulted - to say • Young people and children will be ""actively encouraged to participate in the preparation of the RLDP"" is pretty meaningless. Resources need to be given to help this group engage, including special sessions on zoom for over and under 15s."	It is considered that the increased use of digital technology and social media will help encourage young people to engage in the RLDP process.	No change required.
		Q3	Don't know – No specific comments made.	The Draft DA clearly sets out the stages of engagement for the RLDP process, identifying when, how and who will be engaged in accordance with the LDP Regulations. Inter alia Section 2.9 of the Draft DA outlines how documentation will be made available for consultation and Figure 3 and Table 1 provide an overview of the RLDP process and when consultation will occur. More detail is provided under sections 3.2 and Appendix 2.	No change required.
		Q4	No - Many people engage only face-to-face. The	Virtual engagement and consultation via web-	No change required.

			availability of zoom means this can be effective and allow questioning, far better at involving people. Zoom meets should be arranged for communities and interest group who want it.	based technology will be utilised as appropriate throughout the RLDP process.	
		Q5	No - "The Climate Emergency needs priority; how that is to be faced needs to have a prior stage, The Nature Emergency needs priority; we first need an assessment of how it's impacting the VoG. It's clear the officers have an understanding of the Climate Change (Wales) Regs that is quite shallow and would be contested. They represent the Nature Emergency as part of the Climate Emergency which we think is wrong. We need opportunity to argue this out at an early stage."	The Draft DA clearly sets out the stages of the RLDP process in accordance with the LDP Regulations. The Council has declared Climate Change and Nature Emergencies as stated in the draft RR which will be considered through the RLDP process.	No change required.
		Q6	No - The intention to treat the Climate and Nature Emergencies as "other" matters show they need addressing in an initial stage.	The timetable set out in the Draft DA has been prepared in accordance with the Development Plans Manual and is considered to be realistic and achievable. The Council has declared Climate Change and Nature Emergencies as stated in the draft RR which will be considered through the RLDP process.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments.	None.	No change required.
16	ID No: 6	Q1	Yes - Effective, meaningful and accessible community engagement is crucial in developing the RLDP. The ways of communicating should be diverse, and innovative in order to engage with members of the community, and particular attention should be paid to those whose voices are not always heard.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q2	Yes - Accepting the limitations of officer time, it is nonetheless important that steps are taken to reach into communities where people may not have the ability to travel to community events or access online discussions. This could be a particular issue in some of the deprived communities for example, for older people, children or people with disabilities. Innovative ways of communicating should be used. Other partners can support with the dissemination of information and	Comments noted. It is considered that the increased use of digital technology and social media will help encourage engagement in the RLDP process. However the draft DA maintains the use of a range of established engagement methods e.g. drop in sessions, exhibitions to ensure that consultations are as inclusive as possible.	No change required.

			engagement with particular groups.		
		Q3	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q4	Yes - Points at which people can get involved and how are clear, but when engagement is done it must be clear what the expectations are from people who get involved, and what they are being asked to do. It must be clear what the parameters are and what can and cannot be influenced and changed. Communities are consulted frequently about a wide range of things, so they will need to understand the process and the time it takes for decisions to be made, and how their ideas and thoughts will be taken on board.	Comments noted. The Council endeavours to clearly set out the purpose of each consultation stage and to provide information that encourages engagement. The draft DA clearly sets out the process and timescale for preparing the RLDP. Members of the public are encouraged to register on the RLDP web pages which will ensure that they are kept advised of progress.	No change required.
		Q5	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q6	Don't know – No specific comments made.	The timetable set out in the Draft DA has been prepared in accordance with the Development Plans Manual and is considered to be realistic and achievable.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments.	None.	No change required.
17	ID No: 710	Q1	Don't know - We don't believe we have received notification of the consultation and have only now become aware of it. The documents are very long and technical despite a commitment in the Draft Delivery Agreement to provide EASY READ DOCUMENTS. [REDACTED] do not have the resources to properly review and comment upon documents of this nature. Please advise if there are any recommendations which will impact Cowbridge, Llanblethian or Aberthin. Please advise the next steps and keep us informed.	Comments noted. This organisation was notified via email of the Delivery Agreement/Review Report consultation on the 4th November 2021 and subsequently on 17th December 2021 regarding the consultation extension. As the RLDP progresses, it is the Council's intention to prepare Easy Read versions of some technical documents to assist with consultations as set out under paragraph 2.4.5 of the Draft Delivery agreement. Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that the introductory paragraphs of the Review Report provide an outline of why the document has been prepared and its contents.	No change required.
		Q2	Don't know – See answer to Question 1.	The engagement methods detailed within the Draft DA take account of guidance contained in the Development Plans Manual and are considered to be appropriate.	No change required.
		Q3	Don't know – See answer to Question 1.	The Draft DA clearly sets out the stages of engagement for the RLDP process, identifying when, how and who will be engaged in	No change required.

				accordance with the LDP Regulations. Inter alia Section 2.9 of the Draft DA outlines how documentation will be made available for consultation and Figure 3 and Table 1 provide an overview of the RLDP process and when consultation will occur. More detail is provided under sections 3.2 and Appendix 2.	
		Q4	Don't know – See answer to Question 1.	See Q3 response above.	No change required.
		Q5	Don't know – See answer to Question 1.	See Q3 response above.	No change required.
		Q6	Don't know – See answer to Question 1.	The timetable set out in the Draft DA has been prepared in accordance with the Development Plans Manual and is considered to be realistic and achievable.	No change required.
		Further comments	We don't believe we have received notification of the consultation and have only now become aware of it. The documents are very long and technical despite a commitment in the Draft Delivery Agreement to provide EASY READ DOCUMENTS. [REDACTED] do not have the resources to properly review and comment upon documents of this nature. Please advise if there are any recommendations which will impact Cowbridge, Llanblethian or Aberthin. Please advise the next steps and keep us informed.	See Q1 response above.	No change required.

*

Representations marked with an asterisk include overarching comments and therefore, are not duplicated in Appendix B.

Appendix B: Draft Review Report Comments, Council Responses and Proposed Amendments.

Review Report					
Question 1: Does the draft Review Report identify all the key contextual issues to be considered in the review of the LDP? (Section 3)					
Question 2: Are the existing LDP vision and objectives appropriate for the Replacement LDP? (Sections 6.1 and 6.2)					
Question 3: Do you think that the LDP strategy needs to be reviewed? (Sections 6.3 and 6.4)					
Question 4: Do you agree with the review of the LDP policies? (Section 7)					
Question 5: Do you agree that the Review should be undertaken individually as opposed to jointly with an adjoining local authority? (Section 9.2)					
No.	Organisation / Individual	Question	Comment	Council Response	Proposed Amendments/Action
1	ID No: 653	Q1	Don't know - No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q2	Don't know - No specific comments made.		
		Q3	Don't know - No specific comments made.		
		Q4	Don't know - No specific comments made.		
		Q5	Don't know - No specific comments made.		
		Further comments	No specific comments made.		
2	ID No: 654	Q1	Yes - Very comprehensive and covers everything. However, all the new climate challenges for the entire planet mean nothing if the enormity of some of these developments - which yes you give answers, but actually mean nothing. You have to listen to your so called 'stakeholders', listen and change.	Comments noted. Issues such as climate change, housing and biodiversity will be considered through the RLDP process as required by national planning policy. Consultation with stakeholders will be undertaken in accordance with the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q2	No - very little movement on the really big important questions of climate change. Far too many houses being built, too much biodiverse land being built on. Quite shocking	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes – Yes. Changed in many ways. Please do not just talk and pay lip service to Future Generations Act, the climate emergency etc, please do something about it. So much concreting over the Vale - how does this fit in with all the green policies?	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.

		Q4	Yes – Yes the LDP is out of touch. How on earth can you still plan to destroy a 100acre Farm/farm land/greenfields/flowers meadows/biodiverse area. Where are the green credentials here.	The RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is undertaken and that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. The specific comments made are considered to relate to a planning application and do not relate to the current consultation.	No change required.
		Q5	Yes – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	Please just listen to the people who actually live in the area. We are not prepared for this to be another box ticking process that the council has to be seen to do. Not good enough.	All consultation responses will be considered by the Council as set out in the Draft DA. Details of consultation will be set out in the Initial and Final Consultation Reports.	No change required.
3	ID No: 657	Q1	No - I have asked to provide a candidate site for consideration, and the report seems to be progressing beyond that stage, with the submission of new candidate sites.	The comments are not specific to the current consultation but relate to a subsequent stage of the RLDP process i.e. candidate sites submissions, which will be undertaken during Summer 2022 as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q2	No - As before.	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes – No specific comments made.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.

		Q4	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comments noted	No change required.
		Q5	Yes – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments made.	None.	No change required.
4	ID No: 658	Q1	No - The specifics for rural areas are missing, particularly with regards to tourism. without specifics it is impossible to review the draft within its context. The obfuscation is deliberate and could mean that development is made where the population may oppose it.	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan and examines the performance of the LDP in respect of how the policies have delivered the Plan's vision, aims and strategy. Section 7 of the Review Report provides a review of the LDP Policies and gives an overview of whether a policy or allocation is functioning effectively, whether any amendments are likely to be needed and whether any policies should be removed or amalgamated as part of the review process. Sections 7.7 and 7.10 consider the tourism and environmental policies of the adopted LDP and conclude that although the current policies are functioning effectively, changes in national policy warrant review. The issues raised in respect of tourism and rural development will therefore be considered in the preparation of the RLDP.	No change required.

		Q2	No - There should be less development rather than more. The land below Hensol which is rural and a site of interest should not be considered for development and should be protected.	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. Development allocations in the RLDP will be considered in relation to the final RLDP strategy, national policy and local requirements.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - Special land should be protected. In light of the economic affect of covid all development should be reigned back.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. The impact of the Covid-19 pandemic will be considered through the RLDP process as will protection of the natural environment.	No change required.
		Q4	Don't know – No specific comment.	The RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is undertaken and that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.	No change required.
		Q5	Yes – No specific comment.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	<p>This development plan does not pay sufficient attention to the protection of the environment. Land already in use or previously built on should be used first, agricultural land should not be used. This is the vale of Glamorgan and its greenness should be protected.</p> <p>Tourism in the rural areas should be specified. I do not have a clue from the document what is proposed for rural areas and I studied economics and politics at university. It</p>	National planning policy as set out in Planning Policy Wales Edition 11 February 2021, clearly directs LPAs to 'prioritise the use of suitable and sustainable previously developed land and/or underutilised sites for all types of development. When identifying sites in their development plans planning authorities should consider previously developed land and/or underutilised sites	No change required.

			obfuscates and is confusing. How can we seriously be consulted when specifics are missing.	located within existing settlements in the first instance with sites on the edge of settlements considered at the next stage.' The RLDP will have full regard to national policy as set out in PPW in all policy areas including Tourism. As per the Council's response to question 2 above, these matters will be considered in the RLDP review.	
5	ID No: 685	Q1	Stop destroying our green spaces and wildlife stop pollution on our roads	The RLDP will be prepared in line with extant Welsh Government guidance and legislation as set out in Planning Policy Wales Edition 11 February 2021 and Future Wales: The National Plan 2040, which seek to protect and enhance wildlife, ecosystems and green spaces and which promotes sustainable transport with reduced reliance on private vehicles and the reuse of previously developed land.	No change required.
		Q2			
		Q3			
		Q4			
		Q5			
		Q6			
		Further comments			
6	ID No: 686	Q1	As a council you cannot be considering more housing and flats in and around the Barry area without a very significant upgrade of the infrastructure. The whole of the road system is very rapidly becoming one large carpark. To increase housing and not improve the road access in my opinion would be a real and long-lasting mistake for the town of Barry. Please be sensible access then homes Do not pretend you cannot see the traffic problem just go and sit on Cardiff Road around rush hour the problem goes much further and is affecting the villages of Sully and Dinas Powys on a daily basis it needs to be a proper plan not like the folly in the 5-mile lane. Barry could once again become a lively and prosperous town if people could actually get in and out of it.	The RLDP will be informed by background evidence prepared on a range of topics including transport and infrastructure requirements. New housing required to meet the identified housing need will be located at appropriate sites and be in accordance with the final RLDP strategy which will be subject to public consultation. Where necessary, new housing and employment sites will be required to implement and/or contribute to improvements to local infrastructure and/or the highway network.	No change required.
		Q2			
		Q3			
		Q4			
		Q5			
		Q6			
		Further comments			
7	ID No: 661	Q1	No – "The draft Review Report contains factual inaccuracies. The document contains factual inaccuracies on page 44 regarding the Planning application no	The comments in respect of Model Farm are noted. However, in this regard, the formal quashing on the Model Farm decision was	Amend references to Model Farm in RR as

			<p>2019/0087/OUT. The draft report states that planning permission has been granted, without acknowledging that the application has been quashed by the Council. You will be aware that the application is currently subject to action under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – Section 77 and direction under article 18(1).</p> <p>At section 6.3.35 and in table 11, the Council is also claiming that 2,000 jobs have been delivered on this site, when no planning permission is currently in place. This is complete nonsense and continues to display the Council's Planning Departments' biased approach to this planning application. This misleading and incorrect information is repeated at section 6.3.48.</p> <p>In our view:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •This is misleading and inaccurate information. •This is a deliberate inclusion of inaccurate information by your Planning Officers, which has the potential to substantially confuse the local community and undermine trust in the process. •The Draft Review Report requires revision and re-issuing urgently with the correct information about this planning application. •Effective consultation is not possible as the Draft Review Report contains this misleading information, and we will be complaining to the Planning Inspector when any revision of the LDP is put before them. •To allow this misleading information to be included in the Draft Review Report is going to taint the whole LDP review process. All subsequent information will be tainted by the errors contained in this report. •You should instigate an internal investigation as to why misleading information is being placed before the public by the Council's planning department. 	<p>not made until 4th October 2021 when the Court Order by HHJ Jarman QC, confirmed the application for permission for judicial review was granted. Until this point, the outcome was not determined. Therefore, at the time the RR was considered by Cabinet (27th September 2021) it was up to date, and it was this version that was approved for the purpose of the current public consultation. The RR will therefore be updated to reflect the changes that have taken place since it was approved by Cabinet for public consultation.</p>	<p>detailed in Appendix C to reflect current position.</p>
		<p>Q2</p>	<p>No - "There is insufficient consideration of the changes and impact caused by Covid 19. The future of air travel is in</p>	<p>The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

doubt and the Airport is no longer financially viable. Inaccurate claims are made in the Report about job creation and the report states that planning applications have been approved when they have not.

- In a number of aspects, the LDP review report is overly positive about what has been achieved and gives misleading positivity to the state of retail centres, job creation and improvements to the transport system.
- Requires additional framework so that Planning Officers cannot decide whether to enact Supplementary Planning Guidance independent of Planning Committee approval. The present arrangements, as evidenced by the Model Farm application allows for officers to 'pick and choose' which elements of guidance apply, and which do not.
- Consultation arrangements are biased in favour of the applicant in the current actions of the Vale of Glamorgan's Planning Department. Consultation implies that respondents have some input and influence over a final decision, but that is not the case in the VOG. Decisions are taken at pre-meetings and decided prior to public planning committee meetings.
- Circumstances have changed with regard to Cardiff Airport due to the pandemic – it is no longer a financially viable operation and requires public subsidy for it to survive. The section at 3.3.7 requires re-evaluation and an acknowledgement that considerable taxpayer support is keeping the airport alive.
- Page 9 – TAN 15 is now published and the final details of that should be included in the Draft review report.
- Planning Policy Wales emphasises that the planning system should contribute towards tackling the climate emergency – how can the VOG support this when they allow developers to be excused from inconvenient supplementary planning guidance? For example, at the proposed Model Farm development when £3.7 million is proposed to be gifted to L

process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.

Comments noted. Section 7 of the Review Report provides a review of the LDP Policies. It gives an overview of whether a policy or allocation is functioning effectively, whether any amendments are likely to be needed and whether any policies should be removed or amalgamated as part of the review process. It clearly states, "The policy assessment undertaken to date is not considered to be definitive and further consideration will be given to the need to revise the Plan's policies as part of the Replacement LDP preparation process".

In this regard, the RLDP will be informed by background evidence prepared on a range of topics including inter alia retail, flooding, housing, employment, population, the environment, and transport. It should be noted that the publication of TAN15 by the Welsh Government has been delayed until June 2023. The impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on all topic areas will also be considered.

Specific comments in respect of Model Farm are not relevant to the current consultation and will be addressed through the planning application process.

		<p>and G as the developer refuses to pay for a contribution towards active travel on the grounds of financial viability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The VOG is not acting in accordance with 'Llwybr Newydd: The Transport Strategy for Wales' as it is allowing developers to avoid paying SPG contributions towards active and sustainable transport options.•The Council states at section 3.6.19 that it 'places biodiversity alongside climate change at the heart of decision making' but it is seeking to allow public subsidies to a developer who is destroying farmland. The Council is saying one thing and doing another.•The LDP refers to a 'stunning coastline' yet the development of an industrial estate at Model Farm, which buildings up to five stories high will be visible from the sea and impact upon the Heritage Coastline.•The Draft Review document – at section 3.6.27 is inadequate in giving details about the effect of the Cardiff Metro plans. It is currently the situation that no sections of the Metro will be in the VOG other than a short section in Penarth. The draft report needs to clarify the actual current situation.•Page 20 – housing and population projections – a further 10,000 people up to 2036 – and 6,214 households during the revised plan period – pressure on already inadequate road network and no viable or explained alternative sustainable transport solutions.•Too much land is allocated for employment opportunities at and around the airport. There is no demonstration of need for this in the evidence presented.•Section 4.2.9 says that the 'potential jobs growth is considerably less than the labour force'. If more land is developed for employment in the western vale and around the airport that will attract workers from outside the area rather than local people (?) therefore adding to the pressure on the road network from Culverhouse Cross to the airport.		
--	--	---	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The VOGC should regularly review its pandemic recovery plan as the situation is rapidly changing – especially in regard to the future of the airport and ass" 		
		<p>Q3</p>	<p>Yes - "Times have changed. the future of the airport is uncertain. Substantial changes have taken place regarding the retail environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The VOGC has failed to adequately deliver on its commitment to provide affordable housing. Repeatedly the Council allows developers to avoid their commitments and Planning Officers are weak in enforcing Supplementary Planning Guidance. The Council lacks experience in depth within its planning function and are readily and repeatedly content to allow developers to fail to deliver. •Page 43 – St Athan is a different place to Rhose – please be more accurate in the distinction between the two places. •Page 44 – and the section on the Model Farm development is complete garbage. Misleading information provided by planning officers – doesn't mention that the planning application has been quashed. •At Table 11 the Council are claiming that 2,000 jobs have been delivered at the Enterprise Zone/Model Farm development – when it hasn't even received planning approval. •The statement at section 6.3.37 which claims that the adopted LDP has delivered 25.09% of the anticipated jobs - and is therefore beyond the monitoring target set out in the AMR is misleading and untrue. As it is taking Model Farm into consideration. •The section on 'Cardiff Airport and Bro Tathan Enterprise Zone at Page 46 does not take into consideration the long-term changing aspect of air travel and the impacts of Covid-19. The document acknowledges that Cardiff Airport has had the largest decline in any UK airport – but doesn't see what the impact on development will be. 	<p>The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. The comments made in respect of Model farm and the inaccuracy in the RR have been addressed above.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Section 6.3.48 again states that planning permission has been granted at Model Farm which is untrue. •The section on Page 47 – land to the south of Junction 34 – shows that there is still a live application for B1, B2 and B8 of 36 hectares – this must be seen as preferential for any likely developer as it is adjacent to the M4 and has much better access. Further evidence that there is no evidenced demand for the Model Farm site. •At section 7.4.2 the report repeats that planning permission has been granted at Model Farm, which is not true, and makes the following statement 'This demonstrates that employment allocations are steadily coming forward during the plan period and are on track'. This is untrue. •At section 7.8.3 the VOGC is positive about section 106 contributions for sustainable transport schemes but doesn't mention the loss of £3.7 million that it has allowed L and G to avoid potentially. •Section 7.10 talks about the green wedge - yet the report does not explain the issue of part of the green wedge being taken away without explanation in 2011 at Model Farm." 		
		Q4	Yes – No specific comment made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q5	No – The review should be undertaken with adjoining local authorities on a South Wales sub regional basis.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments made.	None.	No change required.
8	ID No: 662	Q1	No - There needs to be a clear strategy for the provision of accommodation for the elderly. It needs to be wide reaching and deal with various needs: first the need for sheltered	The comments in respect of accommodation provision for the elderly are noted. The RLDP will be supported by a range of	No change required.

			accommodation (both to own and rent) for couples and single people, and second the need for extended families to be able to live together. This will reduce the cost of care and enable grandparents to be involved in bringing up their grandchildren. It will require the Authority to accept the need for houses to be altered and extended and also for a separate 'family' dwelling to be built in a garden if space permits, subject to a restraint on its use being restricted to family occupation. It is not always possible to alter an existing house. Further if the accommodation is needed for an active couple more space will be required.	background evidence addressing multiple topic areas including housing and population requirements. The Council is currently preparing an older Persons Strategy that will form a part of the RLDP evidence base. The general issues raised will be considered through these mechanisms and incorporated into the RLDP as required.	
		Q2	No – See comments above.	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes – See comments above.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q4	Yes – Subject to above comments.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q5	Don't know – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments made.	None.	No change required.
9	ID No: 663	Q1	No - It should consider the environment more. Things like the incinerator should not be built close to houses. Stupid decision and it should be closed.	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant	No change required.

				<p>revisions to the Plan. It also examines the performance of the LDP in respect of how the policies have delivered the Plan's vision, aims and strategy taking into account the findings of the three AMRs undertaken by the Council since the adoption of the Plan. In this regard, the RR considers the impact of such legislation as the Well Being of Future Generations Act 2015 and the Climate Change (Wales) Regulations 2021 along with the performance of the existing LDP environmental policies and concludes that a Replacement LDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036." Environmental issues will be considered through the RLDP process as required by national planning policy.</p> <p>The matter of the incinerator is not an issue for this consultation.</p>	
		Q2	No - More environment consideration. Less building and fewer new houses as the roads can't cope.	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. Environmental protection and housing requirements will be considered through the RLDP process and supported by background evidence.	No change required.
		Q3	No – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q4	No - Over positive about actions completed. And misleading.	The RR considers the performance of the LDP in respect of how the policies have delivered the Plan's vision, aims and strategy considering the findings of the three AMRs undertaken by the Council since the adoption of the Plan.	No change required.

		Q5	Don't know – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments made.	None.	No change required.
10	ID No: 664	Q1	<p>No - [REDACTED]. You are failing to understand the issue of traffic on the road network around Barry. There are constant delays and hold ups that have a real impact on resources within the health sector. Planning on building another industrial estate at the airport is another ridiculous pressure on the road network that we really do not need when there is ample undeveloped land at Junction 34 which is adjacent to the M4.</p> <p>Constantly building new areas of housing without addressing the road problem is not helpful.</p> <p>Lesley Griffiths - the Rural Affairs Minister for Welsh Govt just said on the BBC that 'Without welsh farms there would be no food for welsh people' - I agree with that - and therefore you should not be supporting the destruction of a productive farm adjacent to the airport which is unnecessary. Look at what your own report said - for example the Peter Brett report on connectivity</p>	<p>The RR concludes that the most appropriate form of review is the Full Revision Procedure, and it is recommended that a Replacement LDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. Section 7 of the RR provides a review of the LDP Policies and gives an overview of whether a policy or allocation is functioning effectively, whether any amendments are likely to be needed and whether any policies should be removed or amalgamated as part of the review process. Section 7.8 of the RR relates to Transport Infrastructure and the performance of LDP policies SP7 and MG16 and concludes that while there are currently no concerns with the effectiveness and implementation of the transport policies of the LDP, several contextual changes have occurred since the plan was adopted which will need to be considered, not least the publication by the Welsh Government of 'Llwybr Newydd: The Wales Transport Strategy 2021'. This was published in March 2021 and sets out the Welsh Government's strategic priorities for</p>	No change required.

				transport investment in Wales. The central aim of the strategy is to reduce the impact that transport has on climate change, setting a target for 45% of all journeys within Wales to be undertaken sustainably by 2040. The RLDP will be required to comply with national policy and reflect this objective.	
		Q2	No - Less housing and more support for the environment.	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. The issues raised will be considered through the RLDP process which will reflect the objectives of national planning policy and be supported by background evidence.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - Abandon the plans to concrete over a working productive farm and ancient woodlands.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. The specific comments made relate to a planning application and do not form part of the current consultation.	No change required.
		Q4	No - Less housing and more for the environment.	The RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is undertaken and that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. The issues raised will be considered through the RLDP process which will reflect the objectives of national planning policy and be supported by background evidence.	No change required.
		Q5	Don't know – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will	No change required.

				adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	
		Further comments	No specific comments made.	None.	No change required.
11	ID No: 665	Q1	<p>No - There are misleading and incorrect factual errors in the report – they state that planning permission has been granted for the Industrial Estate at Model Farm, Rhoose when it has not been.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The report is overly positive in stating what the Council has achieved – for example, that 2,000 jobs have already been created at the Model Farm industrial estate. - The report fails to see the importance of concreting over a productive working farm – more consideration of the environment should be given to protect farmland and ancient woodland in Wales. - Traffic congestion between Rhoose, Llantwit Major and Barry is a huge problem that the Council fails to understand. - Planning Officers get away with failing to apply the Council's own Supplementary Planning Guidance without anyone being challenged by the ruling administration. - The Council are willing to subsidise Developers over the objections of local people. - There is plenty of land available for industrial estates at Junction 34 of the M4 - Hensol – which is for sale and ready to be developed. It has better road and rail links and should be the priority first. - We do not need additional housing until the road network is improved. 	<p>The comments in respect of Model Farm are noted. However, in this regard, the formal quashing on the Model Farm decision was not made until 4th October 2021 when the Court Order by HHJ Jarman QC, confirmed the application for permission for judicial review was granted. Until this point, the outcome was not determined. Therefore, at the time the RR was considered by Cabinet (27th September 2021) it was up to date, and it was this version that was approved for the purpose of the current public consultation. The RR will therefore be updated to reflect the changes that have taken place since it was approved by Cabinet for public consultation. The specific comments made in respect of Model Farm relate to a planning application and are not relevant to the current consultation.</p>	Amend references to Model Farm in RR as detailed in Appendix C to reflect current position.
		Q2	No - Until the road network is supported by more active travels options and a complete overall of the public transport network the VOG C should restrict the building of new housing only to support affordable housing for social	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. Issues such as	No change required.

			landlords - and primarily housing for rent. There is too much emphasis given to building and support for developers and less emphasis on the environment which is contrary to Welsh Government Guidance in Planning Policy Wales.	affordable housing, active travel and environmental protection will be considered through the RLDP process which will reflect the objectives of national planning policy and be supported by background evidence.	
		Q3	Yes - It is not necessary to support expansion of the airport facilities as it is a financially failing enterprise.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. The role and function of Cardiff Airport will be considered through the RLDP process and will reflect the objectives of national planning policy.	No change required.
		Q4	No – No specific comments made.	The overall conclusion of the RR is that the Council undertake a Full Revision of the adopted LDP and that a Replacement LDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.	No change required.
		Q5	Don't know – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments made.	None.	No change required.
12	ID No: 666	Q1	No - No mention of the environmental damage by concreting over a fully working family farm - to replace it with another unwanted business park.	The overall conclusion of the RR is that the Council undertake a Full Revision of the adopted LDP and that a Replacement LDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. The RLDP will consider all issues required by national planning policy. The specific comments relate to a planning application and do not relate to the current consultation.	No change required.

		Q2	No - Need to include environmental issues, plus the traffic congestion on a road that is already too busy - slight problem and the whole of the Vale becomes gridlocked - making emergency access almost impossible - dangerous situation!!!	Comments noted. The existing LDP Vision and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. Environmental and transportation issues will be considered through the RLDP review and supported by background evidence.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - Not taking into account all the issues that have been highlighted by the people who live in this area and commute daily to work who are affected all the time by the traffic chaos.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. The specific comments relate to a planning application and are not relevant to the current consultation however transportation issues will be considered in the RLDP.	No change required.
		Q4	Yes - Needs review due to the climate crisis we are facing - more important than ever to retain all our working farms and green spaces.	The RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is undertaken and that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. The issues raised will be considered through the RLDP process which will reflect the objectives of national planning policy and be supported by background evidence.	No change required.
		Q5	Yes - Each area has its own issues - but we all need to be mindful of the climate crisis we are facing.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	Plenty of brown field sites that are in a better location that should be used before destroying a working farm and adding more strain on an already creaking road system.	The comments made are considered to relate to a planning application and do not relate to the current consultation.	No change required.

13	ID No: 667	Q1	Don't know - "Must make provision to save green spaces. Model farm should be left alone. There should be an upgrade of the roads and transport. There needs to be more police to combat a rise in crime."	The comments made in respect of Model Farm and police numbers are not matters for consideration through the current consultation. The RLDP will consider future infrastructure requirements.	No change required.
		Q2	Don't know - Leave Model Farm as a farm. Anything else would be detrimental to the area.	The existing LDP Vision and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. The specific comments made in respect of Model Farm are considered to relate to a planning application and are not relevant to the current consultation.	No change required.
		Q3	Don't know – No specific comments.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q4	Don't know - Why do you bother asking us when you ignore what we say.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q5	Yes – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	The roads are really congested and in a poor state. There needs to be more trains and busses. Car parking in Barry is terrible, the new charges are a disgrace and will kill the high street. There needs to be a rethink about Model Farm as it will be devastating and go against the environmental policy of the Welsh Government.	The RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is undertaken and that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. Transportation issues will be considered through the RLDP process and will reflect the objectives of national planning policy	No change required.

				and be supported by background evidence. The specific comments made in respect of Model Farm relate to a planning application and are not relevant to the current consultation. Transport and infrastructure issues will be considered through the RLDP process.	
14	ID No: 668	Q1	No - Protection of ancient sites heritage SSSI SINCs and greenfields must be a priority.	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan. It also examines the performance of the LDP in respect of how the policies have delivered the Plan's vision, aims and strategy taking into account the findings of the three AMRs undertaken by the Council since the adoption of the Plan. In this regard, the RR considers the impact of such legislation as the Well Being of Future Generations Act 2015 and the Historic Environment (Wales) Act 2016 along with the performance of the existing LDP environmental policies and concludes that a Replacement LDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036." Protection of the natural and historic environment issues will be considered in the through the RLDP process as required by national planning policy.	No change required.
		Q2	No - More protection is necessary in the new LDP of greenfields and working farms due to climate change.	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - It is not strong enough in the protection of greenfields open spaces and farms.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.

		Q4	Yes - An annual review is necessary due to changing climate affects.	Local Planning Authorities (LPA) have a requirement to keep their Local Development Plan (LDP) up to date and to review their LDP 4 years post adoption in line with LDP Regulation 41. Changes to an adopted LDP can only be made through formal plan revision. The RR and the DA are the initial stages in the plan review. An annual review of policies is not practical however once adopted the performance of the RLDP will be assessed through the monitoring framework and reported through the Annual Monitoring Report.	No change required.
		Q5	Yes - However the WG must take responsibility in ensuring that LDPs are fit for purpose,	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues. All LDPs are prepared in accordance with WG guidance and subject to an Independent Examination to ensure that they are Sound.	No change required.
		Further comments	This Council must start listening to the comments of the residents that they serve.	Comments noted. The Council welcomes engagement from local residents and all stakeholders throughout the RLDP process as set out in the draft DA.	No change required.
15	ID No: 669	Q1	Don't know - The report as far too lengthy for public consultation. A highlight report is needed otherwise you are paying lip service to consultation.	As the RLDP progresses, it is the Council's intention to prepare Easy Read versions of some documents to assist with the consultation as set out under paragraph 2.4.5 of the Draft Delivery agreement.	No change required.

				Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that the Executive Summary outlines the purpose of the document, and the recommendations are set out in the conclusion and next steps sections.	
		Q2	No - There are misleading statements. Planning permission has not been granted for Model Farm. No jobs have been secured - the predicted amount of jobs is pure speculation. The traffic report for model farm is ridiculous and does not reflect the reality for people living in Rhoose or the eastern Vale.	<p>The comments in respect of Model Farm are noted. However, in this regard, the formal quashing on the Model Farm decision was not made until 4th October 2021 when the Court Order by HHJ Jarman QC, confirmed the application for permission for judicial review was granted. Until this point, the outcome was not determined. Therefore, at the time the RR was considered by Cabinet (27th September 2021) it was up to date, and it was this version that was approved for the purpose of the current public consultation. The RR will therefore be updated to reflect the changes that have taken place since it was approved by Cabinet for public consultation.</p> <p>The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.</p> <p>The specific comments made in respect of Model Farm relate to a planning application and are not relevant to the current consultation.</p>	Amend references to Model Farm in RR as detailed in Appendix C to reflect current position.
		Q3	Yes - "VOG need to listen to residents and change consultation methods so more people engage. We are in a state of climate emergency. Concreting over prime farmland and woodland is criminal when other sites such as Hensol	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. The specific comments made	No change required.

			with better road links are available. The traffic survey done for Model Farm is pure nonsense. I'd advised every Councillor to try driving in and out of Rhoose at peak travel times to see whether they think the introduction of an industrial estate will not further ruin the lives of residents. No more houses are needed until the road infrastructure is much better."	in respect of Model Farm relate to a planning application and are not relevant to the current consultation.	
		Q4	No - You are still not listening to the people who put you in your positions and care more for developer's interests than residents wants and needs.	The RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is undertaken and that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. The issues raised will be considered through the RLDP process which will reflect the objectives of national planning policy and be supported by background evidence.	No change required.
		Q5	No - "VOG councillors are not able to see the bigger picture. You work only along party lines and input from others could help councillors understand environmental issues and how to represent the interests of residents more clearly. A white elephant of an industrial estate where beautiful farmland once stood will bring nothing but shame on you all. Surely you must realise that having this land in the original LDP for industrial development was a big mistake and if more residents understood the full implications they would never have agreed to it. Planning officers have failed to implement your own planning guidance and additional scrutiny may benefit everyone."	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues. The specific comments made in respect of Model Farm relate to a planning application and are not relevant to the current consultation.	No change required.
		Further comments	VOG are poor at listening to local people and need to do far more to consult effectively so residents understand the implications of what is planned. Is there a highlight version that residents can read? Document is far too long to properly digest by the public. If you really want to consult the public you have a duty to provide documents in an accessible manner and make	The DA and RR consultation has been prepared to obtain the views of external organisations, groups, and individuals. All comments received will be considered, changes made where necessary and relevant. The RLDP will be prepared in accordance with the CIS set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.

			things as ease as possible for residents. That way scandalous decisions like the development of prime farm land at Model Farm don't slip through because people haven't realised the implications of the LPD and how is will blight their lives for ever.	As above for Q1.	
16	ID No: 652	Q1	<p>No - "There are misleading and incorrect facts in the report, for example it says that planning permission has been granted for the industrial estate at Model Farm Rhoose; it's been quashed meaning no permission has been granted. It also says that 2000 jobs have already been created at the Model Farm industrial estate. This is very much an overstatement.</p> <p>Too little credit is given to the benefits on the environment of retaining the working, and productive farm, especially when you consider how much politicians keep banging on about food miles.</p> <p>Successive housing developments in and around the Vale, without significant infrastructure improvements, already creates huge traffic issues especially around peak times such as school runs. The Council fails to grasp this real issue; this needs to be addressed and given clear consideration in this document.</p> <p>The Council is willing to subsidise developers, such as L&G, and prioritise them over the objections of local people. The are better sites available for an industrial estate at the M4 J34, Henson. It's for sale, ready for development and has better road and rail links; why is this not the first choice?"</p>	<p>The comments in respect of Model Farm are noted. However, in this regard, the formal quashing on the Model Farm decision was not made until 4th October 2021 when the Court Order by HHJ Jarman QC, confirmed the application for permission for judicial review was granted. Until this point, the outcome was not determined. Therefore, at the time the RR was considered by Cabinet (27th September 2021) it was up to date, and it was this version that was approved for the purpose of the current public consultation. The RR will therefore be updated to reflect the changes that have taken place since it was approved by Cabinet for public consultation. The specific comments made in respect of Model Farm relate to a planning application and are not relevant to the current consultation.</p>	Amend references to Model Farm in RR as detailed in Appendix C to reflect current position.
		Q2	Don't know – No specific comments.	The existing LDP Vision and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes – No specific comments.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and	No change required.

				subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	
		Q4	Don't know – No specific comments.	The RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is undertaken and that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.	No change required.
		Q5	Yes – No specific comments.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	Mr Drakeford has yet to come up with a solution for the well needed M4 relief road, VOG need to stop giving planning permission for new properties until a new road and rail improvement plan is actually delivered. One train and hour to Rhose leaves only road as a viable transport option and that already overly congested. Do something about it!	The specific comments in respect of the M4 relief road are not related to current consultation documents. Transportation including sustainable transport will be considered in the RLDP.	No change required.
17	ID No: 651	Q1	No – No specific comments.	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan.	No change required.
		Q2	No – No specific comments.	The existing LDP Vision and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes – No specific comments.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q4	No – No specific comments.	The RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is undertaken and that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.	No change required.

		Q5	Yes – No specific comments.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	<p>There are misleading and incorrect factual errors in the report – you state that planning permission has been granted for the Industrial Estate, at Model Farm Rhoose, when it has not been.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The report is overly positive in stating what the Council has achieved – for example you state that 2,000 jobs have ALREADY been created at the Model Farm industrial estate. - you fail to see the importance of concentrating over a productive working farm – more consideration of the environment should be given to protect farmland and ancient woodland in Wales. - Traffic congestion between Rhoose, Llantwit Major and Barry is a huge problem that the Council fails to understand. - Planning Officers getting away with failing to apply the Council's own Supplementary Planning Guidance without anyone being challenged by the ruling administration. - The Council are willing to subsidise Developers over the objections of local people. - There is plenty of land available for industrial estates at Junction 34 of the M4 - Hensol – which is for sale and ready to be developed. It has better road and rail links and should be the priority first. - We do not need additional housing until the road network is improved. 	<p>The comments in respect of Model Farm are noted. However, in this regard, the formal quashing on the Model Farm decision was not made until 4th October 2021 when the Court Order by HHJ Jarman QC, confirmed the application for permission for judicial review was granted. Until this point, the outcome was not determined. Therefore, at the time the RR was considered by Cabinet (27th September 2021) it was up to date, and it was this version that was approved for the purpose of the current public consultation. The RR will therefore be updated to reflect the changes that have taken place since it was approved by Cabinet for public consultation. The specific comments made in respect of Model Farm relate to a planning application and are not relevant to the current consultation however issues such as transportation and protection of the environment will be considered through the RLDP process.</p>	Amend references to Model Farm in RR as detailed in Appendix C to reflect current position.
18	ID No: 670	Q1	Don't know – No specific comments made.	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place	No change required.

				since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan.	
		Q2	No - Times have changed since original LDP was made.	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - I think due to climate change we all need to try to cut back on pollution model farm is a working farm if it was changed into a business park all the extra vehicles would create a lot more pollution and the road could not cope with it there would be traffic ques during peak times.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. The specific comments made in respect of Model Farm relate to a planning application and are not relevant to the current consultation.	No change required.
		Q4	No - No specific comments made.	The RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is undertaken and that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.	No change required.
		Q5	Yes - Anyone who is affected should be consulted.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues. Public consultation on the RLDP will take place as set out in the draft DA.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments made.	None.	No change required.
19	ID No: 671	Q1	No - No specific comments made.	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan.	No change required.
		Q2	No - No specific comments made.	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP	No change required.

				process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	
		Q3	Yes - No specific comments made.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q4	No - No specific comments made.	The RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is undertaken and that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.	No change required.
		Q5	No - The Vale is not an island, the LDP should take national & even international factors into consideration, especially the Climate Emergency!	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments made.	None.	No change required.
20	ID No: 672	Q1	<p>No - There are misleading and incorrect factual errors in the report – it states that planning permission has been granted for the Industrial Estate, at Model Farm Rhoose, when it has not been.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The report is overly positive in stating what the Council has achieved – for example they state that 2,000 jobs have ALREADY been created at the Model Farm industrial estate. - It fails to see the importance of concreting over a productive working farm – more consideration of the environment should be given to protect farmland and ancient woodland in Wales. - Traffic congestion between Rhoose, Llantwit Major and Barry is a huge problem that the Council fails to understand. - Planning Officers fail to apply the Council's own Supplementary Planning Guidance without anyone being 	The comments in respect of Model farm are noted. However, in this regard, the formal quashing on the Model Farm decision was not made until 4th October 2021 when the Court Order by HHJ Jarman QC, confirmed the application for permission for judicial review was granted. Until this point, the outcome was not determined. Therefore, at the time the RR was considered by Cabinet (27th September 2021) it was up to date, and it was this version that was approved for the purpose of the current public consultation. The RR will therefore be updated to reflect the changes that have taken place since it was approved by	Amend references to Model Farm in RR as detailed in Appendix C to reflect current position.

			<p>challenged by the ruling administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Council are willing to subsidise Developers over the objections of local people. - There is plenty of land available for industrial estates at Junction 34 of the M4 - Hensol – which is for sale and ready to be developed. It has better road and rail links and should be the priority first. - We do not need additional housing until the road network is improved. 	<p>Cabinet for public consultation. The specific comments made in respect of Model Farm relate to a planning application and are not relevant to the current consultation however issues such as transportation and protection of the environment will be considered through the RLDP process.</p>	
		Q2	No - No specific comments made.	<p>The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.</p>	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - No specific comments made.	<p>The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.</p>	No change required.
		Q4	Don't know - No specific comments made.	<p>The RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is undertaken and that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.</p>	No change required.
		Q5	Yes - No specific comments made.	<p>Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.</p>	No change required.
		Further comments	No specific comments made.	None.	No change required.
21	ID No: 673	Q1	No - In regard to the Housing Development on Land at Upper Cosmeston Farm, Lavernock Road, Cosmeston, the candidate site information provided to the LDP has subsequently been found to be incorrect, flawed and makes	<p>The comments made relate to a current planning application and not the RR. All issues associated with the planning application including compliance with</p>	No change required.

			<p>any development on this site unsound. The current application states that the development is not in accordance with the LDP and is advancing into the "Green Wedge" area to prevent coalescence between Penarth and Sully. Increased Coastal Erosion at the south of the development and the increase in flooding to the Flood Zone located to the north of the candidate do not concur with candidate site and it would appear that Welsh Water are now stating that waste transfer systems are severely overloaded contrary to the LDP documentation. Similarly the contents of the historic Council landfill site present within the candidate were inappropriately underestimated as was the historic value of the old farmhouse building which has been subsequently been listed and the archaeology which were totally disregarded in the LDP documentation. There are concerns over increased traffic congestion at the locality and surrounding areas leading to poor quality not properly identified within the candidate site documentation. The inclusion of the site as a candidate site in the LDP and the subsequent planning application appear to involve inducements made by the applicant to the Vale of Glamorgan Council whether it being land provision for a school and subsequent land and monetary funding for a Special Needs School on adjoining land advancing further into the Green Wedge area.</p>	<p>national and local planning policy, flooding and the historic environment will be considered through the planning application process.</p> <p>The adopted LDP was considered by an Independent Planning Inspector and found to be sound.</p>	
		<p>Q2</p>	<p>No - In regard to the Housing Development on Land at Upper Cosmeston Farm, Lavernock Road, Cosmeston, the candidate site information provided to the LDP has subsequently been found to be incorrect, flawed and makes any development on this site unsound. The current application states that the development is not in accordance with the LDP and is advancing into the "Green Wedge" area to prevent coalescence between Penarth and Sully. Increased Coastal Erosion at the south of the development and the increase in flooding to the Flood Zone located to the north of the candidate do not concur with candidate site and</p>	<p>The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.</p> <p>The specific comments made relate to a current planning application and not the RR. All issues associated with the planning application including compliance with national and local planning policy, flooding and the historic environment will be</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

		<p>it would appear that Welsh Water are now stating that waste transfer systems are severely overloaded contrary to the LDP documentation. Similarly the contents of the historic Council landfill site present within the candidate were inappropriately underestimated as was the historic value of the old farmhouse building which has been subsequently been listed and the archaeology which were totally disregarded in the LDP documentation. There are concerns over increased traffic congestion at the locality and surrounding areas leading to poor quality not properly identified within the candidate site documentation. The inclusion of the site as a candidate site in the LDP and the subsequent planning application appear to involve inducements made by the applicant to the Vale of Glamorgan Council whether it being land provision for a school and subsequent land and monetary funding for a Special Needs School on adjoining land advancing further into the Green Wedge area.</p>	<p>considered through the planning application process.</p> <p>The adopted LDP was considered by an Independent Planning Inspector and found to be sound.</p>	
		<p>Q3 Yes - In regard to the Housing Development on Land at Upper Cosmeston Farm, Lavernock Road, Cosmeston, the candidate site information provided to the LDP has subsequently been found to be incorrect, flawed and makes any development on this site unsound. The current application states that the development is not in accordance with the LDP and is advancing into the "Green Wedge" area to prevent coalescence between Penarth and Sully. Increased Coastal Erosion at the south of the development and the increase in flooding to the Flood Zone located to the north of the candidate do not concur with candidate site and it would appear that Welsh Water are now stating that waste transfer systems are severely overloaded contrary to the LDP documentation. Similarly the contents of the historic Council landfill site present within the candidate were inappropriately underestimated as was the historic value of the old farmhouse building which has been subsequently been listed and the archaeology which were totally disregarded in the</p>	<p>The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.</p> <p>The specific comments made relate to a current planning application and not the RR. All issues associated with the planning application including compliance with national and local planning policy, flooding and the historic environment will be considered through the planning application process.</p> <p>The adopted LDP was considered by an Independent Planning Inspector and found to be sound.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

			LDP documentation. There are concerns over increased traffic congestion at the locality and surrounding areas leading to poor quality noy properly identified within the candidate site documentation. The inclusion of the site as a candidate site in the LDP and the subsequent planning application appear to involve inducements made by the applicant to the Vale of Glamorgan Council whether it being land provision for a school and subsequent land and monetary funding for a Special Needs School on adjoining land advancing further into the Green Wedge area.		
		Q4	No - In regard to the Housing Development on Land at Upper Cosmeston Farm, Lavernock Road, Cosmeston, the candidate site information provided to the LDP has subsequently been found to be incorrect, flawed and makes any development on this site unsound. The current application states that the development is not in accordance with the LDP and is advancing into the "Green Wedge" area to prevent coalescence between Penarth and Sully. Increased Coastal Erosion at the south of the development and the increase in flooding to the Flood Zone located to the north of the candidate do not concur with candidate site and it would appear that Welsh Water are now stating that waste transfer systems are severely overloaded contray to the LDP documentation. Similarly the contents of the historic Council landfill site present within the candidate were inappropriately underestimated as was the historic value of the old farmhouse building which has been subsequently been listed and the archaeology which were totally disregarded in the LDP documentation. There are concerns over increased traffic congestion at the locality and surrounding areas leading to poor quality noy properly identified within the candidate site documentation. The inclusion of the site as a candidate site in the LDP and the subsequent planning application appear to involve inducements made by the applicant to the Vale of Glamorgan Council whether it being	Section 7 of the RR provides a review of the LDP Policies. It gives an overview of whether a policy or allocation is functioning effectively, whether any amendments are likely to be needed and whether any policies should be removed or amalgamated as part of the review process. While many of the adopted LDP policies are performing well the RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is appropriate to reflect contextual changes that have occurred since its adoption and recommends that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. The specific comments made relate to a current planning application and not the RR. All issues associated with the planning application including compliance with national and local planning policy, flooding and the historic environment will be considered through the planning application process.	No change required.

			land provision for a school and subsequent land and monetary funding for a Special Needs School on adjoining land advancing further into the Green Wedge area.	The adopted LDP was considered by an Independent Planning Inspector and found to be sound.	
		Q5	<p>No - In regard to the Housing Development on Land at Upper Cosmeston Farm, Lavernock Road, Cosmeston, the candidate site information provided to the LDP has subsequently been found to be incorrect, flawed and makes any development on this site unsound. The current application states that the development is not in accordance with the LDP and is advancing into the "Green Wedge" area to prevent coalescence between Penarth and Sully. Increased Coastal Erosion at the south of the development and the increase in flooding to the Flood Zone located to the north of the candidate do not concur with candidate site and it would appear that Welsh Water are now stating that waste transfer systems are severely overloaded contrary to the LDP documentation. Similarly the contents of the historic Council landfill site present within the candidate were inappropriately underestimated as was the historic value of the old farmhouse building which has been subsequently been listed and the archaeology which were totally disregarded in the LDP documentation. There are concerns over increased traffic congestion at the locality and surrounding areas leading to poor quality not properly identified within the candidate site documentation. The inclusion of the site as a candidate site in the LDP and the subsequent planning application appear to involve inducements made by the applicant to the Vale of Glamorgan Council whether it being land provision for a school and subsequent land and monetary funding for a Special Needs School on adjoining land advancing further into the Green Wedge area.</p>	<p>Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.</p> <p>The specific comments made relate to a current planning application and not the RR. All issues associated with the planning application including compliance with national and local planning policy, flooding and the historic environment will be considered through the planning application process.</p> <p>The adopted LDP was considered by an Independent Planning Inspector and found to be sound.</p>	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments made.	None.	No change required.

22	ID No: 674	Q1	No - My comments shown below try to cover this in a little more detail, but the contextual issues need much further thought in the light of experiences over the last two years re Covid 19 and the need for people to be able to get out into the country and enjoy the diminished green areas we still have available to us, directly coupled with the increasing awareness of mental health issues.	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan. Section 4 of the RR considers the contextual changes that have taken place since adoption and paragraphs 4.2.13 – 4.2.15 consider the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and how this may have impacted on the way people work, shop and travel and concludes that these issues will need to be considered in the RLDP process particularly regarding employment, retail, and future infrastructure needs.	No change required.
		Q2	Don't know - There just seems to be a lack of real breadth to the thinking embodied in the document on issues of Transport needs and the blind pursuit of replacing Green land with bricks and mortar.	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. Issues such as transportation and environmental protection will be considered through the RLDP process.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - In terms of Housing provision under SP1, SP3 Policies and growth, there needs to be a much more balanced approach which must be in line with the Environment Act, wherein it is quoted that any development proposal on Green land must not only replace that removed by the Development plus a further 10%.	The existing LDP strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. Section 7.2 and 7.10 of the RR consider the housing and environmental policies of the adopted LDP and recognise that the RLDP process will provide the opportunity to update the existing policy framework in these areas to reflect contextual and national policy changes.	No change required.
		Q4	No - It is of real concern that the Transport implications embodied in SP7 seem to merely focus on bus and cycle infrastructure; there has to be a well thought out policy towards cyclists and their use of infrastructure provided; in most cases other than parents and children there is a clear	Section 7.8 of the RR assesses the performance of the transportation policies of the adopted LDP and highlights the progress that has been made on strategic and sustainable transportation schemes.	No change required.

			<p>reluctance to use the huge amount of investment in cycle lanes and paths and thus render themselves to the real dangers of interfacing with motorised transport.</p> <p>Secondly there is hardly a mention of Rail in the document although plans are believed to exist for a new station at Gileston on the VoG line, for example. Moreover, there is no original thinking about reinstatement of lines as part of the sustainable transport policy.....in England Exeter to Oakhampton has already happened, just last month and the Borders line in Scotland some years ago. Sully to Penarth where most of the trackbed still exists gets no mention despite the aspirations of housing growth.</p>	<p>Notwithstanding this, the RR concludes that while the policies are functioning effectively, as set out in Appendix 5, revision is required to take account of completed transport schemes, proposed transport schemes in the Metro and to meet the objectives of the National Transport Strategy. Amendments need to consider active travel and reflect transport priorities consistent with the national sustainable transport hierarchy which prioritises walking, cycling and public transport ahead of private motor vehicles. It is considered the issues raised would form part of this review.</p>	
		Q5	<p>No - There has to be a growing awareness of plans in Cardiff, Rhondda Cynon Taf and Bridgend and how their respective RDLPs will impact the Vale.</p>	<p>Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
		Further comments	<p>Specifically, I want to take the opportunity this Consultation provides to counter the current Proposal re New Housing et al at Upper Cosmeston Farm, Lavernock under Planning Application 2020/01170/OUT.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.This development is not in line with the current or Replacement LDP 2.It permanently replaces 60 acres of countryside with houses and roads; how does this accord with the direct replacement requirement plus 10% embodied within the Environment Act 3.This development will destroy a huge swathe of wildlife and their habitat and prevent the quiet enjoyment of green 	<p>The comments relate to an extant planning application that is currently under consideration by the Council and do not relate to the current consultation. The issues raised will be considered through the planning application process.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

			<p>space of the existing population of Penarth and the wider Vale area a feature, clearly seen as vital to Mental Health over recent years</p> <p>4.The Transport Infrastructure based upon the existing B4267 road and connecting roads is already under strain and would be inadequate to support further Personal Transport use.</p> <p>5. The traffic levels and congestion resulting from this development will compromise existing users of the road[s] during the hours of 0700 to 0900, 1415 to 1545[Schools exit period] and 1615 to 1830hrs</p> <p>6.The pollution levels for the duration of the Replacement Development Plan to 2036 will increase CO2 emissions contrary to the agreements at November 2021 COP26 summit</p> <p>5.Provision of cycle lanes is not an antidote to the transport requirements of the vast majority of people.</p> <p>6. The area is prone to flooding and removal of natural soil and field/woodland with replacement by concrete and tarmac will merely exacerbate this.</p>		
			<p>These comments are intended to be constructive and seek to challenge the direction of the RDLP and underline the need to take a more objective view of such developments in the quest to replace valuable natural resources with ever more dwellings and the damage to the fragile environment we have in the Vale.</p>		
23	ID No: 675	Q1	<p>Don't know - I find the whole document impossible to understand.</p>	<p>Comments noted. As identified in the Draft DA, at key stages of the RLDP process, the Council will prepare Easy Read versions of documents to help people engage in the process.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that the Executive Summary outlines the</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

				purpose of the document, and the recommendations are set out in the conclusion and next steps sections.	
		Q2	Don't know - I find the whole document impossible to understand.	See response to Question 1 above.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - Whilst the council is happy to list its successes I feel the public would consider the current planning and development situation in Barry to be a complete failure, particularly with transport infrastructure and a general feeling of "flats everywhere".	The existing LDP strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q4	Don't know - I find the whole document impossible to understand.	See response to Question 1 above.	No change required.
		Q5	Yes – No specific comments made.	None.	No change required.
		Further comments	<p>I find the whole document impossible to understand.</p> <p>I have submitted a response to the LDP consultation however I would like to ask how I'm supposed to understand any of the 92 pages and indeed how anybody else is supposed to understand it? It was recently mentioned in a council meeting that consultations are not performing as best as they could and that responses are quite low. What are you doing to tackle this problem?</p> <p>How can we give an informed response if we don't understand all the corporate layout?</p>	See response to Question 1 above.	No change required.
24	ID No: 676	Q1	Don't know – No specific comments made.	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan. It also examines the performance of the LDP in respect of how the policies have delivered the Plan's vision, aims and strategy taking into account the findings of the three AMRs undertaken by the Council since the adoption of the Plan.	No change required.

		Q2	Don't know – No specific comments made.	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q3	Don't Know – No specific comments made.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q4	Yes - The commentary states that the Vale of Glamorgan is required through the LDP process to meet the apportionment set out in the Second Review of the RTS which equates to 16.806MT of crushed rock over 25 years. It is suggested that the authority currently has 18.730MT of existing land banks of permitted reserves for crushed rock meaning there is sufficient existing quantitative provision to meet the identified apportionment. However, it is important to reflect that the figures used in the RTS have a baseline of 2016 and may need to be reviewed to reflect both the amount of mineral worked since 2016 and the revised aspirations of the plan, particularly if the revised LDP contains new allocations. How the authority has concluded that the landbank is currently 18.730mt is not clear on the basis of the information provided by the Draft Review Report. The Company believes that this figure should be reviewed as part of any Review on the basis of its practicality of being realised within the draft Revised Plan period and the extent to which this figure relates to aggregates rather than industrial minerals.	The RLDP will be supported and informed by a robust and focussed evidence base prepared to consider the core issues that will be addressed by the Plan. The provision and availability of minerals within the Vale of Glamorgan will be considered in a Minerals Background paper which will be informed by the most up-to-date and relevant information available at the time of its preparation.	No change required.
		Q5	No – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will	No change required.

				adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	
		Further comments	No specific comments made.	None.	No change required.
25	ID No: 30	Q1	██████████ reviewed the LDP draft Review Report and	The comments of this organisation are noted. The Eagleswell School site was designated to meet housing need in LDP Policy MG2 (23) and was considered through the examination process. The requirements for additional housing and other infrastructure within Llantwit Major and throughout the Vale of Glamorgan will be considered through the RLDP process and supported and evidenced by a range of background documents and specialist evidence. Prospective development sites for a range of uses can be promoted through the Candidate Site process which will take place during Summer 2022 as set out in the Draft Delivery Agreement. Prospective development sites can be promoted through this process for a range of uses and will be considered by the Council against the Candidate Site Assessment methodology.	No change required.
		Q2	Draft Delivery Agreement and wished the following		
		Q3	comments to be noted:		
		Q4	1. Former Eagleswell School Site, Boverton, Llantwit Major		
		Q5	██████████ wish that the LDP Housing Allocation for this site (72 proposed dwellings under Policy MG2) be redesignated as a health and social care facility for the town.		
		Further comments	██████████ note the increasing ageing population within the town and state that this, is the only site within Llantwit Major that is identifiable for this purpose. ██████████ would request that this site is redesignated as a Heath Centre, an Old Peoples home and include a limited number of houses for the elderly. It should be noted at present there is not an Old Peoples Home within Llantwit Major for our residents. All the other main Vale Towns Barry, Cowbridge and Penarth have such a facility. ██████████ recognise the need for housing within the area however feel that the alterative areas of proposed development noted on the LDP for the outskirts of Llantwit Major would fulfil this requirement. 2. With all the new housing developments that have been built in the town (as part of the LDP) and the proposed developments plans up to 2026 ██████████ have concerns that the present infrastructure of the town is potentially inadequate to deal with the current and planned potential growth. Particular areas for consideration include: -		

			<p>a) Education</p> <p>b) Health Care</p> <p>c) Waste Management – increase to demand with proposed new developments. What impact will this have on the existing facility and is this adequate to manage the increase wastewater requirements?</p> <p>d) Damage to the environment</p> <p>e) Travel – limited public transport services from Llantwit Major (i.e. Still only hourly trains to Cardiff Central Station)</p>		
26	ID No: 31	Q1	<p>No - Omits Wales' Ecological Footprint- Scenarios to 2020, which in the conclusion states that;</p> <p>-'where possible the potential for footprint reductions should be quantified and presented as part of the business case for implementing a policy',</p> <p>And</p> <p>'A broad understanding amongst the Welsh population of what they are working towards in footprint terms and why this is important'.</p>	<p>The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan. The Wales' Ecological Footprint- Scenarios to 2020 is considered to be background evidence to primary Welsh Government policy. As such while having some relevance it does not warrant reference in the RR as its conclusions and recommendations are appropriately addressed and covered by the primary legislation/policy detailed in section 3 of the RR.</p>	No change required.
		Q2	<p>No - There is no objective methodology provided within the plan for benchmarking or evaluating the impacts of policy proposals or individual actions</p> <p>See;</p> <p>https://www.google.com/url?q=https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/36943&sa=U&ved=2ahUKEwjBmv_6ytL0AhViolwKHfiqBhkQFnoECAkQAg&usg=AOvVaw0NnHJKGgwsSI-zBJTCnkUo</p> <p>https://scattercities.com/</p> <p>https://climate.leeds.ac.uk/why-we-built-a-place-based-carbon-calculator/</p> <p>https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2021/dec/03/carbon-cutting-app-aims-help-londoners-ease-net-zero-future</p>	<p>The existing LDP vision and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. As with the adopted LDP, the RLDP will be required to include a monitoring framework that considers the effectiveness of the RLDP against indicators, targets and trigger points.</p>	No change required.

			https://lifestyletest.sitra.fi/		
		Q3	Yes - The Vale Council has now declared a climate emergency and must address that in its Local Development Plan and Place Planning. Existing Planning Policy does not adequately address issues identified in objective methodologies such as the Code for Sustainable Homes. Neither do the Building Regulations. The present system is consistently failing to provide the required numbers of Affordable Homes in Penarth.	<p>The comments of this organisation are noted. The review report includes sections on the Climate and Nature Emergency Declarations. The RLDP will be prepared in line with national planning policy. The RLDP will be subject to an independent examination to determine whether it complies with this guidance and is sound. The issues raised by this organisation will be considered in the preparation of the RLDP.</p> <p>The existing LDP strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.</p>	No change required.
		Q4	Yes - The legislation regarding affordability and the viability of development sites for housing is not being observed. A site value should be determined after including the construction cost and LA obligations. The right to examine and question these viability appraisals should be extended to Town and Community Councillors. The Vale of Glamorgan has consistently failed to collect Section 106 Affordable Homes contributions for large developments in Penarth during the last 5 years.	Comments noted. WG guidance on RLDPs now requires that candidate sites are supported by appropriate evidence that demonstrates that a site is in a sustainable location, free from constraints, is capable of being delivered and is financially viable.	No change required.
		Q5	No - A regional response to the Climate Change Emergency and the impact of policies is more appropriate, including transport in particular.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.

		Further comments	No further comments.	None.	No change required.
27	ID No: 108	Q1	Thank you for including [REDACTED] in the consultation process for the new interim Local Development plan. We have had time to read through the content and have made some comments below which we would be more than happy to meet with you to discuss and would respectfully request that these are taken into consideration for inclusion in the amended local development plan.	The comments from this organisation in respect of Secured by Design and Development Quality Requirements are noted. This information will be reflected in the content of the RLDP as it progresses and further consultation with this organisation will be undertaken as set out in the draft DA to ensure that the RLDP continues to reflect current guidance and best practice. The specific issues raised will be considered through the planning application process.	No change required.
		Q2			
		Q3			
		Q4			
		Q5			
		Further comments	<p>1. There is no mention of crime and disorder or our statutory obligation under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. In respect of Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act [REDACTED] must consider it.</p> <p>The plan also refers to affordable housing. However, there does not seem to be any reference to 'Secured by Design' a Secured by Design Gold award is a requirement by Welsh Government for grant funded social housing projects under their Development Quality Requirements (DQR). Crime and the fear of crime is a concern for communities. By building homes to Secured by Design standards research suggests crime can be reduced by up to 80%</p> <p>Welsh Government's Technical Advice note 12 also states:</p> <p>"5.17.3 The Safer Places³¹ and Secured by Design Initiative³² provide recognised standards that have been shown to reduce crime (particularly residential burglary) and the impact of crime upon neighbourhoods. It is desirable for the security of all housing developments, public buildings, and all buildings funded by public bodies, to achieve similar measurable standards."</p> <p>[REDACTED] would ask for the above to be reflected on in the document and for Secured by Design standards and principles to be considered for all developments.</p>		

			<p>2. All new schools built in Wales should also meet Secured by Design standards and this is not reflected in this document.</p> <p>3. All planning applications that fall with the criteria for 'Public Accessible Places' should be referred to South Wales Police 'Designing Out Crime officer' at the 'concept stage' or pre application stage to work with Counter Terrorism Security Advisers to advise on reduction of vulnerability to terrorism and in line with the new legislation.</p> <p>If you would like to meet to discuss the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>		
28	ID No: 390	Q1	<p>Thank you for consulting us on these documents, we are responding as a regular consultee and in our remit as advised by Welsh Government/Cadw concerning the Historic Environment and the archaeological resource.</p> <p>As we have noted previously in our responses concerning the historic environment in the Vale of Glamorgan, this is an important part of the Council's area, and includes statutorily designated historic assets of both areas and structures, as well as non-designated historic assets. The range of these includes the Llancaiach Registered Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest, and part of the Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows Registered Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest; the Register of Parks and Gardens, which will become statutory in early 2022; as well as the physical remains of archaeological sites, both buried and upstanding, and isolated finds of all periods, all of which contribute to the distinctive heritage and current form of the area. The greater part of these are not statutorily protected, and are recorded in the Historic Environment Record to which your authority contributes. These should not be seen as any constraint to development but viewed with the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act, contribute substantially to the well-being goals relating to culture and</p>	<p>The comments and the advisory information in respect of updated legislative changes in respect of the historic environment are welcomed. This information will be reflected in the content of the RLDP as it progresses and further consultation will be undertaken as set out in the draft DA to ensure that the RLDP continues to protect the historic environment of the Vale of Glamorgan.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 3.3.12 of RR to include TAN 24 The Historic Environment as set out in Appendix C.</p>
		Q2			
		Q3			
		Q4			
		Q5			
		Further comments			

			<p>community, and by understanding and enhancement to the remaining goals.</p> <p>The Draft Delivery Agreement is helpful and the charts for the key stages allow us to be aware of upcoming consultations, and we note that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] remains on the list of consultees.</p> <p>Legislative changes have occurred since the last LDP, as noted in the Draft Review Report, and these include the Historic Environment (Wales) Act 2016, TAN24: The Historic Environment, and Planning Policy Wales Edition 11, 2021. The LDP Objective 4; To Protect and enhance the Vale of Glamorgan's historic, built and natural environment: relates to the built environment and is measured through MD8 Historic Environment and the AMR evidence indicates the policy is functioning effectively. It should also be noted that the historic environment is not limited to the built heritage, and includes buried remains, and remains surviving as low earthworks.</p> <p>If you have any questions or require further advice on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>		
29	ID No: 391	Q1	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q2	No - The vision makes no reference to it being a place to live or to work.	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - Based on the area being with the National Plan's Growth Area which is a new consideration over and above those considered during the current LDP.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. The RLDP strategy will reflect the WG objectives as set out in Future Wales The National Plan 2040.	No change required.
		Q4	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comment noted.	No change required.

		Q5	Yes – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments.	None.	No change required.
30	ID No: 130	Q1	Yes - Whilst this section reflects changes to Technical Advice Notes, it is important to remember that documents such as MTAN1 are also relevant. We would also recommend that this section refers to the Second Review of the RTS. We note a typographic error in the title "NATURAL RESOURCE WALES AREA STATEMENTS.	The section of the RR relates to contextual changes that have taken place since the plan was adopted. MTAN1 was published in 2004 and was considered in the LDP. With regard to the Second Review of the Regional Technical Statement, the implications of this document to a Plan review are considered in Section 7 of the RR. The Review of the LDP Policies and Section 7.12 outlines the Councils requirements under the RTS. The provision and availability of minerals within the Vale of Glamorgan will be considered in a Minerals Background paper which will be informed by the most relevant information available at the time of its preparation. The typographical error is noted and will be amended accordingly.	Typographical error amended.
		Q2	Yes - In general, the vision and the objectives remain relevant. It may be necessary to incorporate minor amendments to reflect changes arising from the Coronavirus pandemic.	Comments noted. The impact of the Coronavirus pandemic will be considered through the preparation of the RLDP. The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and	No change required.

			subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.		
		Q3	Yes - It is important that the LDP Strategy is reviewed to take into consideration the significant changes in policy, legislation and in society, not least arising from the impact of the Coronavirus pandemic.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q4	Yes - We note the commentary states that the Vale of Glamorgan is required, through the LDP process, to meet the apportionment set out in the Second Review of the RTS which equates to 16.806MT of crushed rock over 25 years. The narrative also indicates that the authority currently has 18.730MT of existing land banks of permitted reserves for crushed rock meaning there is sufficient existing quantitative provision to meet the identified apportionment. However, it is important to acknowledge that the figures used in the RTS have a baseline of 2016 and may need to be reviewed to reflect both the amount of mineral worked since 2016 and the revised aspirations of the plan, particularly if the revised LDP contains new built development allocations. This may have an impact upon demand, the need for additional reserves and upon the safeguarding of mineral resources. Further, there are mineral operations within the Vale of Glamorgan where the mineral reserve forms an integral part of non-aggregate/industrial mineral supply. It is imperative that the LPA engages with the respective mineral operators to ensure robust and full modern reserve assessments are properly considered in the plan to ensure that the non-aggregate/industrial mineral reserves and aggregate reserves are accounted for separately to ensure the most sustainable use of the reserve and deliver a steady and adequate supply of both aggregates and industrial minerals. These matters should be addressed in the Minerals Background Paper which should then inform the plan. We would also suggest that the large number of applications approved in both mineral safeguarding areas and within	The RLDP will be supported and informed by a robust evidence base prepared to consider the core issues that will be addressed by the Plan. The provision and availability of minerals within the Vale of Glamorgan will be considered in a Minerals Background paper which will be informed by the most relevant information available at the time of its preparation. With regard to planning applications approved by the Council within mineral safeguarding areas and/or buffer zones, all applications are considered on their own merits.	No change required.

			buffer zones may call in to question the robustness of the respective policies.		
		Q5	Yes - Whilst there will inevitably be matters which need cross boundary considerations, it would be appropriate for the plan to be reviewed individually.	Comments noted. Notwithstanding, Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments.	None.	No change required.
31	ID No: 678	Q1	<p>No - "A prosperous Wales talks about ""limits of the global environment and therefore uses resources efficiently and proportionately (including acting on climate change)""</p> <p>A resilient Wales talks about ""A nation which maintains and enhances a biodiverse natural environment with healthy functioning ecosystems""</p> <p>A healthier Wales talks about ""A society in which people's physical and mental well-being is maximised""</p> <p>I feel that any planned development on existing green wedge land within the replacement LDP contradicts the above statements especially given the increased emphasis on environmental impact and mental well-being given the on-going pandemic. Also, building on existing green belt land does nothing to promote a reduction in carbon emissions which is also a priority for the Vale of Glamorgan."</p>	<p>The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan. Section 3.2 of the RR refers to the Well Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 the implications of which are incorporated into PPW. The RLDP will be prepared in accordance with the requirements of PPW.</p> <p>The existing Green Wedge designations in the adopted LDP will be reviewed as a part of the RLDP process.</p>	No change required.
		Q2	No - I think there is a much greater emphasis on taking action to reduce impact on climate change, promoting green space to improve mental health and taking action to reduce carbon emissions than there was in the previous LDP.	The existing LDP Vision and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process. In accordance with WG guidance, the Vision and objectives of the RLDP should be unique to local circumstances and be informed by council strategies, well-being objectives and plans and respond to key issues.	No change required.

		<p>Q3</p>	<p>Yes - "I say 'Yes' because although the LDP strategy seems to read OK, the goals and objectives which sit alongside the strategy seem to contradict what is being said in the strategy statement. For example, how does green land ear marked for development in the revised LDP support, for example: Objective 2: To ensure that development within the Vale of Glamorgan makes a positive contribution towards reducing the impact of and mitigating the adverse effects of climate change?"</p>	<p>The comments made relate to the adopted LDP the content of which was considered through examination by an independent planning inspector and found to be sound. The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
		<p>Q4</p>	<p>Don't know - "On the whole the policy statements seem to read OK, but my concern is that some of the data being used is now quite old and probably not representative of today's society and needs. Is the Council confident they have got the figures correct and therefore not overstating or understating actual needs? e.g. 7.2.2. The housing requirement set out in the current LDP is 9,460 dwellings (Policy SP3 refers) over the Plan period 2011-2026. This figure was primarily informed by the 2011-based 10-year migration variant Welsh Government household projections which projected a rise in households of 13.3% over the Plan period."</p>	<p>Section 7 of the RR provides a review of the LDP Policies. It gives an overview of whether a policy or allocation is functioning effectively, whether any amendments are likely to be needed and whether any policies should be removed or amalgamated as part of the review process. While many of the adopted LDP policies are performing well the RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is appropriate to reflect contextual changes that have occurred since its adoption and recommends that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. The RLDP will be informed and supported by new background evidence on a range of topics prepared as a part of the RLDP process including population and household projections.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
		<p>Q5</p>	<p>Yes - I agree because every county is different</p>	<p>Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

				relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	
		Further comments	The main concern I have with the replacement LDP is that there has recently been a massive shift toward minimising environmental impact, promoting green space and taking action to reduce the carbon footprint within the Vale of Glamorgan. Although the Vale Council seem to recognise this within the strategy & policy statements of the updated LDP, I am concerned that some of the planned actions, particularly around housing development, do not align themselves to these revised strategy & policy statements.	<p>The RR and the DA are the initial stages in the RLDP process and do not include any policy direction.</p> <p>The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan and concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is undertaken and that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.</p> <p>The Council has declared Climate Change and Nature Emergencies which will be considered through the RLDP process.</p>	No change required.
32	ID No: 39	Q1	Vale of Glamorgan Replacement Local Development Plan (RLDP) 2011 – 2026: [REDACTED] feedback	<p>While this organisation's comments refer to a section of the Draft RR, the matters raised do not directly relate to the consultation documents but relate to meetings and discussions that have taken place regarding the established gypsy and traveller site in Llangan. These matters are more appropriately consider by the Council's Housing Department.</p> <p>Site provision for the Gypsy and Traveller community will be considered through the RLDP and candidate site processes. Gypsy and traveller site allocations will be based on the outcome of the latest Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment.</p>	No change required.
		Q2	[REDACTED]		
		Q3	[REDACTED]		
		Q4	[REDACTED] feedback on the proposed		
		Q5	RLDP is focussed upon the following section of the document and the resolution of the relocating of the gypsy traveller site for Mr W Carroll and his family in accordance with the previous agreement reached between Mr Carroll, [REDACTED] and the Vale of Glamorgan Council (VOGC).		
		Further comments	<p>7.3. GYPSY AND TRAVELLER ACCOMMODATION- POLICIES MG5, MD18</p> <p>7.3.3. The granting of planning approvals for 9 private pitches on 5 sites throughout the Vale of Glamorgan (including a temporary site and a renewal of previous planning approval) indicate that the criteria-based policy</p>		

MD18 is functioning well and enables private sites to be developed.

7.3.4. In terms of transit site provision, there is a consensus amongst the south-east Wales local authorities that transit sites would best be considered and provided on a regional basis. In this regard a regional working group has been established to investigate the regional transit need for gypsy and travellers and to identify possible sites and this information will feed into the RLDP review process.

█ comments regarding the Gypsy Traveller site near Llangan and the new privately owned site close by in St. Mary Hill

█, Llangan Action and the current occupant of the site have been working closely with senior officers and councillors of the VOGC for a number of years, notably Marcus Goldsworthy, VOGC Head of Regeneration and Planning, Cllr Christine Cave and Cllr John Bird, all of whom were very supportive of the new private site application.

A meeting was held on the 12th June 2017 between the VOGC, █, Llangan Action (local action group) and the current site occupant Mr Carroll. Attendees included: Marcus Goldsworthy, John Thomas, Jonathan Bird, Christine Cave, Andrew R T Davies, Jenna Malvisi, plus members from █, Llangan Action and Mr Carroll. A follow-up meeting was held on the 14th July 2017. Minutes of the meetings are available on request.

During the meetings, a number of options were discussed with the aim to have a single-family site in the local area and to transfer the original site control to █.

Mr Carroll confirmed after the meeting in June 2017 that he and his family would like to move to his land in St Mary Hill and vacate the Llangan site, and subsequently the planning application for Mr Carroll's land in St Mary Hill has been amended to accommodate his family.

██████████ made an application to transfer the control of Mr Carroll's current site east of Llangan village to the VOGC in 2018. ██████████ are now waiting for the VOGC to finalise all Gypsy Traveller sites in the Vale of Glamorgan, at which point the land at Llangan can be transferred to ██████████ and removed from the RLDP as agreed with the VOGC.

Land transfer application summary

The application relates to the transfer by way of legal interest (either by way of a lease or freehold transfer) of the land east of Llangan Village for the purpose of providing Community Amenity land. Discussion with VOGC has centred on allotments but a survey of residents has shown there to be equal interest in using part of the land for green space, community woodlands, nature reserves, play areas and exercise, to be based on the local need and funding available.

Locally we have close links between Llangan School, Llangan Action and the Old Schoolroom Management Committee which has recently purchased a marquee for outside events. These currently take place on borrowed farmland but the site, if acquired, would form a much better venue for them. It is envisaged that these groups, focussed by ██████████, will take forward the development of the area to reflect the needs of all ages and conditions of residents.

██████████ secured funding to develop an allotment site in Treoes which was opened circa 2012. The site is owned by ██████████ and funding was sought through various programmes to provide allotments to the residents within Treoes. This is managed under a lease with the Allotments Association, with an elected committee. Residents of Llangan and Fferm Goch are under provided for in terms of community land for this purpose and this proposal is to acquire land to develop for the benefit of those residents.

██████████ are currently unable to respond to the requests from residents for the provision of allotments, open spaces, parks, orchards, play areas, sports facilities especially close to the village of Llangan.

Conclusion

Since the meetings in 2017 and 2018 the land transfer application has been on hold, with the pandemic, in part, contributing to the delays. Mr Carroll and his family have continued to develop the St. Mary Hill site as their future family home but have also stayed on the old site. They are, however, now in a position to move to the St, Mary Hill site, as and when this is agreed by the VOGC. If the VOGC feel that good progress has been made with the remaining gypsy traveller site allocation in the Vale of Glamorgan, then ██████████ would like to ask for the land transfer to be progressed and the original site near Llangan to be removed from the RLDP during this review stage as agreed with the VOG team at the meetings held in 2018. If this is not possible due to the delays caused by the pandemic, ██████████ would like to ask if the Llangan wider site (open field area) could be removed from the RLDP, retaining only the part that Mr Carroll's family still occupy. This would give reassurance to Mr

			Carroll's family and the local community, that over time the entire site would be transferred to [REDACTED] for community projects and Mr Carroll's family would then occupy their new private site nearby.		
33	ID No: 679	Q1	<p>No - "The LDP report is factually incorrect in stating that outline planning permission has been granted for the proposed development at Model Farm. This permission was quashed after a Judicial Review, This information should be available in the report. The lack of information gives a false impression that such developments are needed and are wanted by the community.</p> <p>Consultation arrangements seem to favour the applicants in large scale developments with the V O G Planning Dept. Decisions are taken at pre - meetings ,before the public planning committee meetings</p> <p>One of the objectives of the V O G Local Wellbeing Plan is ""To enable people to get involved, participate in their local communities and shape local service. "" and "" To protect, enhance and value our environment "" These are fine words , but sadly they are not being put into action by the council.</p> <p>The V O G Corporate Plan sets out 4 well being objectives,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> # To work with and for our communities. # To support learning, employment and sustainable growth. # to support people at home and in their community # To respect and enhance and enjoy our environment. <p>For these objectives, the council is setting out actions which are to include aspects relevant to land use planning to influence and direct the focus of the Replacement LDP.</p> <p>With regard to the Model Farm development, how can the VOG support such a scheme when it goes against their own declaration ""To place biodiversity alongside climate change at the heart of decision making in the VOG and to continue to work with partners across the county, region and nationally to protect Wales' biodiversity ""</p>	<p>The comments in respect of Model Farm are noted. However, in this regard, the formal quashing on the Model Farm decision was not made until 4th October 2021 when the Court Order by HHJ Jarman QC, confirmed the application for permission for judicial review was granted. Until this point, the outcome was not determined. Therefore, at the time the RR was considered by Cabinet (27th September 2021) it was up to date, and it was this version that was approved for the purpose of the current public consultation. The RR will therefore be updated to reflect the changes that have taken place since it was approved by Cabinet for public consultation.</p> <p>The Model Farm strategic employment allocation was included in the adopted LDP and found to be sound by an Independent Planning Inspector. Any other issues associated with the allocation would have been considered at this time.</p> <p>The specific comments made in respect of Model Farm relate to a planning application that is currently under consideration by the Council and are not relevant to the current consultation and will be addressed through the planning application process.</p>	Amend references to Model Farm in RR as detailed in Appendix C to reflect current position.

			<p>The same council is prepared to subsidise the developer who wants to destroy 100 acres of productive farmland, destroying wildlife habitat and causing potential gridlock on the roads near Weycock Cross, Barry by not making them pay £ 3.7 million contribution towards SPG for sustainable travel plans. This is utter hypocrisy ! The current arrangements, as seen in this case, require additional detail to prevent Planning officers deciding whether to enact Supplementary Planning Guidance independant of Planning Committee approval.</p> <p>The VOG council needs to take notice of its own Environment Officers reports if it is going to achieve the goals set out in its Biodiversity Forward Plan (2019) to ""seek to maintain and enhance biodiversity in the proper exercise of their functions and in doing so promote the resilience of ecosystems "" ."</p>		
		Q2	<p>No – "The Council has stated that since the adoption of the VOG LDP there have been many changes, Covid pandemic; Climate crisis; WBP and changes to national legislative and policy framework. These points should lead the council towards ensuring locally sourced food, grown in a sustainable environment, with low food miles and an even lower carbon footprint."</p>	<p>The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. The Council has declared Climate Change and Nature Emergencies which will be considered through the RLDP process.</p>	No change required.
		Q3	<p>Yes - Too much emphasis has been placed on Cardiff Airport as a key driver for economic recovery in the Vale. It is no longer a financially viable business and requires substantial public subsidy to keep it alive. There is no proven need for extra development of B1, B2, or B8 units near this failing airport. More emphasis needs to be given to promoting sites which already exist, but are still unused, such as Junction 34 M4 Hensol or St Athan. The report incorrectly states that the Model Farm site has been approved and 2000 jobs created, when in reality it has been quashed. This is very misleading and gives the impression that there is a need in this area. The roads near the airport</p>	<p>The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.</p> <p>The role and function of Cardiff Airport will be considered through the RLDP process and will reflect the objectives of national planning policy. The employment allocations of the adopted LDP will be reviewed as a part of the RLDP process.</p>	No change required.

			are already gridlocked at peak times and further work is needed in these areas to alleviate this problem.		
		Q4	Don't know – No specific comments made.	Section 7 of the RR provides a review of the LDP Policies. It gives an overview of whether a policy or allocation is functioning effectively, whether any amendments are likely to be needed and whether any policies should be removed or amalgamated as part of the review process. While many of the adopted LDP policies are performing well the RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is appropriate to reflect contextual changes that have occurred since its adoption and recommends that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.	No change required.
		Q5	Yes – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments.	None.	No change required.
34	ID No: 101	Q1	Don't know – No specific comments made.	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan and recommends that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.	No change required.
		Q2	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes – See notes below.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and	No change required.

			subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.		
		Q4	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comment noted.	No change required.
		Q5	No - [REDACTED] see benefits in a joint review with Cardiff County Council/.	<p>Section 9.2 of the RR considers joint LDPs and joint working. It is considered that the preparation of a joint plan with neighbouring authorities is not appropriate due to the lack of synergy on key aspects of plan preparation. Each authority has unique factors to consider within their own plan that would not benefit from a joint approach.</p> <p>Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.</p>	No change required.
		Further comments	<p>" [REDACTED] Vale of Glamorgan LDP Draft Delivery Agreement.</p> <p>Population and employment changes</p> <p>There are, and will be, significant unknown issues around the effects of Covid with some speculation around that, post Covid, there will be a growing demand for working at home opportunities.</p> <p>The council are still examining the 2021 census returns and the resulting statistics. The council state that they are not yet able to understand the impact that both an ageing population and contextual changes in population and employment will have leaving "an inherent uncertainty" in forward planning.</p>	<p>The RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is appropriate and recommends that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.</p> <p>Issues such as the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, climate change, population, employment, flooding, and the environment, will be considered through the RLDP process in line with national policy and supported by background evidence.</p> <p>The comments in respect of community engagement and consultation are noted</p>	No change required.

The employment 'pull' of Cardiff as an employment hub is and will remain a significant demand in South East Wales with the resulting generation of widescale commuting across the county. This would suggest that there will be opportunities to seek other employment development venues within the Vale area where employment can be developed to divert the demand on commuting to Cardiff. The need to establish and improve both existing and new transport links across the whole of the Vale / Cardiff area is paramount which in turn will have a direct demand on housing need and development, not only on convenient windfall sites, but to create opportunities related to this demand on existing brownfield sites and or existing redundant buildings to supply this demand.

Environment

A headline on Wales On-Line on 5th November 2021 stated that 'Huge areas of Cardiff, Barry and Newport would be left submerged by 2050' based on current climate change trends as would parts of the M4, an essential transport link for all of South Wales. While this is exaggerated journalism with the need for a headline, nevertheless it is clear that climate change will raise projected flood risk levels to areas close to the coast and significant rivers within the Vale which can expect to be subject to flooding above the current projections.

The vision of the LDP lists four objectives, of which Objective 4 is 'To protect, enhance and value our environment'. [REDACTED] considers that this objective is vital and should over-ride many other objectives in the Plan. There are a number of Welsh Government directives that are relevant to Climate Change, including Prosperity for All: Low Carbon Wales (March 2019), Building Better Places: The Planning System for Delivering Resilient

however the Council considers that the consultation methods set out in the draft DA (CIS) are appropriate for the RLDP process.

			<p>and Brighter Futures (July 2020) and The National Strategy for Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management in Wales. And yet The Vale of Glamorgan Corporate Plan 2020-2025 simply states that one of the outcomes is to 'respect, enhance and enjoy our environment'.</p> <p>The Vale Council has issued both a Climate Emergency and a Nature Emergency policy. The RLDP must fully reflect that.</p> <p>Consultation and Community Engagement</p> <p>It is understood that community engagement as a part of the consultation process is under severe restrictions as a result of the Covid virus. However, [REDACTED] feel that it is vital to make opportunities for appropriate spaces of sufficient size (within current Covid advice and restrictions) to be found across the county to hold larger public meetings to provide a better opportunity to discuss wider issues and cover some of the more complex issues. It is felt that 'drop in' sessions will be too limited in scope and not particularly effective.</p> <p>Online meetings can be useful provided that they are well planned and delivered. They offer the opportunity for officers of the Council to reach a wide audience and provide both overview and topic and/or locality specific information to various interested parties eg here in Penarth - to members of the Town Council, ourselves [REDACTED] and various other groups thereby promoting sharing of views and meaningful debate.</p> <p>"</p>		
35	ID No: 681	Q1	No - Llantwit Major and surrounding areas, cannot cope this the increase in the population. The GP, dentists and school are full. Drugs are now openly sold on the estates.	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan and concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is appropriate	No change required.

				and recommends that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. The infrastructure requirements of settlements will be considered as an integral part of the RLDP process.	
		Q2	Don't know – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes – No specific comments made.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q4	Don't know – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q5	Yes – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	The delivery of affordable housing must be undertaken with improvements in all the infrastructure, trains, buses, doctors, schools, dentist. Money would be far better spent improving Bridgend and Barry town centres.	Affordable housing provision and infrastructure requirements will be considered through the RLDP process.	No change required.
36	ID No: 682	Q1	No – No specific comments made.	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan. It recommends that a Replacement LDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.	No change required.
		Q2	No – No specific comments made.	The existing LDP Vision and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.

		Q3	Yes – No specific comments made.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q4	No – No specific comments made.	Comment noted. Section 7 of the RR provides a review of the LDP Policies. It gives an overview of whether a policy or allocation is functioning effectively, whether any amendments are likely to be needed and whether any policies should be removed or amalgamated as part of the review process. While many of the adopted LDP policies are performing well the RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is appropriate to reflect contextual changes that have occurred since its adoption and recommends that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.	No change required.
		Q5	Don't know – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	<p>"Looking at the Welsh Governments planning application to the Vale of Glamorgan Council for the development of housing on land at Upper/Lower Cosmeston farm I wish to make the following comments:-</p> <p>The development is not in accordance with the Local Development Plan. The planning application site does not conform to the Candidate Site listed in the LDP, with the</p>	The comments made relate to a planning application and are not related to the current consultation. The issues raised would be considered through the planning application process.	No change required.

application site advancing greatly into the Green Wedge supposedly set to prevent coalescence between Penarth and Sully.

The Candidate Site information does not concur with the reports listed in the Planning Application.

It will damage the Green Wedge between Penarth and Sully which currently has a rural setting.

Permanently replace 60 acres of countryside with houses and roads.

Compromise the peace and tranquility of our coastal path

Destroy wildlife and their habitats in contravention of current Welsh Government and Vale Council policies.

The Candidate Site and Planning Application reports totally dismisses the historic nature and archaeology of the site which recently has seen the old farmhouse granted listed building status by CADW who also believe that recent important archaeological finds require further investigations.

Add thousands of extra cars onto surrounding roads every day that currently cannot cope with current traffic flow.

It will create further delays during rush hour resulting in an increase in CO2 emissions

Increase flood risk on Lavernock Road which was badly flooded on the 23rd December 2020. Coastal Erosion and flooding are underestimated.

Overwhelm existing local medical services which are already full and will be worse with the closure of the Albert Road Penarth surgery

Overlook Cosmeston Lakes Country Park, turning it into an urban park'

Be close to the European Severn Estuary Marine Site of Special Scientific Interest and the Severn Estuary RAMSAR site and could damage them.

The site is affected by contaminated land from an historic Council landfill site, containing chemicals and compounds such as Arsenic, Cancer causing Hydrocarbons and capped

			with Asbestos containing materials, making it unsuitable for development. The site is subject to increasing occurrences of severe coastal erosion."		
37	ID No: 683	Q1	No – No specific comments made.	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan. It recommends that a Replacement LDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.	No change required.
		Q2	No - "Housing Policies Should be reviewed inline of Covid Pandemic and social norms and changes evolved."	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. Section 4.2.13 of the RR identifies the impact that the Covid - 19 pandemic has had on a range of topic areas including housing. The RR identifies that the role of the planning system to aid recovery will be considered in the RLDP. PPW also highlights how the planning system can respond to the Covid-19 pandemic recovery.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - "Housing Policies Should be reviewed inline of Covid Pandemic and social norms and changes evolved. Windfall, Affordable and Environmental sustainable housing should be encouraged in minor rural vale settlements as opposed to Large National home developers and their schemes. "	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. Specific comments in respect of housing addressed above.	No change required.
		Q4	No - "Housing Policies Should be reviewed inline of Covid Pandemic and changes evolved. Policy SP7 and MG16 Transport Infrastructure non existence in Colwinstone in the rural Vale and detrimental to VoGC Transport Plan 2015-30 also."	Section 7 of the RR provides an overview of whether a policy or allocation is functioning effectively, whether any amendments are likely to be needed and whether any policies should be removed or amalgamated as part of the review process. While many of the adopted LDP policies are performing well the RR concludes that a full review of the	No change required.

				adopted LDP is appropriate to reflect contextual changes that have occurred since its adoption and recommends that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. Specific comments in respect of housing addressed above.	
		Q5	Yes – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments.	None.	No change required.
38	ID No: 700	Q1	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q2	No - Affordable Housing Provision - 40% in Darren Farm Cowbridge is sufficient - no more green fields to be used.	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. The issue of housing provision including affordable housing and environmental protection will be considered through the RLDP process and supported by robust evidence. The provision of affordable housing at Darren Farm is in accordance with the adopted LDP.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes – No specific comments made.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q4	No - Affordable housing.	Section 6.3.25 of the RR provides a review of affordable housing delivery within the Vale of Glamorgan since the Plan was	No change required.

				<p>adopted. The RR identifies that the Council has generally been successful in securing the required affordable housing percentages in accordance with the policies of the adopted plan. It concludes that the RLDP will need to ensure the most appropriate policy approach is taken by the Council to maximise affordable housing delivery in light of the most recent evidence of affordable housing need including older persons accommodation. Affordable housing provision in the RLDP will be considered in accordance with national planning policy and objectives as set out in PPW and local need as evidenced in the Local Housing Market Assessment.</p>	
		Q5	Yes – No specific comments made.	<p>Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.</p>	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments.	None.	No change required.
39	ID No: 699	Q1	No - There is no mention of the decommissioned Aberthaw Power Station site, future impact on the local area and SSS@s.	<p>The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan. It recommends that a Replacement LDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.</p>	No change required.

				The issue of the decommissioned power station at Aberthaw and any associated land will be considered through the RLDP process.	
		Q2	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - Answer is the same as section 20 above. This is a major brownfield site and should be included.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q4	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q5	Yes - As a community we do not vote for or have any influence on other local authorities. Adjoining authorities strategies may be taken in to consideration but the LDP should be undertaken individually.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments.	None.	No change required.
40	ID No: 697	Q1	No - "The draft LDP goes completely against the current legislation on environmental protection - strongly proclaimed and endorsed by both the Vale of Glamorgan Council and Welsh Assembly Government. There are numerous brownfield sites available for proposed and potential development (as deemed necessary)"	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan. It recommends that a Replacement LDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. The RR and the DA are the initial stages in the RLDP process and do not include any policies. Environmental protection and the provision of development sites will be considered through the RLDP process.	No change required.
		Q2	No - "The draft LDP goes completely against the current legislation on environmental protection - strongly proclaimed	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP	No change required.

		and endorsed by both the Vale of Glamorgan Council and Welsh Assembly Government. There are numerous brownfield sites available for proposed and potential development (as deemed necessary)"	process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. See above.	
	Q3	Yes - "The draft LDP goes completely against the current legislation on environmental protection - strongly proclaimed and endorsed by both the Vale of Glamorgan Council and Welsh Assembly Government. There are numerous brownfield sites available for proposed and potential development (as deemed necessary)"	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. See above.	No change required.
	Q4	No - "The draft LDP goes completely against the current legislation on environmental protection - strongly proclaimed and endorsed by both the Vale of Glamorgan Council and Welsh Assembly Government. There are numerous brownfield sites available for proposed and potential development (as deemed necessary)"	The RR examines the performance of the LDP in respect of how the policies have delivered the Plan's vision, aims and strategy taking into account the findings of the three AMRs undertaken by the Council since the adoption of the Plan and recommends that a Replacement LDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. See above.	No change required.
	Q5	Yes - "The draft LDP goes completely against the current legislation on environmental protection - strongly proclaimed and endorsed by both the Vale of Glamorgan Council and Welsh Assembly Government. There are numerous brownfield sites available for proposed and potential development (as deemed necessary)"	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues. See above.	No change required.
	Further comments	"The draft LDP goes completely against the current legislation on environmental protection - strongly proclaimed and endorsed by both the Vale of Glamorgan Council and Welsh Assembly Government.	See above.	No change required.

			There are numerous brownfield sites available for proposed and potential development (as deemed necessary)"		
41	ID No: 698	Q1	No - It does not consider the environment, building on green fields, the welfare of citizens and the stress of reading, understanding documents made by paid workers skilled in the domain of their tasks such as 1. This review, 2. Lack of support and inconsideration of well-being to citizens opposing destruction of their land 3. Allowing multibillion corporations to have the power to ram road their own agenda and influence local councils and Members of Senydd, 4. Consideration of infrastructure prior to developments, 5. Locating business parks on ready to use brown field sites, 6. Allowing people's homes and livelihoods to be destroyed. All having a negative impact on well-being, environment, biodiversity, local businesses, local farming, food miles, community, people's homes.	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan. It recommends that a Replacement LDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. Issues such as the environment, biodiversity, employment, rural economy, communities, and housing will be considered through the RDLP process.	No change required.
		Q2	No – No specific comments made.	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - This needs to be more than a paper exercise with public opinion taken on board.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q4	No – No specific comments made.	The RR examines the performance of the LDP in respect of how the policies have delivered the Plan's vision, aims and strategy taking into account the findings of the three AMRs undertaken by the Council since the adoption of the Plan and recommends that a Replacement LDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.	No change required.
		Q5	No - Shared factors can be of benefit, for instance access to Bridgend business park on the edge of the Vale has much better M4 access, as does Llantrisant in RCT	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working	No change required.

				where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	
		Further comments	As above.	As above.	No change required.
42	ID No: 668	Q1	No - No it does not go far enough in the protection of greenfields and farmland before development is considered	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan. It recommends that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. Environmental issues will be considered through the RDLP process and in accordance with national planning policy.	No change required.
		Q2	No - There has not been sufficient up dating to mitigate climate change and planet emergency	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. The Council has declared Climate Change and Nature Emergencies which will be considered through the RLDP process.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - A full review to include the WG and Council environmental policies is required	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. Environmental issues will be considered through the RDLP process.	No change required.
		Q4	No - They have not been reviewed to include the effects of validate change and the protection of greenfields and farm land	The RR and the DA are the initial stages in the RLDP process and do not include any policy direction but merely provide an indication of how the adopted LDP has performed since its adoption. Environmental protection and climate change issues will be considered through the RLDP process.	No change required.

		Q5	No - The Vale of Glamorgan is a unique heritage and should make its own LDP with this in mind	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	Planning and Building appears to be of of control in the Vale. The LDP must reflect the needs of future generations and those of its residents and not the greed of large companies who are only interested in profit.	Planning applications for development are considered by the Council in accordance with local and national planning policies.	No change required.
43	ID No: 703	Q1	No - No comments on new house building causing flooding. Antique sewers not capable of coping with new capacity. Update needed as some sections are factually incorrect and have proven to be causing severe flooding problems. Stated ways to solve problems aren't working now and further development will make it worse	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan. It recommends that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. Environmental issues including flooding will be considered through the RLDP process in accordance with Welsh Government planning policy set out in PPW and TAN15.	No change required.
		Q2	No - Time has moved on and some recommendations will no longer be suitable. We need blue flag beaches for tourism and the depositing sewage into the sea at any point is not suitable	Comments noted. The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - The airport is not thriving and further cash boosts will not make it viable. Therefore any plan requiring it to be so are unsound, the business park ar model farm is not needed or wanted. The council already has empty sites it needs to use first	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. The role and function of Cardiff Airport will be considered through the RLDP process and will reflect the objectives of national	No change required.

				planning policy. The employment allocations of the adopted LDP will be reviewed as a part of the RLDP process.	
		Q4	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q5	Yes – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments.	None.	No change required.
44	ID No: 660	Q1	Once again we have been asked to put our views & wishes forward concerning this development. One wonders if this is really a democratic society when your decisions seem to go ahead whatever we, the majority think. However, there is always hope.	The comments relate to a planning application that is currently under consideration by the Council and do not relate to the current consultation. The issues raised will be considered through the planning application process.	No change required.
		Q2			
		Q3			
		Q4			
		Q5			
		Further comments	Our, that is this household [REDACTED] are against building on & around Lower Cosmeston Farm because: Drainage is an issue & more building, as proved in Sully, is going to make flooding worse especially if climate change is forecast to produce more rain. The coast line is also disappearing! These factors could be offset by planting more trees instead as worldwide summits are suggesting. Are you not heeding this advice? The atmosphere can also be helped by less housing & this less traffic. Traffic is already a nightmare through Lavernock Rd & Dinas Powys with all hosing developments in Barry. This brings up another point Brockhill, Cosmeston Drive & Upper Cosmeston Farm were all built on brown areas where works & dilapidated buildings once were.		

			<p>Another serious reason for not disturbing this area is because of toxic landfill that could mean a lot of payout in compensation later when complaints & even deaths caused from asbestos & I chemicals could occur. There could be a possibility of sinking where shafts were dug.</p> <p>It may not seem important to you but this area has alot of historical past. The area could be educational & preserved as Lower Cosmeston Farm has become listed so not enough research has been done on this or rather certain ears don't want to hear it.</p> <p>I feel that this request put out by you was not made clear enough. We are reading that more houses are built than are actually needed in Wales. So come on The Vale of Glamorgan. Ake up to what is common sense & think of the majority not yourselves.</p>		
45	ID No: 705	Q1	Don't know – No specific comments made.	The RR considers the contextual, legislative and policy changes that have taken place since the adoption of the LDP which warrant revisions to the Plan. It recommends that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.	No change required.
		Q2	Don't know – No specific comments made.	The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q3	<p>Yes - I don't agree with the 4 key elements of the adopted LDP Strategy. They do not go far enough to protect our climate and address the nature crisis. Instead, the strategy should focus on the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address the climate crisis and nature crisis; cut back development and prioritise natural sites • Accept that VoG infrastructure is inadequate for flooding, sewage treatment and car-transport, • new housing sites to be restricted to Metro linked sites and small developments within settlements for local need (the previous LDP paid no regard to Metro plans). 	Comments noted. The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.

- Investment in flood mitigation, sewage treatment and sustainable transport to focus on building resilient communities.
- Review and curtail the Airport-St Athan enterprise zone (6.3.19) accepting the uncertain future of the airport (largest decline in any UK airport 6.3.47), cut out the Model farm development and plan for potential downgrading to a local airport.
- Boost local shops and facilities in local settlements to reduce the needs for travel, including rejuvenation of the five town centres.
- No developments in the coastal strip apart from facilities that need a coastal location,
- Promote tourist opportunities and facilities, restore beaches to Blue Flag standards
- Tidal /renewable energy

In addition to the above 6.4.3 says measures to address the climate and nature emergencies will also be key matters for the Replacement LDP I agree, but see these as fundamental, not 'also' add-ons and should be re worded to reflect this. In the Climate Change Wales Regs. 2021 "emergency" means priority for climate and nature, while freezing or dropping past plans and projects and the plan in its current state does not reflect this.

Retail strategy the current retail strategy has NOT worked well; empty premises in Holton Rd have remained at ~15%. A strategy for reducing shop numbers and conversion to housing

Housing allocations: some have stalled – pretence that the big numbers at Darren Farm and Cosmeston are going ahead.

		<p>Review these stalled sites, for compliance with policies in the plan, not as 6.3.15 only review sites that have not progressed.</p> <p>Cosmeston – car-dependent, far from facilities; in the coastal zone; toxic landfill; access is vulnerable to floods; first planned to be Green Wedge; archaeological find/listed farmhouse</p> <p>Darren Farm – cut back as limited market demand; too big for sustainable development and Cowbridge to absorb</p> <p>Hayes Wood – remote from facilities; not part of a sustainable settlement; poor bus services</p> <p>Llandough Hill – land vulnerable to flooding from soakways in developments above which discharge rapidly through the permeable rock (limestone). Past permissions of soakways and discharge into Llandough stream ('drain') have to be corrected. Llandough is not a sustainable settlement – this would be a car-borne extension of Cardiff.</p> <p>Assess Sewage Treatment capacity for the purposes of new development</p> <p>Dwr Cymru assurances cannot be accepted as they are unlawfully discharging untreated sewage to rivers and the sea</p> <p>The assurances with the 2009 UV installation that they'd meet Blue-flag bathing water standards at Barry beaches has proved untrue. This is important for tourism, so must be reviewed.</p> <p>Review Sewage Treatment capacity</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

Widely known that many sewage works are discharging untreated sewage frequently, at times when weather conditions are not "exceptional" and therefore unlawfully. The VoG cannot claim not to know, as effluent from Cog Moors pollutes Barrey Island waters

summertime sampling is showing Whitmore Bay does not comply with Blue Flag standard

data disclosed by DCWW shows untreated discharge ~80 times a year, more frequently in the winter months

the UV disinfection is switched off during the winter months, so Whitmore Bay sea bacteria are likely to be many times worse than summertime.

The LDP should assess the excess flow over the treatment capacity and conclude there is no leeway for additional sewage in the system as at present. Accepting assurances from DCWW that they can take the sewage from further connections amounts to collusion with criminals who take payments for dealing with your waste then dispose of it unlawfully. It breaches the duty of care to accept assurances when you have reason to believe their disposal is (in part) unlawful.

As the Vale wants to promote tourism and leisure use of the sea, the LDP should get assurances on

use of UV disinfection at all times of the year when immersion activities take place

specify DCWW has to invest in further treatment capacity to relieve overloading of Cog Moors STW and meet the Blue

Flag standard as was intended when the UV plant was installed (2009) and now year-round when immersion sports take place.

In terms of new connections to the public sewer:

require all new developments in the Cog Moors area (the Thaw and Cadoxton catchments in the Vale) to pay towards new treatment works and delay all over a threshold (say 10 dwellings) pending commissioning of the further sewage capacity

seek that Cardiff Council freezes the Plas Dwr (Cardiff west) development until further sewage capacity is commissioned, or alternatively requires the developers to pay towards new sewage treatment plant.

Tighten spec for Attenuation Ponds

Capacity has been planned for average rainfall. run-off storage

settlement/attenuation pond to take run-off; if it discharges to Welsh Water or to private drain, it had to be covered in a S.106 Condition at this outline stage

sizing the attenuation pond to take average annual run-off causes flooding during storms' It has to have sufficient capacity for the maximum planned storms

Review the Cardiff Airport & Gateway Development Zone of 44.75 hectares of B1, B2 and B8 business park and associated car parking.

		<p>speculative growth, no 'need' demonstrated, contrary to sustainable development</p> <p>related to completely over-optimistic airport projections; put it on hold pending a clearer future for the failing airport</p> <p>now 'need' under climate emergency to cut back air transport and related development</p> <p>infrastructure capacity is wanting - roads, sewage....</p> <p>need under nature emergency to save this valuable countryside, farmed sustainably with care for nature.</p> <p>Plan for expansion of the tourism sector, giving more jobs; valuing our coast (excluding development on it), and regaining our Blue flags (correcting the deficit in sewage treatment).</p> <p>Enable use of Barry Dock for water sports (incl immersion sports) and cockle-farming by ending the routine sewer discharges into it (150 times a year)</p> <p>Create a blue-green Country Park with conservation area and history trail on RWE's Aberthaw site (east of the ash-mound, plus south alongside the coastal path)</p> <p>Proper appraisal of flooding with planning for more severe rainstorms under Climate Change</p> <p>Proper appraisal of flooding with planning for more severe rainstorms under Climate Change</p> <p>Flooding is due to housing and roadway run-off discharged to sewer (most of Penarth). In Dinas Powys to the river</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Cadoxton too. In Llandough to the Eastbrook. Barry has many old CSOs. In Sully, Penarth and Barry, surface water drainage systems need building and enhancing to take rainstorm run-off into the sea.

The Section 19 report on the 23 Dec 2020 floods was inadequate for LDP planning

wrongly omitted flooding at east Llandough and lower Penarth

lower Penarth is part of the Cadoxton River catchment, but completely wrongly modelled in NRW flood mapping – this assumes run-off into the Sully Brook, with flooding onto the Glamorganshire golf course. In fact little reaches the Brook, but goes into the sewer – the 23 Dec rainstorm overloaded the sewer and flooded Castle Ave and Lavernock Rd, then Cosmeston car-park and lake.

found the roadway surface water pipe (discharge down Swanbridge Rd to sea) was inadequate; probably the housing surface water pipe (over sports field) is also inadequate, but no upgrades were promised.

accepted that the 23 Dec. rainstorm was well below the 'extreme' but considered capacity only relative to this one, not planning for the 'extreme' rainstorms plus the 30-40% "climate uplift".

The LDP needs to contain an honest appraisal, relative to the uplifted extreme storms

The S19 report fails to include retrospective SuDS schemes, despite policy for these. The LDP needs to map out the older housing areas which still rely on combined sewer systems,

as preliminary to assessing practicality and priority for adding surface water drains.

The LDP needs to include policy for the widest spectrum of SuDS schemes, for individual householders, businesses, and public buildings, as well as highways.

These should include

holding pond/lake for Llandough Hospital and car-park run-off, with controlled discharge to the Eastbrook

holding pond/lake for surface drainage waters from Castle Estate etc, (west Penarth) in Cosmeston Park

retrofit surface water collection systems discharging to sea in lower Penarth, where the existing combined sewer overflows (Brockhill Rise CSO) overflows frequently (over 100x per year) much more than during the legally acceptable 'extreme' weather.

expand capacity of Sully surface water discharges to sea.

incentivise house-owners to install soakaways for drainage from rooves and patios.

Require planning consent for new hardstanding (over 2 sq m) and that it's permeable and/or drains to soakaway.

Avoid soakaways in permeable limestone (Llandough), where soakaway rainfall quickly reaches surface water drains and streams; instead retrofit larger holding ponds to reduce flooding of the Llandough stream.

big programme of SuDS schemes in streets to take run-off into swales and grassed areas

Appraisal of the NRW flood-planning Map

The revision of TAN15 on Flooding has been delayed because of criticisms of the NRW map, which is supposed to be used for LDP purposes. The VoG needs to examine its inadequacies here.

the predictions show limited flooding around Barry's No.2 Dock, though flood levels from the detailed 2008 Arup study for the Waterfront development gave flood levels about a metre higher. The flood planning level for the East Quays housing development is thus a metre higher than what the Minister assumed for the Barry Biomass incinerator, though the two sites are 100 metres apart. The rubric for the NRW map says it's not to be used for individual developments, where a specific study is needed. The VoG needs to choose the Arup study over the NRW flood map and ask NRW to sort out the difference

the NRW predictions for the east Vale were tested by the 4-hour intense rainstorm of 23 Dec. 2020. Results in lower Penarth showed the NRW map was completely wrong in showing flooding from the Sully Brook over the Glamorganshire golf course. In fact the flooding was on the Lavernock Road (Cosmeston) and across the carpark into the lake; the floodmap shows no flooding on the carpark and very little on Lavernock Rd.

The S.19 report on Sully and Dinas Powys which also suffered flooding in the 23 Dec. rainstorm did not assess what's needed to cope with the 'extreme' storm. It reported the 23 Dec. flood was well below the 'extreme' that has to be

		<p>taken into account for planning purposes. The LDP therefore needs to make such flood assessments for all these communities and justify the spending on SuDS schemes (as above) against assessed outcomes.</p> <p>Street Trees: Reverse VoG policy of not replacing street trees; positive schemes to restore tree-lined streets – Broad St in Barry; Plassey St in Penarth</p> <p>Street trees help absorb some rainstorm run-off and can be combined with SuDS as in Grangetown to add permeable areas where rainwater infiltrates into the ground, relieving the sewer.</p> <p>Street trees provide much needed shading during extreme heat waves, making shopping areas pleasant and attractive for street life</p> <p>Street trees have cooling effect in urban areas during heat waves</p> <p>People like street trees (they increase property values),</p> <p>The VoG engineers' claim to require costly root-cages is not borne out in other towns; Cardiff has a positive planting policy, Bristol uses root barriers where necessary at a cost of ~£250 and finds many locations don't need them.</p> <p>Positive strategy re. Nature Emergency</p> <p>Countryside tree/woodland planting – develop strategy with regard to ecology and species</p> <p>Policy to join up the Barry Woodlands SSSI - include extra fields and allow them to reforest.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Management plans for the countryside/woodland SINC – eg. those of Pop Hill and south of Dinas Powys – joining them up and stopping fragmentation

Green and Blue Country Parks – for tourism and nature conservation

Aberthaw Country Park and Historical Site – to create by combining the existing conservation area in the old Thaw valley and Harbour with the coastal strip between the ash-mound and seawall.

Cosmeston Medieval Village: expansion to include the newly listed Farmhouse and archaeological site of Lower Cosmeston Farm..

Five-Mile-Lane archaeological site – save what's remaining with a proper plan for planting and management; exhibit records in a local museum

Value the Coast as a national asset

planning for maintenance and improvement of the Wales Coastal Path

exclude development on the coastal strip except for facilities that need a coastal location - this longstanding principle needs safeguarding in the LDP as it was ignored in allocation development land at Cosmeston. Defining the "coastal strip" needs including in the LDP in consultation with the public, and taking into account the aim to promote tourism and expand the tourism business.

Reclaim Aberthaw Power Station site

			<p>With end of power stations from the 1950s, this complex site must be restored to a sustainable state with beneficial uses. "Re-wilding" of the old Thaw valley and the ash-mound are well underway. Restoring the beach etc. for public recreation.</p> <p>The LDP should identify the problems and allocate responsibilities to cover</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> # the artificial river Thaw mouth, which the sea blocks if not maintained # the seawalls, ongoing maintenance and coping with increasing tidal surges under climate change # possible abandonment of the Gileston beach section of seawall with managed retreat plus new river Thaw estuary. # ash-mound; assessment of managing its drainage and stability. # New Rights-of-Way E.Aberthaw to St Athan and W. Aberthaw, using the railway bridges, also maintaining of the Wales Coastal Path # after-uses of the area, including for biodiversity, tourism, culture-historical recording, public access leisure-uses and rights-of-way. Including conservation organisations in ongoing management # create a Country Park, as above, for leisure and tourism on the coastal strip and eastern part of the site. 		
		<p>Q4</p>	<p>No – No specific comments made.</p>	<p>Section 7 of the RR examines the performance of the LDP in respect of how</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

				the policies have delivered the Plan's vision, aims and strategy taking into account the findings of the three AMRs undertaken by the Council since the adoption of the Plan and recommends that a Replacement LDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.	
		Q5	No - The only way we can address the climate and nature emergencies is by joined up planning and working across local authority areas.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	I didn't find the report particularly accessible to read. It uses lots of jargon and it's left me wondering how inclusive this consultation actually is? How, for example, are you ensuring you are reaching and taking into consideration the views of young people aged under 18 including those from disadvantaged backgrounds? Long term plans such as this will impact future generations and their views are important. Also, how are you reaching people who may have additional learning requirements? I am interested in hearing how you have made this consultation accessible to all affected by the plan.	Comments noted. As identified in the Draft DA, at key stages of the RLDP process, the Council will prepare Easy Read versions of documents to help people engage in the process. Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that the Executive Summary outlines the purpose of the document, and the recommendations are set out in the conclusion and next steps sections.	No change required.
46	ID No: 714	Q1	ECONOMIC GROWTH - All references to economic growth should be removed from the LDP. The VoG assumption to prioritise growth maximisation has to be reassessed. So much of what is important to our well-being lies outside of the purview of statistics. The misguided policies pursuant to growth require reassessment for measuring our wellbeing.	Comments noted. The land use issues raised in the comments such as transport, retail and housing will be considered through the RLDP process in accordance with national planning policy. The Council is currently preparing a Green Infrastructure Plan which will form a part of the evidence base of the RLDP.	No change required.
	Q2				
	Q3				
	Q4				
	Q5				
	Further comments				

TRANSPORT- The VOG should implement a spatial planning and net zero surface transport policy as laid out in the RTP

RETAIL POLICY- The current retail strategy has not worked well, empty premises in Holton Road have remained at about 15%. There should be a strategy for reducing shop numbers and conversion to housing.

HOUSING POLICY - Some of the allocated housing proposals have stalled with a pretence that larger developments will be going ahead. These stalled sites, notably Darren Farm and Cosmeston should be reassessed for compliance with policies in the plan, not just reviewed as at 6.3.15. The Cosmeston allocation is car dependent far from facilities, is in the coastal zone which should be protected. The site is vulnerable to flooding and in close proximity to a hazardous landfill site.

Darren Farm proposals are too big to meet sustainable development criteria and should be cut back in order to meet limited market demand.

Hayes Wood proposals are not part of a sustainable development, are remote from facilities, poorly served by public transport.

Llandough Hill proposals are vulnerable to flooding from developments above discharging storm water rapidly through the permeable limestone rock. Previous permissions for soakaways and discharges to the Llandough stream require reassessment in order to be corrected. Llandough is a car based extension of Cardiff and is not a sustainable development.

STREET TREES - The VOG policy of not replacing street trees must be reversed. There should be a positive scheme

to restore tree lined streets throughout the Vale, particularly in Broad Street in Barry and Plassey Street in Penarth. Street trees contribute much to wellbeing, they provide much needed shading during heat waves, they help absorb some storm water runoff and could be combined with SuDS to add permeable areas where storm water infiltrates into the ground to provide relief to the sewer system. Trees are attractive, people like them, they provide pleasantness in retail areas and increase property prices.

There should be a countryside tree/woodland planting strategy with regard to ecology and species biodiversity. The policy should include the joining up the Barry Woodland SSSI including the provision to extra fields and allow these to reforest.

There should be management plans for the countryside/woodland SINC, eg. Those at Pop Hill and south of Diana's Powys, joining them up and stopping fragmentation.

GREEN AND BLUE COUNTRY PARKS - Aberthaw Country Park and Historical Site - the VoG should create such by combining the existing conservation area in the oldThaw Valley and Harbour with the coastal strip between the ash mound and sea wall.

Cosmeston Medieval Village should be expanded to include the newly listed Farmhouse and archaeological site of Lower Cosmeston Farm

Five Mile Lane archaeological site remains should be saved with a management plan for planting, also exhibit records in a local museum.

VALUE THE COAST AS A NATIONAL ASSET - There should be a plan to maintain and improve the Wales Coastal

		<p>Path. Development should be excluded on the Coastal strip except for facilities that require a coastal location. This long-standing principal requires safeguarding in the LDP as it was ignored in allocating development land at Cosmeston. Defining the "coastal Strip" needs to be included in the LDP in consultation with the public, taking into account the aim to promote tourism and expand tourism business.</p> <p>RECLAIM ABERTHAW POWER STATION SITE - This complex site must be restored to a sustainable state with beneficial uses. Restoring of the old Thaw Valley to its natural state must continue including restoring the beach for public recreation.</p> <p>The LDP should identify the problems and allocate responsibilities to cover</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. the artificial River Thaw which is often blocked if not maintained.2. The sea walls should be maintained and should be capable of coping with increasing tidal surges due to climate change.3) the possible abandonment of the Gileston beach section of sea wall with managed retreat, plus the new River Thaw estuary.4) an assessment of the ash mound drainage and stability5) implement new Rights of Way from East Aberthaw to St Athan and West Aberthaw utilising the railway bridges.6) maintain the Wales Coastal Path7) the ongoing management should include conservation organisations for drawing up after use policies for the area to include biodiversity, tourism, recording historical/cultural data, public access leisure uses and rights of way.8) create a Country Park for leisure and tourism on the coastal strip and eastern part of the site9) develop a railway station to encourage sustainable transport.		
--	--	---	--	--

FLOOD PLANNING - The revision of TAN15 on Flooding has been delayed because of criticism of the NRW map, which is supposed to be used for LDP purposes. The VoG needs to examine its inadequacies here.

The predictions show limited flooding around Barry's No. 2 Dock, though flood levels from the detailed 2008 Ove Arup study for the Waterfront development gave flood levels about a metre higher. The flood planning level for the East Quays housing development is thus a meter higher than what the Minister assumed for the Barry Biomass incinerator, though the two sites are 100 metres apart. The rubric for the NRW map says it's not to be used for individual development, where a specific study is needed. The VoG needs to choose the Ove Arup study over the NRW flood map and ask NRW to sort out the difference.

The NRW predictions for the east Vale were tested by the 4 hour storm of 23rd December 2020. Results in lower Penarth showed the NRW map was completely wrong in showing flooding from the Sully Brook over the Glamorganshire Golf Course. In fact, the flooding was on the Lavernock Road (Cosmeston) and across the car park into the lake. The flood map shows no flooding on the car park and very little on Lavernock Road.

The S.19 report on Sully and Diana's Powys, which also suffered flooding on 23rd December 2020, did not assess what's needed to cope with the extreme storm. It reported the 23rd December flood was well below the 'extreme' that has to be taken into account for planning purposes. The LDP therefore needs to make such flood assessments for all these communities and justify the spending of SuDS schemes against assessed outcomes.

SEWAGE TREATMENT CAPACITY - It is widely known that many sewage works are discharging untreated sewage frequently, at times when weather conditions are not 'exceptional' and therefore unlawfully. The VoG cannot claim ignorance of such, as effluent from Cog Moors pollutes Barry Island waters.

Summertime sampling is showing Whitmore Bay does not comply with Blue Flag Standard.

Data disclosed by DCWWW shows untreated discharge about 80 times a year, more frequently in the winter months.

The UV disinfection is switched off during the winter months, so Whitmore Bay sea bacteria are likely to be many times worse than summertime.

The LDP should assess the excess flow over the treatment capacity and conclude that there is no leeway for additional sewage in the system at present. Accepting assurances from DCWWW that they can take sewage from further connections amounts to collusion with criminals who take payments for dealing with the waste and then discharge it unlawfully. It breaches the duty of care to accept assurances when you have reason to believe their disposal is (in part) unlawful.

As the Vale wants to promote tourism and leisure use of the sea, the LDP should get assurances on:-

Use of UV disinfection at all times

Specify DCWWW has to invest in further treatment capacity

In terms of new connections to the public sewer:-

		<p>Require all new developments in the Cog Moors area to pay toward new treatment works and delay all connections until commissioning of the further sewage capacity has been completed.</p> <p>Seek that Cardiff Council freezes the Plas Dwr (Cardiff west) development until further sewage capacity is commissioned, or alternatively requires the developers to pay toward new sewage treatment plant.</p> <p>ATTENUATION PONDS - The specification for attenuation ponds should be tightened. Capacity has been planned for average rainfall run off storage. Settlement/attenuation pond to take run-off; if it discharges to Welsh Water or to private drain, it has to be covered in a S.106 Condition at this outline stage. Sizing the attenuation pond to take average annual run-off causes flooding during storms. It has to have sufficient capacity for the maximum planned storms.</p> <p>CARDIFF AIRPORT & GATEWAY DEVELOPMENT - Review the Cardiff Airport & Gateway Development Zone of 44.75 hectares of B1, B2 and B8 business park and associated car parking. This is related to completely over optimistic airport projections which should be put on hold pending a clearer future for the failing airport. The 'need' has to now be demonstrated under climate emergency to cut back air transport and related development. The infrastructure capacity is wanting - roads, sewage etc.</p> <p>PUBLIC TOILETS - A lack of public toilets results in certain groups feeling anxious about going out. Older people, for example, do not readily leave their homes without the reassurance that they will have access to public toilets, which can lead to ill-health, with consequent burdens on the</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

			NHS. To fulfill the obligations of the majority of the VoG prosperity for all, building better places, green infrastructure, Public Health (Wales) Act 2017 etc etc the VoG Council should assess the necessity for public toilets provisions and implement requirements.		
47	ID No: 712	Q1	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q2	Yes – No specific comments made.	Comments noted.	No change required.
		Q3	Yes - There are many places where changes have been made to legislation and policies, but they do not seem to be reflected in the recommendation of any changes to the LDP. A resilient Wales would not build on a working farm, and take away the natural biodiversity, GIA would not build on a working farm which provide food for our local area and also wild flower seeds and many natural habitats. This in particular when there is a brown field site, larger than Model Farm in the immediate vicinity, which is larger and nearer to the airport that is to be provided for.	The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.
		Q4	No - The Review should take into account the policy changes and yet no changes seem to be being proposed in development of greenfield sites.	Section 7 of the RR examines the performance of the LDP in respect of how the policies have delivered the Plan's vision, aims and strategy taking into account the findings of the three AMRs undertaken by the Council since the adoption of the Plan and recommends that a Replacement LDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036. The Council will seek to ensure that development within the Vale of Glamorgan RLDP uses land effectively and efficiently.	No change required.
		Q5	Don't know – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will	No change required.

				adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	
		Further comments	No further comments.	None.	No change required.
48	ID No: 708	Q1	<p>No - Many communities vulnerable to flooding under predicted rainstorms due to overloaded combined sewers and failure to retrofit SuDS to housing areas Discharge of untreated sewage from CSOs and Cog Moors due to inadequate capacity</p> <p>Deficit and loss of street trees due to VoG policies refusing to plant new</p> <p>Non-compliant active-travel networks, due to ignoring requirements on gradients. Location of Cosmeston housing site far from facilities and in the coastal strip contrary to planning policies and car-dependent.</p> <p>Model Farm development site allocated without regard to nature and farming, and to airport-related development that ignored the climate emergency</p> <p>Aberthaw site reclamation for nature, leisure recreation, tourism and history has been overlooked with officers focused on "development".</p>	<p>Comments noted. The land use issues raised in the comments will be considered through the RLDP process in accordance with national planning policy. The Council is currently preparing a Green Infrastructure Plan which will form a part of the evidence base of the RLDP.</p> <p>The comments made in respect of Model Farm relate to an allocation in the adopted LDP which was considered by an independent planning inspector and found to be sound.</p>	No change required.
		Q2	<p>No - To promote development opportunities in Barry and the South East Zone The St. Athan area to be a key development opportunity Cardiff Airport a focus for transport and employment investment are not integrated with the Climate and Nature Emergencies, so excluded under CICH Wales Regs 2021.</p> <p>REPLACE BY</p> <p>1. Address the climate crisis and nature crisis; cut back development and prioritise natural sites</p>	Comments noted. The existing LDP Vision and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.	No change required.

			<p>2. Accept that VoG infrastructure is inadequate for flooding, sewage treatment and car-transport,</p> <p>3. new housing sites to be restricted to Metro linked sites and small developments within settlements for local need (the previous LDP paid no regard to Metro plans).</p> <p>4. Investment in flood mitigation, sewage treatment and sustainable transport to focus on building resilient communities.</p> <p>5. Review and curtail the Airport-St Athan enterprise zone (6.3.19) accepting the uncertain future of the airport (largest decline in any UK airport 6.3.47), cut out the Model farm development and plan for potential downgrading to a local airport.</p> <p>6. Boost local shops and facilities in local settlements to reduce the needs for travel, including rejuvenation of the five town centres.</p> <p>7. No developments in the coastal strip apart from facilities that need a coastal location,</p> <p>8. Promote tourist opportunities and facilities, restore beaches to Blue Flag standards</p>		
		<p>Q3</p>	<p>Yes - Minimising car-travel requires jobs close to homes and not increasingly providing housing for people working outside the Vale, particularly in Cardiff.</p> <p>6.4.3 shows a failure to progress “new and enhanced tourism and leisure opportunities” to “address health and wellbeing”, and to “protect natural and historic assets”. Just consider the destruction of the Five Mile Lane irreplaceable archaeological site, which could have provided a major tourist facility. 6.4.3 admits “delivering sustainable development and measures to address the climate and nature emergencies” will have to be “key matters for the Replacement LDP.</p> <p>“Building back better” has to integrate responses to the climate and nature emergencies (CC Wales Regs.21</p>	<p>Comments noted. The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.</p> <p>The RLDP strategy will take account of existing national planning policy and relevant local strategies and objectives.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

			<p>Reconstructing our economy has to cover planting trees and woodland; also re-wilding opportunities rather than “development” opportunities. Reconstruction has to cover our settlements that will flood when hit by rainstorms enhanced by climate change, to implement surface water drainage and to retrofit SuDS schemes. Reconstruction has to put in adequate sewerage and sewage treatment plant for the house-building allowed without foul sewage capacity. Reconstructing our economy include expanding tourism and informal recreation on the Vale coast, to replace unsustainable holidaying abroad. Development as associated with Rhoose airport that does not integrate responses to climate and nature emergencies is blocked, The LDP's previous promotion of growth has to be dropped. So much of what is important to our well-being lies outside of the purview of statistics. The misguided policies pursuing growth did not integrate climate and nature emergencies, nor did they assess wellbeing.</p>		
		<p>Q4</p>	<p>No - Housing allocations: some have stalled – pretence that the big numbers at Darren Farm and Cosmeston are going ahead. Review these stalled sites, for compliance with policies in the plan, not as 6.3.15 only review sites that have not progressed. Cosmeston – car-dependent, far from facilities; in the coastal zone; toxic landfill; access is vulnerable to floods; first planned to be Green Wedge; archaeological find/listed farmhouse Darren Farm – cut back as limited market demand; too big for sustainable development and Cowbridge to absorb Hayes Wood – remote from facilities; not part of a sustainable settlement; poor bus services Llandough Hill – land vulnerable to flooding from soakways in developments above which discharge rapidly through the permeable rock (limestone). Past permissions of soakways</p>	<p>Section 7 of the RR examines the performance of the LDP in respect of how the policies have delivered the Plan's vision, aims and strategy taking into account the findings of the three AMRs undertaken by the Council since the adoption of the Plan.</p> <p>The RR concludes that while many of the adopted LDP policies are performing well, a full review of the adopted LDP is appropriate and recommends that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.</p> <p>The land use issues raised in the comments will be considered through the RLDP process in accordance with national planning policy. The Council is currently</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

		<p>and discharge into Llandough stream ('drain') have to be corrected. Llandough is not a sustainable settlement – this would be a car-borne extension of Cardiff.</p> <p>Assess Sewage Treatment capacity for the purposes of new development Dwr Cymru assurances cannot be accepted as they are unlawfully discharging untreated sewage to rivers and the sea THE ASSURANCES WITH THE 2009 UV INSTALLATION THAT THEY'D MEET BLUE-FLAG BATHING WATER STANDARDS AT BARRY BEACHES HAS PROVED UNTRUE. THIS IS IMPORTANT FOR TOURISM, SO MUST BE REVIEWED.</p> <p>Review Sewage Treatment capacity Widely known that many sewage works are discharging untreated sewage frequently, at times when weather conditions are not "exceptional" and therefore unlawfully. The VoG cannot claim not to know, as effluent from Cog Moors pollutes Barrey Island waters # summertime sampling is showing Whitmore Bay does not comply with Blue Flag standard # data disclosed by DCWW shows untreated discharge ~80 times a year, more frequently in the winter months # the UV disinfection is switched off during the winter months, so Whitmore Bay sea bacteria are likely to be many times worse than summertime. The LDP should assess the excess flow over the treatment capacity and conclude there is no leeway for additional sewage in the system as at present. Accepting assurances from DCWW that they can take the sewage from further connections amounts to collusion with criminals who take payments for dealing with your waste then dis[pose of it unlawfully. It breaches the duty of care to accept</p>	<p>preparing a Green Infrastructure Plan which will form a part of the evidence base of the RLDP.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

assurances when you have reason to believe their disposal is (in part) unlawful.

As the Vale wants to promote tourism and leisure use of the sea, the LDP should get assurances on

use of UV disinfection at all times of the year when immersion activities take place

specify DCWW has to invest in further treatment capacity to relieve overloading of Cog Moors STW and meet the Blue Flag standard as was intended when the UV plant was installed (2009) and now year-round when immersion sports take place.

In terms of new connections to the public sewer:

require all new developments in the Cog Moors area (the Kenson-Weycock and Cadoxton catchments in the Vale) to pay towards new treatment works and delay all over a threshold (say 10 dwellings) pending commissioning of the further sewage capacity

seek that Cardiff Council freezes the Plas Dwr (Cardiff west) development until further sewage capacity is commissioned, or alternatively requires the developers to pay towards new sewage treatment plant.

Tighten spec for Attenuation Ponds

Capacity has been planned for average rainfall. run-off storage

settlement/attenuation pond to take run-off; if it discharges to Welsh Water or to private drain, it had to be covered in a S.106 Condition at this outline stage

sizing the attenuation pond to take average annual run-off causes flooding during storms' It has to have sufficient capacity for the maximum planned storms

Review the Cardiff Airport & Gateway Development Zone of 44.75 hectares of B1, B2 and B8 business park and associated car parking.

speculative growth, no 'need' demonstrated, contrary to sustainable development

- related to completely over-optimistic airport projections; put it on hold pending a clearer future for the failing airport
- now 'need' under climate emergency to cut back air transport and related development
- infrastructure capacity is wanting - roads, sewage....
- need under nature emergency to save this valuable countryside, farmed sustainably with care for nature.

Plan for expansion of the tourism sector, giving more jobs; valuing our coast (excluding development on it), and regaining our Blue flags (correcting the deficit in sewage treatment).

Enable use of Barry Dock for water sports (incl immersion sports) and cockle-farming by ending the routine sewer discharges into it (150 times a year)

Create a blue-green Country Park with conservation area and history trail on RWE's Aberthaw site (east of the ash-mound, plus south alongside the coastal path)

Proper appraisal of flooding with planning for more severe rainstorms under Climate Change

Proper appraisal of flooding with planning for more severe rainstorms under Climate Change

Flooding is due to housing and roadway run-off discharged to sewer (most of Penarth). In Dinas Powys to the river Cadoxton too. In Llandough to the Eastbrook. Barry has many old CSOs. In Sully, Penarth and Barry, surface water drainage systems need building and enhancing to take rainstorm run-off into the sea.

The Section 19 report on the 23 Dec 2020 floods was inadequate for LDP planning

wrongly omitted flooding at east Llandough and lower Penarth

lower Penarth is part of the Cadoxton River catchment, but completely wrongly modelled in NRW flood mapping –

		<p>this assumes run-off into the Sully Brook, with flooding onto the Glamorganshire golf course. In fact little reaches the Brook, but goes into the sewer – the 23 Dec rainstorm overloaded the sewer and flooded Castle Ave and Lavernock Rd, then Cosmeston car-park and lake.</p> <p>## found the roadway surface water pipe (discharge down Swanbridge Rd to sea) was inadequate; probably the housing surface water pipe (over sports field) is also inadequate, but no upgrades were promised.</p> <p>## accepted that the 23 Dec. rainstorm was well below the 'extreme' but considered capacity only relative to this one, not planning for the 'extreme' rainstorms plus the 30-40% "climate uplift".</p> <p>The LDP needs to contain an honest appraisal, relative to the uplifted extreme storms</p> <p>The S19 report fails to include retrospective SuDS schemes, despite policy for these. The LDP needs to map out the older housing areas which still rely on combined sewer systems, as preliminary to assessing practicality and priority for adding surface water drains.</p> <p>The LDP needs to include policy for the widest spectrum of SuDS schemes, for individual householders, businesses, and public buildings, as well as highways.</p> <p>These should include</p> <p>## holding pond/lake for Llandough Hospital and car-park run-off, with controlled discharge to the Eastbrook</p> <p>## holding pond/lake for surface drainage waters from Castle Estate etc, (west Penarth) in Cosmeston Park</p> <p>## retrofit surface water collection systems discharging to sea in lower Penarth, where the existing combined sewer overflows (Brockhill Rise CSO) overflows frequently (over 100x per year) much more than during the legally acceptable 'extreme' weather.</p> <p>## expand capacity of Sully surface water discharges to sea.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

incentivise house-owners to install soakaways for drainage from rooves and patios.

Require planning consent for new hardstanding (over 2 sq m) and that it's permeable and/or drains to soakaway.

Avoid soakaways in permeable limestone (Llandough), where soakaway rainfall quickly reaches surface water drains and streams; instead retrofit larger holding ponds to reduce flooding of the Llandough stream.

BIG PROGRAMME OF SUDS SCHEMES IN STREETS TO TAKE RUN-OFF INTO SWALES AND GRASSED AREAS

Appraisal of the NRW flood-planning Map

The revision of TAN15 on Flooding has been delayed because of criticisms of the NRW map, which is supposed to be used for LDP purposes. The VoG needs to examine its inadequacies here.

the predictions show limited flooding around Barry's No.2 Dock, though flood levels from the detailed 2008 Arup study for the Waterfront development gave flood levels about a metre higher. The flood planning level for the East Quays housing development is thus a metre higher than what the Minister assumed for the Barry Biomass incinerator, though the two sites are 100 metres apart. The rubric for the NRW map says it's not to be used for individual developments, where a specific study is needed. The VoG needs to choose the Arup study over the NRW flood map and ask NRW to sort out the difference

the NRW predictions for the east Vale were tested by the 4-hour intense rainstorm of 23 Dec. 2020. Results in lower Penarth showed the NRW map was completely wrong in showing flooding from the Sully Brook over the Glamorganshire golf course. In fact the flooding was on the Lavernock Road (Cosmeston) and across the carpark into the lake; the floodmap shows no flooding on the carpark and very little on Lavernock Rd.

THE S.19 REPORT ON SULLY AND DINAS POWYS WHICH ALSO SUFFERED FLOODING IN THE 23 DEC. RAINSTORM DID NOT ASSESS WHAT'S NEEDED TO COPE WITH THE 'EXTREME' STORM. IT REPORTED THE 23 DEC. FLOOD WAS WELL BELOW THE 'EXTREME' THAT HAS TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT FOR PLANNING PURPOSES. THE LDP THEREFORE NEEDS TO MAKE SUCH FLOOD ASSESSMENTS FOR ALL THESE COMMUNITIES AND JUSTIFY THE SPENDING ON SUDS SCHEMES (AS ABOVE) AGAINST ASSESSED OUTCOMES.

Street Trees: Reverse VoG policy of not replacing street trees; positive schemes to restore tree-lined streets – Broad St in Barry; Plassey St in Penarth

Street trees help absorb some rainstorm run-off and can be combined with SuDS as in Grangetown to add permeable areas where rainwater infiltrates into the ground, relieving the sewer.

Street trees provide much needed shading during extreme heat waves, making shopping areas pleasant and attractive for street life

Street trees have cooling effect in urban areas during heat waves

People like street trees (they increase property values),

THE VOG ENGINEERS' CLAIM TO REQUIRE COSTLY ROOT-CAGES IS NOT BORNE OUT IN OTHER TOWNS; CARDIFF HAS A POSITIVE PLANTING POLICY, BRISTOL USES ROOT BARRIERS WHERE NECESSARY AT A COST OF ~£250 AND FINDS MANY LOCATIONS DON'T NEED THEM.

Positive strategy re. Nature Emergency

Countryside tree/woodland planting – develop strategy with regard to ecology and species

Policy to join up the Barry Woodlands SSSI - include extra fields and allow them to reforest.

		<p>Management plans for the countryside/woodland SINCs – eg. those of Pop Hill and south of Dinas Powys – joining them up and stopping fragmentation</p> <p>Green and Blue Country Parks – for tourism and nature conservation</p> <p>Aberthaw Country Park and Historical Site – to create by combining the existing conservation area in the old Thaw valley and Harbour with the coastal strip between the ash-mound and seawall.</p> <p>Cosmeston Medieval Village: expansion to include the newly listed Farmhouse and archaeological site of Lower Cosmeston Farm..</p> <p>FIVE-MILE-LANE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE – SAVE WHAT'S REMAINING WITH A PROPER PLAN FOR PLANTING AND MANAGEMENT; EXHIBIT RECORDS IN A LOCAL MUSEUM</p> <p>Value the Coast as a national asset</p> <p># planning for maintenance and improvement of the Wales Coastal Path</p> <p># exclude development on the coastal strip except for facilities that need a coastal location - this longstanding principle needs safeguarding in the LDP as it was ignored in allocation development land at Cosmeston. Defining the "coastal strip" needs including in the LDP in consultation with the public, and taking into account the aim to promote tourism and expand the tourism business.</p> <p>Reclaim Aberthaw Power Station site</p> <p>With end of power stations from the 1950s, this complex site must be restored to a sustainable state with beneficial uses. "Re-wilding" of the old Thaw valley and the ash-mound are well underway. Restoring the beach etc. for public recreation.</p> <p>The LDP should identify the problems and allocate responsibilities to cover</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p># the artificial river Thaw mouth, which the sea blocks if not maintained</p> <p># the seawalls, ongoing maintenance and coping with increasing tidal surges under climate change</p> <p># possible abandonment of the Gileston beach section of seawall with managed retreat plus new river Thaw estuary.</p> <p># ash-mound; assessment of managing its drainage and stability.</p> <p># New Rights-of-Way E.Aberthaw to St Athan and W. Aberthaw, using the railway bridges, also maintaining of the Wales Coastal Path</p> <p># after-uses of the area, including for biodiversity, tourism, culture-historical recording, public access leisure-uses and rights-of-way. Including conservation organisations in ongoing management</p> <p># CREATE A COUNTRY PARK, AS ABOVE, FOR LEISURE AND TOURISM ON THE COASTAL STRIP AND EASTERN PART OF THE SITE.</p> <p>Transport Strategy</p> <p># town circular buses in Penarth-Llandough and Llantwit Major areas. Reliance on buses passing through on circuitous routes creates poor and inflexible services.</p> <p># review active travel networks to meet gradient standards. The present networks discriminate against those with physical disability or mobility limitations, so breach the Council's duty to avoid indirect discrimination against the elderly and disabled</p> <p># funding for upgrades to pavements and walking routes to meet good/high standards; the failure to provide reasonable funds (compared with highway maintenance) is indirect discrimination against the elderly and disabled</p> <p># make rail stations into activity hubs; the failure to develop retail and other activities at the Vale rail stations has given us very unattractive locations. Being poorly lit and isolated</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>in evenings makes them unsafe particularly for women, so the failure is indirect discrimination against women.</p> <p>Town Planning towards net-zero in local transport</p> <p>WGovt wants public facilities to be located in town centres, to rebuild their attractiveness and facilitate access by walking or cycling. This research by RTPi and others show how to achieve it via positive planning rather than the VoG's laissez faire.</p> <p>https://www.rtpi.org.uk/research/2020/june/net-zero-transport-the-role-of-spatial-planning-and-place-based-solutions/</p>		
		Q5	Yes – No specific comments made.	Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.	No change required.
		Further comments	<p>Further Comments:</p> <p>The intention to proceed with old planning allocations that flout the Climate and Nature Emergencies is a dishonest attempt to continue Business-as-Usual.</p> <p>This is particularly shown in the Model Farm and Cosmeston developments. The Welsh Government is deeply involved in both, so in no position to give disinterested planning advice. The public sees it as an undemocratic fix that discredits the planning system. So the VoG needs to find a way to openly and transparently review both these allocations.</p>	The comments made in respect of Model Farm and Upper Cosmeston Farm relate to allocations in the adopted LDP which were considered by an independent planning inspector and found to be sound. Issues associated with the development of these sites will be considered through the planning application process. The Council has declared Climate Change and Nature Emergencies which will be considered through the RLDP process.	No change required.
49	ID No: 6	Q1	Yes - There are some key contextual issues which have become very much a focus recently, and the review report comments on these, including climate change, and the impact of Covid-19. The document omits reference to	Comments noted. The Coronavirus Act 2020 will be added to the section 3.2 of the RR. The impact of the coronavirus pandemic will	Add Coronavirus Act 2020 to Section 3.2 of the RR as set out in Appendix C.

		<p>pandemic legislation e.g. Coronavirus Act 2020 which includes directions in relation to events, gatherings and events (schedule 22) and Local Authority meetings (section 78).</p>	<p>be considered as a part of the RLDP process.</p>	
	Q2	<p>No - An objective focusing on the improvement of health and well-being for residents in the Vale of Glamorgan would strengthen the LDPs approach to creating healthy places. The objective on reducing the need to travel contributes to the improvement in health but it is only one aspect. There needs to be more on a range of other measures such as improving access to green space, creating communities where people can connect with each other, and improving the walkability of neighbourhoods for example. An objective around involving communities in planning would meet the WB of Future Generations goals. Objective 1 could be reframed as being about healthy placemaking.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The existing LDP Vision and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.</p> <p>In developing the RLDP the Council will recognise the strong links between health, wellbeing and planning.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
	Q3	<p>Yes - There have been many changes to national policy and strategy since the LDP was agreed which need to be reflected in a replacement LDP. Population changes must be considered and taken into account in future plans, for example the demographic shifts towards having a much larger number of older people living in the Vale by 2036.</p> <p>Welsh Government Planning Policy now has a much stronger emphasis on healthy places, and the importance of planning in the improvement of health and well-being of communities. This emphasis should be reflected in the RLDP.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA. In developing the RLDP the Council will recognise the strong links between health, wellbeing and planning</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
	Q4	<p>Yes - The policies need to be updated to reflect population changes, in terms of demographics, but also to ensure that health and well-being is woven throughout the LDP. For example, in the housing and design policies. The LDP could take a 'health in all policies' approach. There have been significant societal and environmental changes that should be considered in a policy review as outlined in Q1 above.</p>	<p>Comments noted. While many of the adopted LDP policies are performing well the RR concludes that a full review of the adopted LDP is appropriate to reflect contextual changes that have occurred since its adoption and recommends that a RLDP is prepared for the period 2021-2036.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

		Q5	<p>Yes - As stated in the report, all LA s are at different stages of LDP preparation so it seems right to undertake the review individually.</p> <p>The SDP process will bring together regional LAs so this will enable them to work together on spatial planning at that level.</p>	<p>Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage will adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.</p>	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments.	None.	No change required.
50	ID No: 376	Q1	<p>Yes - It is considered that changes to national, regional, and local policies together with new legislation and strategies which may have implications for the Replacement LDP have been identified and summarised appropriately. The reference to the final TAN 15: Development and Flood Risk being published in Autumn 2021 is now incorrect/ out of date and will need to be updated as this has now been significantly delayed.</p>	Comments noted.	Amend paragraph 3.3.12 to reflect delays in the revision to TAN 15 as set out in Appendix C.
		Q2	<p>No - The existing LDP's Vision is for the Vale of Glamorgan to be a place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That is safe, clean, and attractive, where individuals and communities have sustainable opportunities to improve their health, learning and skills, prosperity, and wellbeing; and • Where there is a strong sense of community in which local groups and individuals have the capacity and incentive to make an effective contribution to the future sustainability of the area. <p>However, the Vision makes no reference to the Vale of Glamorgan being an attractive and popular place to live and work. The LDP review process provides the opportunity to review this Vision so it can further reflect the economic, social, and environmental aspirations contained within the Vale of Glamorgan Wellbeing Plan (2018) which was published since the since the adoption of the LDP.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA</p> <p>The vision and objectives of the RLDP will have regard to the Vale of Glamorgan Public Services Board Well-being Plan.</p>	No change required.

		<p>This is also consistent with the LDP Development Plans Manual (Edition 3, 2020) which states that Wellbeing Plans should form a key part of the evidence base and should be used to shape and influence the LDP vision, strategy, and objectives alongside national placemaking objectives contained in PPW.</p> <p>It is noted that the current LDP objectives are generally compatible with the cross-cutting themes of the National Well Being Goals and those of the Vale of Glamorgan Wellbeing Plan. However, there is scope to enhance the LDP objectives further in the Review.</p>		
		<p>Q3</p> <p>Yes - based on the area now being within Future Wales: The National Plan's South East Wales Growth Area which is a new consideration over and above those considered during the preparation of the current LDP.</p> <p>The review of the LDP is therefore required to ensure that the strategy and policy framework reflects the aspirations and priorities for the South East Wales Growth Area as set out in Future Wales and to ensure that it is in general conformity with it.</p> <p>Within the wider growth area, the focus is on strategic economic and housing growth; essential services and facilities; advanced manufacturing; transport and digital infrastructure. Key investment decisions will seek to support places in the National Growth Area and the wider region. Policy 36 (South Wales Metro) states that SDPs and LDPs "should plan growth and regeneration to maximise the opportunities arising from better regional connectivity, including identifying opportunities for higher density, mixed use and car free development around new and improved metro stations".</p>	<p>Comments noted. The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.</p> <p>The strategy will have regard to national planning policy and objectives.</p>	No change required.
		<p>Q4</p> <p>Yes - [REDACTED] agree that the Employment Policies of the LDP (SP5, MG9, MD14, MD15, MD16, MD17) should be reviewed. These were informed by the recommendations of the Employment Land and Premises Study 2013 and should</p>	<p>Comment noted. A comprehensive evidence base will be prepared in support of the emerging RLDP policies including</p>	No change required.

be revised as necessary to reflect the findings of employment land review and national policy. LDP Policy MG11 identifies land to the south of Junction 34, M4, Hensol for strategic (29.59ha) and local (6.64ha) employment land for a mix of employment uses including B1, B2 and B8. The employment allocation relates to an existing employment area which was initially occupied by Bosch and subsequently acquired by Renishaw at the start of the LDP period in 2011. The site has a lapsed outline consent (ref: 2014/00228/EAO) for a development comprising Class B1, B2 and B8 uses; a Hotel/Residential Training Centre and ancillary uses with associated infrastructure, approved in June 2016. The outline consent has not yet come forward however, an application (ref. 2021/00899/EOA) was submitted to vary condition 2 of 2014/00228/EAO to extend the period of time for submission of reserved matters by a further five years from the date of the new permission. [REDACTED] agree with the Council's view that although the original outline application has not come forward in the plan period, the new application demonstrates there is still a willingness to bring forward the allocation.

A reserved matters planning application (ref. 2019/01421/RES) has also been approved in April 2021 for an extension to the existing Renishaw facility which will provide 33,909 square metres of additional B2 floor space which would meet the local employment land need identified in Policy MG9 – Employment Allocations and under Policy MG11. The proposal would result in the expansion of the existing employment use as part of the Renishaw company. [REDACTED] fully support this important allocation at a strategic location to the south of Junction 34 and note that it would lead to the creation of over 3,800 jobs. [REDACTED] agree that based on the above planning applications, approved and under consideration at the site, the allocation is still deliverable and should therefore be carried forward to the

employment, transport and green infrastructure.

		<p>Replacement LDP with the policy updated to reflect recent approvals.</p> <p>█████ agree that (Planning Obligations and Community Facilities) LDP Policies MD4, MG6, MG7, MG28 should be reviewed. Policy MD4 enables community infrastructure and planning obligations to be sought, where appropriate having regard to development viability. Policy MD4 accepts that it may not always be possible for developers to satisfy all the planning obligation requirements and therefore there is a distinction between 'essential infrastructure' and 'necessary infrastructure' – this should be carried forward in the LDP Review.</p> <p>█████ agree that the LDP Review will provide an appropriate opportunity to review development viability, particularly in respect of new policies introduced by Welsh Government, such as Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs), Green Infrastructure and Placemaking requirements. Appropriate mechanisms should be put in place however, so that such policies should not render development unviable and undeliverable.</p> <p>With regard to the Transport Infrastructure Policies (SP7 and MG16), █████ agree that these policies appear to be functioning effectively on the basis that identified transportation schemes have been delivered. █████ agree that revisions will be required to take account of completed transport schemes to date, proposed Metro transport schemes, National Transport Strategy and to reflect the principle of the sustainable transport hierarchy as set out in national policy.</p>		
	<p>Q5</p>	<p>█████ is in agreement that the Review should be undertaken individually as opposed to jointly with an adjoining local authority. However, given the constrained development opportunities within the administrative boundary, the Council should not discount accommodating required growth adjacent to the boundaries of the authority e.g. south RCT.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Welsh Government guidance requires all LPAs to work collaboratively and to maximise opportunities for joint working where it creates efficiencies and improves the evidence base. While the RLDP will focus</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

			<p>It is encouraging that the Council are committed to working jointly where opportunities arise to ensure consistency where appropriate, and share a joint evidence base with other local authorities in the region, to ensure that cross-boundary matters are adequately addressed including the provision of housing.</p> <p>It is noted that there will therefore be an overlap in the plan periods of the LDP Review and the SDP. Planning regulations require LDPs to be in general conformity with the SDP, as acknowledged within the Draft Delivery Agreement (2021-2036), however the preparation of the SDP has been delayed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and the extent of input to the SDP is currently unknown. This is frustrating and it is hoped that progress will be made on the SDP as soon as possible to cover cross-boundary issues and limit any delay to the delivery of the plan.</p>	<p>on the Vale of Glamorgan where relevant the Council will engage with adjoining LPAs to ensure consistency of approach on pertinent issues.</p>	
		Further comments	No further comments.	None.	No change required.
51	ID No: 376	Q1	<p>Yes - It is considered that changes to national, regional, and local policies together with new legislation and strategies which may have implications for the Replacement LDP have been identified and summarised appropriately. The reference to the final TAN 15: Development and Flood Risk being published in Autumn 2021 is now incorrect/ out of date and will need to be updated as this has now been significantly delayed.</p>	Comments noted.	Amend paragraph 3.3.12 to reflect delays in the revision to TAN 15 as set out in Appendix C.
		Q2	<p>No - The existing LDP's Vision is for the Vale of Glamorgan to be a place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That is safe, clean, and attractive, where individuals and communities have sustainable opportunities to improve their health, learning and skills, prosperity, and wellbeing; and • Where there is a strong sense of community in which local groups and individuals have the capacity and incentive to make an effective contribution to the future sustainability of the area. 	<p>Comments noted. The existing LDP Vision, and objectives will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA</p> <p>The vision and objectives of the RLDP will have regard to the Vale of Glamorgan Public Services Board Well-being Plan.</p>	No change required.

		<p>However, the Vision makes no reference to the Vale of Glamorgan being an attractive and popular place to live and work. The LDP review process also provides the opportunity to review this Vision so it can further reflect the economic, social, and environmental aspirations contained within the Vale of Glamorgan Wellbeing Plan (2018) which was published since the since the adoption of the LDP.</p> <p>This is also consistent with the LDP Development Plans Manual (Edition 3, 2020) which states that Wellbeing Plans should form a key part of the evidence base and should be used to shape and influence the LDP vision, strategy, and objectives alongside national placemaking objectives contained in PPW.</p> <p>It is noted that the current LDP objectives are generally compatible with the cross-cutting themes of the National Well Being Goals and those of the Vale of Glamorgan Wellbeing Plan, however, the LDP Review will provide scope to enhance the LDP objectives.</p>		
		<p>Q3</p> <p>Yes - based on the area now being within Future Wales: The National Plan's South East Wales Growth Area which is a new consideration over and above those considered during the preparation of the current LDP.</p> <p>The area is now a priority area for growth and the review of the LDP is therefore required to ensure that the strategy and policy framework reflects the aspirations and priorities for the South East Wales Growth Area, as set out in Future Wales, and to ensure that it is in general conformity with it.</p> <p>Within the wider growth area, the focus is on strategic economic and housing growth; essential services and facilities; advanced manufacturing; transport and digital infrastructure.</p> <p>The LDP review also provides an opportunity for the Council to undertake a review of development viability, including a review of the current LDP policy requirements and site thresholds for affordable housing provision, to ensure the</p>	<p>Comments noted. The existing LDP Strategy will be reviewed as an integral part of the RLDP process and subject to public consultation as set out in the Draft DA.</p> <p>The strategy will have regard to national planning policy, local strategies and objectives. A comprehensive evidence base will be prepared in support of the emerging RLDP policies including population and housing, employment and transport.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

		<p>most appropriate policy approach is taken by the Council to maximise housing delivery and growth.</p> <p>The Draft Review Report sets out the status of the housing allocations within the Plan and indicates that delivery of housing allocations to date has been successful. It is noted that some sites have yet to come forward and as such the Report states that the LDP review shall provide the opportunity to re-examine the deliverability of these sites as well as the need for additional allocations to meet the housing requirement in light of the latest demographic evidence, which is supported.</p>		
		<p>Q4 Yes - [redacted] agree that the Housing Policies (SP3, SP4, MG1, MG2, MD5, MD6, MD10, MD11, MD12) should be reviewed. Revisions to these policies are required to reflect the revised level of housing growth and spatial strategy over the new plan, deliverability of extant housing allocations and new allocations to meet the revised housing requirement. In terms of housing growth, it is noted that the total number of dwellings approved on MG2 sites as of 1st April 2021 equates to 5,527 dwellings or 65% of dwellings allocated under policy MG2. Appendix 1 sets out the status of the housing allocations within the Plan and indicates that delivery of housing allocations to date has been successful and the Council anticipates that the delivery of housing allocations shall continue for the remainder of the plan period. However, it is noted that a number of sites have yet to come forward and as such, the LDP review will provide a suitable opportunity to re-examine the deliverability of these sites as well as the need for additional allocations to meet the housing requirement.</p> <p>The Draft Review Report shows a difference between the projections used to inform the adopted LDP and clearly signifies that the dwelling requirement within the adopted LDP will need to be reconsidered as part of the LDP Review process for the new plan period. The most recent population</p>	<p>Comments noted. A robust evidence base will be prepared in support of the emerging RLDP policies based on the most up-to-date information. Topic papers will include matters such as housing and biodiversity. The settlement hierarchy will also be reviewed as a part of the RLDP strategy process.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

and household projections demonstrate that there would be a dwelling requirement in the replacement LDP based upon the continued growth within the next plan period (2021 – 2036). The review of the LDP should use the most up to date projections and it is noted these will need to be reviewed when the population and household Census information is released (March 2022/March 2023) to fully understand the impact this will have on the dwelling requirement.

Policy SP4 Affordable Housing Provision sets a target of up to 3,252 affordable dwellings over the Plan period, derived from an assessment of potential levels of affordable housing secured on allocated housing sites and windfall developments informed by the Council's Affordable Housing Viability evidence. The LDP review provides the opportunity to update the development viability evidence and the target for affordable housing for the new plan period and this is supported.

The Draft Review Report sets out the status of the housing allocations within the Plan and indicates that delivery of housing allocations to date has been successful. It is noted that some sites have yet to come forward and as such the Report states that the LDP review shall provide the opportunity to re-examine the deliverability of these sites as well as the need for additional allocations to meet the housing requirement in light of the latest demographic evidence.

██████ considers that Design Polices MD1, MD2 and MD3 should be reviewed cautiously.

██████ considers that LDP Policy MD1 (Location of New Development) should be carried forward in the LDP Review. This policy directs new development to sustainable locations by favouring proposals where they support the role and function of the settlements within the settlement hierarchy. In this regard, ██████ fully supports the identification of St

		<p>Nicholas as a minor rural settlement and it is considered that further sustainable growth should be directed here.</p> <p>Policy MD2 relates to the design of new development and it is noted that this is proposed to be reviewed in the Replacement LDP to reflect the importance of placemaking and climate change. [REDACTED] has concerns in relation to the potential requirements of this policy alongside the associated financial implications for development proposals.</p> <p>Policy MD3, which identifies the type of developments which are required to provide open space where there is an identified need, should be carried forward as it is currently functioning effectively.</p> <p>[REDACTED] agree that the Planning Obligations and Community Facilities Policies (MD4, MG6, MG7, MG28) should be reviewed and reaffirmed in the Replacement LDP. Policy MD4 enables community infrastructure and planning obligations to be sought, where appropriate, having regard to development viability. Policy MD4 accepts that it may not always be possible for developers to satisfy all the planning obligation requirements and therefore there is a distinction between 'essential infrastructure' and 'necessary infrastructure' – this should be carried forward in the LDP Review.</p> <p>[REDACTED] agree that the LDP Review will provide an appropriate opportunity to review development viability, particularly in respect of new policies introduced by Welsh Government, such as Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs), Green Infrastructure and Placemaking requirements. Appropriate mechanisms should be put in place so that such policies should not render development unviable and undeliverable.</p> <p>[REDACTED] support the review of the Biodiversity and Environment Policies (SP10, MG17, MG18, MG19, MG20, MG21, MG27, MD9). It is noted that in general, the environmental policies of the Plan are functioning effectively but will need to be reviewed to reflect the Council's statutory requirement to</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

			conserve and enhance biodiversity as specified under Section 6 of the Environment Act 2016. In particular, it is noted that Policy MD9 is proposed to be amended so that development proposals provide a net benefit for biodiversity, however the level of this and any other requirements should be clarified in the revised policy.		
		Q5	No response given.	None.	No change required.
		Further comments	No further comments.	None.	No change required.
52	ID No: 710	Q1	<p>Don't know - We don't believe we have received notification of the consultation and have only now become aware of it. The documents are very long and technical despite a commitment in the Draft Delivery Agreement to provide EASY READ DOCUMENTS.</p> <p>██████████ do not have the resources to properly review and comment upon documents of this nature.</p> <p>Please advise if there are any recommendations which will impact Cowbridge, Llanblethian or Aberthin.</p> <p>Please advise the next steps and keep us informed.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This organisation were notified via email of the Delivery Agreement/Review Report consultation on the 4th November 2021 and subsequently on 17th December 2021 regarding the consultation extension. As the RLDP progresses, it is the Council's intention to prepare Easy Read versions of some technical documents to assist with consultations as set out under paragraph 2.4.5 of the Draft Delivery agreement. Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that the introductory paragraphs of the Review Report provide an outline of why the document has been prepared and its contents.</p>	No change required.
		Q2	Don't know – See answer to Question 1.	As above.	No change required.
		Q3	Don't know – See answer to Question1.	As above.	No change required.
		Q4	Don't know – See answer to Question1.	As above.	No change required.
		Q5	Don't know – See answer to Question1.	As above.	No change required.
		Further comments	We don't believe we have received notification of the consultation and have only now become aware of it. The documents are very long and technical despite a commitment in the Draft Delivery Agreement to provide EASY READ DOCUMENTS.	See response to Q1 above.	No change required.

			<p>██████████ do not have the resources to properly review and comment upon documents of this nature. Please advise if there are any recommendations which will impact Cowbridge, Llanblethian or Aberthin. Please advise the next steps and keep us informed.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix C: Proposed Amendments to Draft Delivery Agreement and Draft Review Report

DELIVERY AGREEMENT AMENDMENTS

Paragraphs 1.2.6. – 1.3.2. read:

1.2.6. This document is the Council's draft DA and it will be subject to a public consultation. The draft DA will then be revised as necessary before being formally approved by the Council and submitted to the Welsh Government for agreement.

1.2.7. The public consultation on the draft Delivery Agreement (DA) will commence on Friday 5th November 2021 and end on Monday 31st January 2022. Comments can be made any of the following ways:

- Email: Please complete the consultation form available of the Council's web page at www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk/ldp and send it to: LDP@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk
- Post: Please complete the consultation form available from the Council's principal office at Holton Road, Barry or from the LDP team (telephone 01446 704665) and return it to:

The LDP Team,
The Vale of Glamorgan Council,
The Dock Office,
Subway Road,
Barry,
CF63 4RT.

1.3. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

1.3.1. Following the end of the consultation period, officers will consider the comments received on the draft DA and make any necessary changes. The final amended DA will be reported to the Cabinet and Full Council for approval in accordance with LDP Regulation 9 before submission to the Welsh Government. The Welsh Government's role is to ensure that the DA is robust, realistic and covers the main plan preparation requirements.

1.3.2. Following agreement by the Welsh Government, the DA will be published on the Council's website and made available for inspection at the Council's principal office during normal office hours in accordance with LDP Regulation 10.

Amend Paragraphs 1.2.6. – 1.3.2 to read:

1.2.6. **The draft version of this Delivery Agreement was subject to a public consultation between Friday 5th November 2021 and Monday 31st January 2022. Following the end of the consultation period, officers considered the comments received on the draft DA and made any necessary changes. The amended DA was then reported to the Cabinet and Full Council for**

approval in accordance with LDP Regulation 9 before submission to the Welsh Government. The Welsh Government's role is to ensure that the DA is robust, realistic and covers the main plan preparation requirements.

1.2.7. Following approval from the Welsh Government, the DA has now been published on the Council's website and made available for inspection at the Council's principal office during normal office hours in accordance with LDP Regulation 10.

.....
Paragraph 2.3.13 reads:

TOWN AND COMMUNITY COUNCILS

2.3.13. Town and Community Councils play a key role in disseminating important information to residents within their area. They will be consulted at all stages of the RLDP process and encouraged to raise awareness of the RLDP within their local communities. They can provide up to date local information and opinions on any proposals within their area and are also provide details of any land use-based aspirations they have for their community.

Amend paragraph 2.3.13 to read:

TOWN AND COMMUNITY COUNCILS

2.3.13. Town and Community Councils play a key role in disseminating important information to residents within their area. They will be consulted at all stages of the RLDP process and encouraged to raise awareness of the RLDP within their local communities. They can provide up to date local information and opinions on any proposals within their area, provide details of any land use-based aspirations they have for their community **and can help to identify key local land use issues.**

.....
Section 4.2 – Appendix 2: Summary of Community Involvement in RLDP Key Stages

Community Involvement Timetable and Proposed Methods of Engagement - Definitive Stages

Stage 2 – Pre-Deposit Preparation & Participation (Regulations 14 & 15) reads:

Stages in the RLDP Process - Review / update existing LDP evidence base (including ISA / SEA baseline and framework)

When / Timescale – June 2021 – September 2023

Amend Stage 2 – Pre-Deposit Preparation & Participation (Regulations 14 & 15) to read:

Stages in the RLDP Process - Review / update existing LDP evidence base (including ISA / SEA baseline and framework)

When / Timescale – June 2021 – **February 2024**

.....

Section 4.3 - Appendix 3 - Detailed RLDP timetable – Amend as follows:

Stage 2 Pre-Deposit Preparation and Participation

- Review and update evidence base (including ISA / SEA framework) – the timeframe for this stage has been extended until **February 2024** as shown in the table in Appendix 3
- Prepare CS register and undertake CS assessments - – the timeframe for this stage has been extended until **February 2024** as shown in the table in Appendix 3
- Consultation on ISA Scoping Report (5 weeks) – the table in Appendix 3 for this timetable has been amended to reflect that the consultation will be held across 5 weeks (August/September 2022)

REVIEW REPORT AMENDMENTS

Paragraph 1.2 reads:

1.2.1. The Council is seeking stakeholder views on the matters set out in this draft Review Report. Views are sought on the issues that should be considered in the full review of the LDP, together with the subsequent potential changes required to the LDP, as set out in this report.

1.2.2. Stakeholders are invited to comment on / suggest any additional issues and / or changes that should be considered in the full review of the LDP. Any comments should be supported by relevant evidence.

1.2.3. A consultation response form is available on the Council's website ([click here](#)). If you require assistance accessing or completing the consultation form, please contact the LDP Policy Team on 01446 704665 or email LDP@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk

1.2.4. Comments need to be submitted by Monday 31st January 2022.

Amend Paragraph 1.2 to read:

1.2.1. **The Council sought stakeholder views on the matters set out in the draft Review Report. Views were sought on the issues that should be considered in the full review of the LDP, together with the subsequent potential changes required to the LDP.**

1.2.2. **The consultation on the draft version of this document was held between Friday 5th November 2021 and Monday 31st January 2022. During this time, stakeholders were invited to comment on / suggest any additional issues and / or changes that should be considered in the full review of the LDP.**

1.2.3. **Following closure of this consultation and the processing of all representations made, the draft Review Report was endorsed by Cabinet on Monday 14th March 2022 and subsequently by Full Council on Monday 25th April 2022. The updated Review Report was submitted to Welsh**

Government in accordance with Section 69 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act and approved in May 2022.

.....
Insert new paragraph at 3.2.21 to read:

Coronavirus Act 2020

3.2.21 **The Coronavirus Act gives the government powers to take the right action to respond effectively to the progress of the coronavirus pandemic. A declaration of threat to public health in Wales due to COVID-19 was made by the First Minister on 29 March 2020 under Schedule 22 of the Act. This was required in order to exercise the powers conferred upon the Welsh Ministers under that Act relating to events, gatherings and premises in Wales. Furthermore, under Section 78 of this Act, Local Authorities are permitted to make provisions relating to the holding of Local Authority meetings, including public admission and access to these meetings. The Delivery Agreement recognises the need to adapt methods of engagement in light of the pandemic.**

.....
Paragraph 3.3.12 reads:

TECHNICAL ADVICE NOTES

3.3.12. Since the adoption of the LDP, the following changes have been made to Technical Advice Notes (TAN) in Wales:

- TAN 1: Joint Housing Land Availability Studies was revoked by Welsh Government in March 2020.
- TAN 11: Noise. There was a call for evidence made in early 2020 to support the review of the TAN to include air quality and soundscape.
- TAN 14: Coastal Planning was recently updated, and consultation responses are being reviewed.
- TAN 15: Development and Flood Risk was recently updated, and consultation responses are being reviewed. Final TAN 15 is due to be published in Autumn 2021.
- TAN 20: Planning and the Welsh Language updated in October 2017.

Amend Paragraph 3.3.12 to read:

TECHNICAL ADVICE NOTES

3.3.12. Since the adoption of the LDP, the following changes have been made to Technical Advice Notes (TAN) in Wales:

- TAN 1: Joint Housing Land Availability Studies was revoked by Welsh Government in March 2020.
- TAN 11: Noise. There was a call for evidence made in early 2020 to support the review of the TAN to include air quality and soundscape.
- TAN 14: Coastal Planning was recently updated, and consultation responses are being reviewed.
- TAN 15: Development and Flood Risk (**Publication by the Welsh government of the revised TAN 15 has been paused until June 2023**) was recently updated, and consultation responses are being reviewed. Final TAN 15 is due to be published in Autumn 2021.

- TAN 20: Planning and the Welsh Language updated in October 2017.
- **TAN 24: The Historic Environment.**

.....

Paragraph 3.4.2 reads:

3.4.2. The Regulations governing the scope, content, and procedures for the preparation of SDPs were laid on 22 March 2021 and will come into force on 28th February 2022, the date by which Corporate Joint Committees tasked with the responsibility of SDP production shall become fully operational.

Amend Paragraph 3.4.2

3.4.2. The Regulations governing the scope, content, and procedures for the preparation of SDPs were laid on 22 March 2021 and will come into force **in June 2022, when** Corporate Joint Committees tasked with the responsibility of SDP production shall become fully operational.

.....

Title to Paragraph 3.4.6 reads: NATURAL RESOURCE WALE AREA STATEMENTS

Amend to read: NATURAL RESOURCE WALESS AREA STATEMENTS

.....

Paragraphs 3.6.2 – 3.6.3 read:

3.6.2. The WBP was adopted on the 18th April 2018 and details how the Well-being Objectives have been set, includes short and long-term actions and sets out how the Plan fits with other partnership plans and strategies and the outcomes the PSB wants to achieve. The PSB's four Well-being Objectives are:

- To enable people to get involved, participate in their local communities and shape local service
- To reduce poverty and tackle inequalities linked to deprivation
- To give children the best start in life
- To protect, enhance and value our environment.

3.6.3. The WBP actions reflect where partners think their collective action can add the greatest value in contributing to the seven national well-being goals for Wales. Section 5 of this review report provides further consideration on the WBP and its relationship to the LDP review.

Amend Paragraphs 3.6.2 – 3.6.3 to read:

3.6.2. The **first** WBP was adopted on the 18th April 2018 and details how the Well-being Objectives have been set, includes short and long-term actions and sets out how the Plan fits with other partnership plans and strategies and the outcomes the PSB wants to achieve. The PSB's four Well-being Objectives are:

- To enable people to get involved, participate in their local communities and shape local service
- To reduce poverty and tackle inequalities linked to deprivation
- To give children the best start in life
- To protect, enhance and value our environment.

- 3.6.3. The WBP actions reflect where partners think their collective action can add the greatest value in contributing to the seven national well-being goals for Wales. Section 5 of this review report provides further consideration on the WBP and its relationship to the LDP review. **The Public Services Board consulted on a new draft Well-being Assessment between the 10th January and the 13th February 2022 and will publish a new Well-being Assessment in April 2022 and a new Well-being Plan in May 2023.**
-

Paragraph 6.3.13 reads:

6.3.13. In this respect at 1st April 2021, 40 of the 48 housing sites have either been developed, are under construction, have been granted planning permission or are subject of a planning application pending a Council decision. The sites which have not come forward under the current Plan are listed below:

- MG2 (3) – Land at Church Farm, St Athan
- MG2 (4) – Former Stadium Site / Land adjacent to Burley Place, St Athan
- MG2 (8) - Barry Island Pleasure Park (previous planning consent lapsed)
- MG2 (11) - Land to the west of Pencoedtre Lane
- MG2 (19) - Land adjoining St. Athan Road, Cowbridge
- MG2 (23) - Former Eagleswell Primary School
- MG2 (26) - Headlands School, St. Augustine’s Road
- MG2 (34) - Llandough Landings

Amend Paragraph 6.3.13 to read:

6.3.13. In this respect at 1st April 2021, **40 38** of the 48 housing sites have either been developed, are under construction, have been granted planning permission or are subject of a planning application pending a Council decision. The sites which have **not yet to** come forward under the current Plan are listed below:

- MG2 (3) – Land at Church Farm, St Athan
- MG2 (4) – Former Stadium Site / Land adjacent to Burley Place, St Athan
- MG2 (8) - Barry Island Pleasure Park (previous planning consent lapsed)
- MG2 (11) - Land to the west of Pencoedtre Lane
- **MG2 (14) – Court Road Depot, Barry**
- MG2 (19) - Land adjoining St. Athan Road, Cowbridge
- MG2 (23) - Former Eagleswell Primary School
- MG2 (26) - Headlands School, St. Augustine’s Road
- **MG2 (27) – Land adjacent to Oak Court, Penarth**
- MG2 (34) - Llandough Landings

.....

Paragraph 6.3.33 reads:

6.3.33. The most recent AMR (2020-21) identifies that the target for employment land delivery of 20% by 2020 has been delivered. The next monitoring target outlined in the LDP Monitoring Framework states the Council needs “to secure planning permissions on 44% (163 ha) of employment land by 2022. It should be noted that two applications have recently been approved in April 2021 falling outside of the third AMR period 2019/01421/RES (MG9 (1) in part) and 2020/01367/RG3 (MG9 (4) Plot C in part) which equates to (9.225ha). In addition, an

outline application for the southern part of the allocation referred to as 'land adjacent to Cardiff Airport and Port Road, Rhoose was approved at the 21st July 2021 Planning Committee which would deliver 40.8ha of employment land once developed subject to reserved matters. This helps to demonstrate that employment allocations are steadily coming forward during the Plan period and the Council are on track to meet the next monitoring target (Appendix 3 sets out all developments approved including those outside the most recent AMR period).

Amend Paragraph 6.3.33 to read:

6.3.33. The most recent AMR (2020-21) identifies that the target for employment land delivery of 20% by 2020 has been delivered. The next monitoring target outlined in the LDP Monitoring Framework states the Council needs "to secure planning permissions on 44% (163 ha) of employment land by 2022. It should be noted that two applications have recently been approved in April 2021 falling outside of the third AMR period 2019/01421/RES (MG9 (1) in part) and 2020/01367/RG3 (MG9 (4) Plot C in part) which equates to (9.225ha). ~~In addition, an outline application for the southern part of the allocation referred to as 'land adjacent to Cardiff Airport and Port Road, Rhoose was approved at the 21st July 2021 Planning Committee which would deliver 40.8ha of employment land once developed subject to reserved matters. This~~ helps to demonstrate that employment allocations are steadily coming forward during the Plan period and the Council are on track to meet the next monitoring target (Appendix 3 sets out all developments approved including those outside the most recent AMR period).

.....
Table 11 reads:

Table 11: Jobs Delivered via Planning Approvals on Employment Allocations

Application no.	Type	Site name	Jobs delivered
2019/00871/OUT	Strategic	Land adjacent to Cardiff Airport and Port Road (part of the Cardiff Airport and St Athan Enterprise Zone)	2,000 (subject to reserved matters)
2016/00890/FUL 2017/00756/FUL 2019/01260/HYB	Strategic	St Athan Aerospace Business Park (part of the Cardiff Airport and St Athan Enterprise Zone)	200 550 1,055
2014/00228/EAO	Strategic	Land to the South of Junction 34 M4 Hensol	3,069 (subject to reserved matters)
2019/01421/RES	Local		750
2014/00932/FUL	Local	Atlantic Trading Estate	12
2015/00668/FUL			17
2017/00316/FUL			10
2018/01317/FUL	Local	Hayes Lane, Sully	60
2020/01367/RG3	Local	Atlantic Trading Estate	8
Total (including reserved matters)			7,731
Total (approved)			2,662

Amend Table 11 to read:

Table 11: Anticipated No. of Jobs Delivered via Planning Approvals on Employment Allocations

Application no.	Type	Site name	Anticipated No. of Jobs delivered
2019/00871/OUT	Strategic	Land adjacent to Cardiff Airport and Port Road (part of the Cardiff Airport and St Athan Enterprise Zone)	2,000 (subject to reserved matters)
2016/00890/FUL 2017/00756/FUL 2019/01260/HYB	Strategic	St Athan Aerospace Business Park (part of the Cardiff Airport and St Athan Enterprise Zone)	200 550 1,055
2014/00228/EAO	Strategic	Land to the South of Junction 34 M4 Hensol	3,069 (subject to reserved matters)
2019/01421/RES	Local		750
2014/00932/FUL	Local	Atlantic Trading Estate	12
2015/00668/FUL			17
2017/00316/FUL			10
2018/01317/FUL	Local	Hayes Lane, Sully	60
2020/01367/RG3	Local	Atlantic Trading Estate	8
Total (including reserved matters)			7,731-5,731
Total (approved)			2,662

.....

Paragraph 6.3.48 reads:

6.3.48. The Council adopted the Cardiff Airport & Gateway Development Zone Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on 16th December 2019 which will guide future development on the site. An outline planning application (2019/00871/OUT refers) in relation to the allocated employment land south of Port Road comprising 44.75 hectares of B1, B2 and B8 business park, associated car parking, drainage infrastructure, biodiversity provision and ancillary works together with a country park extension was approved on 14th July 2021.

Amend Paragraph 6.3.48 to read:

6.3.48. The Council adopted the Cardiff Airport & Gateway Development Zone Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on 16th December 2019 which will guide future development on the site. An outline planning application (2019/00871/OUT refers) **was approved on the 14th July 2021** in relation to the allocated employment land south of Port Road comprising 44.75 hectares of B1, B2 and B8 business park, associated car parking, drainage infrastructure, biodiversity provision and ancillary works together with a country park extension. ~~was approved on 14th July 2021.~~ **However, this planning permission was quashed in October 2021 when the Court Order by HHJ Jarman QC, confirmed the application for permission for judicial review was granted. The planning application is now back with the Council for determination and will be reviewed and presented back to Planning Committee for determination in due course.**

.....

Paragraph 7.4.2 reads:

7.4.2. Policies SP5 and MG9 relate to the employment allocations and seek to ensure there is sufficient employment land supply to meet future demand. The AMR target for 2020 was to

secure planning permission on 20% (73.6ha) of allocated employment land. The Council has slightly exceeded the 2020 monitoring target for this indicator. The LDP allocates a total of 368.91 ha (net) of employment land in Policy MG9. During the LDP period (from 2011 onwards) the Council has approved 87.039 ha of employment uses on the employment allocations which equates to 23.59% of allocated employment land. The next monitoring target outlined in the LDP Monitoring Framework states the Council needs “to secure planning permissions on 44% (163 ha) of employment land by 2022. It should be noted that two applications have been approved in April 2021 falling outside of the third AMR period namely 2019/01421/RES (MG9 (1) in part) and 2020/01367/RG3 (MG9 (4) Plot C in part) which equates to 9.225ha. In addition, 44.75ha of employment land at Model Farm (MG9[2]) was approved in July 2021. This demonstrates that employment allocations are steadily coming forward during the plan period and the Council are on track to meet the next monitoring target.

Amend Paragraph 7.4.2 to read:

7.4.2. Policies SP5 and MG9 relate to the employment allocations and seek to ensure there is sufficient employment land supply to meet future demand. The AMR target for 2020 was to secure planning permission on 20% (73.6ha) of allocated employment land. The Council has slightly exceeded the 2020 monitoring target for this indicator. The LDP allocates a total of 368.91 ha (net) of employment land in Policy MG9. During the LDP period (from 2011 onwards) the Council has approved 87.039 ha of employment uses on the employment allocations which equates to 23.59% of allocated employment land. The next monitoring target outlined in the LDP Monitoring Framework states the Council needs “to secure planning permissions on 44% (163 ha) of employment land by 2022. It should be noted that two applications have been approved in April 2021 falling outside of the third AMR period namely 2019/01421/RES (MG9 (1) in part) and 2020/01367/RG3 (MG9 (4) Plot C in part) which equates to 9.225ha. ~~In addition, 44.75ha of employment land at Model Farm (MG9[2]) was approved in July 2021.~~ This demonstrates that employment allocations are steadily coming forward during the plan period and the Council are on track to meet the next monitoring target.

.....
Paragraph 7.13.6 reads:

7.13.6. Consequently, it is considered Policy MD19 – Low Carbon and Renewable Energy Generation, has been effective in delivering windfall renewable developments within the Vale of Glamorgan. However, as noted it is considered a review of the background evidence to the renewable energy policies is required to ensure they reflect national objectives, this includes a greater focus on delivering heat networks which is identified under Policy 16 – Heat Networks of the Future Wales: National Development Plan 2040.

Amend Paragraph 7.13.6 to read:

7.13.6. Consequently, it is considered Policy MD19 – Low Carbon and Renewable Energy Generation, has been effective in delivering windfall renewable developments within the Vale of Glamorgan. However, as noted it is considered a review of the background evidence to the renewable energy policies is required to ensure they reflect national objectives, this includes a greater focus on delivering heat networks which is identified under Policy 16 – Heat Networks of the Future Wales: National Development Plan 2040. **In addition, consideration will also be given to the potential of the Aberthaw Power Station site for renewable energy generation and other appropriate uses through the RLDP review process.**

.....

Paragraph 10.1.1 reads:

10.1.1. Overall, it is considered that the LDP strategy remains relevant. It has been effective in promoting development opportunities in the key settlement of Barry and in other urban settlements in the South East Zone. The ongoing regeneration of Barry Waterfront has been particularly successful in providing a mix of uses including housing, employment, retail and leisure as well as new infrastructure. The Cardiff Airport and Bro Tathan Enterprise Zone has attracted significant new inward investment to the Vale of Glamorgan and will continue to be a key consideration in the Replacement LDP. Additional growth in the sustainable settlements has also helped to spread the benefits of new development more evenly across the authority and support existing local services and facilities. Having reviewed the policies based on the previous AMRs and internal consultation with the development management team, the majority are considered to be working effectively. The Replacement LDP will therefore need to consider the findings of the three AMRs, contextual and policy changes, an updated evidence base and the future needs of the Vale up to 2036 including housing and employment provision.

Amend Paragraph 10.1.1 to read:

10.1.1. Overall, it is considered that the LDP strategy remains relevant. It has been effective in promoting development opportunities in the key settlement of Barry and in other urban settlements in the South East Zone. The ongoing regeneration of Barry Waterfront has been particularly successful in providing a mix of uses including housing, employment, retail and leisure as well as new infrastructure. The Cardiff Airport and Bro Tathan Enterprise Zone has attracted significant new inward investment to the Vale of Glamorgan and will continue to be a key consideration in the Replacement LDP. Additional growth in the sustainable settlements has also helped to spread the benefits of new development more evenly across the authority and support existing local services and facilities. Having reviewed the policies based on the previous AMRs and internal consultation with the development management team, the majority are considered to be working effectively. The Replacement LDP will therefore need to consider the findings of the three AMRs, contextual and policy changes, an updated evidence base and the future needs of the Vale up to 2036 including housing and employment provision. **The Council has joined the Welsh Government and other local authorities in Wales in declaring Climate Change and Nature Emergencies. The Replacement Local Development Plan has a key role to play in making development resilient to climate change and protecting and enhancing the natural environment.**

.....
Table 12 reads:

Table 12: Adopted LDP Anticipated Jobs Delivered by Employment Allocations

Amend Table 12 to read:

Table 12: Adopted LDP **Anticipated** Jobs Delivered by Employment Allocations

APPENDIX D – Letter to all specific and general consultation bodies, respondents to the public consultation and those who have asked to be kept informed of progress on the Replacement LDP

Dear Consultee,

Draft Review Report and Draft Replacement Local Development Plan Delivery Agreement Consultation Update

As you may be aware, the Council carried out a public consultation on the draft Delivery Agreement and draft Review Report between 5th November 2021 and 31st January 2022. The comments received together with the Council's responses were reported to Cabinet and Council in March and April 2022 respectively. The amended Review Report and Delivery Agreement will be submitted to the Welsh Government for approval in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the LDP Regulations 2005 (as amended).

Many of the comments received related to specific policies and allocated sites in the adopted Local Development Plan and other planning matters as opposed to the draft Review Report or the draft Delivery Agreement. Such comments are more relevant to the subsequent stages of the Replacement LDP process, and the Council will bear these in mind when preparing the evidence base, Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan in due course. As set out in Appendix 2 of the Delivery Agreement, there will be a number of further engagement opportunities during the Replacement LDP process for stakeholders to get involved and raise such issues if relevant.

If you require any further information on the Replacement LDP, please contact the Planning Policy team on 01446 704665 or e mail LDP@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk