



For Office use only

Representor No.

Date Received.....

Date of Acknowledgement

Vale of Glamorgan Replacement Local Development Plan 2021-2036

DEPOSIT PLAN CONSULTATION

Public Consultation Representation Form

The Council is seeking your views on the Replacement Local Development Plan (RLDP) **Deposit Plan**. The Deposit Plan is the next formal stage in the development plan preparation process and expands on the Preferred Strategy which the Council consulted on in December 2023 – February 2024.

The Deposit Plan is the full draft version of the RLDP, detailing the **overall strategy, development policies, land designations** (e.g. conservation) and **specific land allocations** for development (including new housing and employment sites) over the 15-year period 2021-2036.

The public consultation will run for 6 weeks between **Wednesday 28th January 2026 and Wednesday 11th March 2026**. Representations received after this time will not be considered.

Full details of the consultation are available on the Council's website at: www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk/ldp or by scanning the QR code above.

The Council encourages representations on the Deposit Plan to be made via our **online consultation portal** available at <https://valeofglamorgan.oc2.uk/> however representations submitted using this form will also be accepted.

Representations are welcomed in both Welsh and English and this representation form is available in other formats on request e.g. Welsh, large print.

1: Contact Details

Your / Your Client's Details			Agent's Details (if relevant) *		
Title	PROFESSOR		Title		
Name	ANDREW VINCENT		Name		
Organisation (If applicable)			Organisation (If applicable)		
Address			Address		
Postcode			Postcode		
Email			Email		
Telephone No.			Telephone No.		
Communication preference: (Please tick)	Email	☐	Communication preference: (Please tick)	Email	☐
	Letter	☒		Letter	☐
Language preference: (Please tick)	English	☒	Language preference: (Please tick)	English	☐
	Welsh	☐		Welsh	☐

*If you are acting as an Agent, please also provide details of person/organisation you are representing (Note: you will need to supply a separate form for each person/organisation you are representing).

Re the Vale of Glamorgan Planning RLDP and the Weycock Cross NW Barry site. There are two related issues which concern me as a resident. The first focuses on the Vale RLDP as a whole and a major concern is the manner in which the whole RLDP has been presented to the public and the compressed time period in which to read, digest and comment.

Vale Planning have already recently replied to a number of residents on the above timing question, namely, that they (Vale Planning) were only fulfilling a statutory requirement of six weeks. This response misses the point. The statutory consultation period is not the issue for residents. The core issue is rather the clumsy, overlong and ill-organised character of the whole RLDP, which eats up time. Vale Planning have a public duty of care for local residents, namely, to minimally help and facilitate public understandings of the issues. Sadly they entirely failed in this basic responsibility. Intentionally or not Vale Planning quite literally dumped thousands of pages of technical documents on the website with little or no guidance or clear pathways for ordinary readers, which is an unforgivable administrative lapse.

Vale Planning have argued that they do provide short executive summaries for documents. However this argument cuts no ice. Most of the executive summaries give no clear indication as to whether there are any *substantive* details about a relevant site for the reader. Therefore one can only ascertain whether a particular site is being addressed by trawling hundreds of pages of dense technical text. Consequently, the arguments that residents should either only read and comment on their own site, or that they should only read executive summaries, is spurious. Multiple PDFs in the RLDP on, for example, traffic, drainage, the environment (dropped in at random throughout the whole RLDP website), will often contain more detailed micro-policy comments on a relevant site. However, such micro-policy comments are literally submerged deep within hundreds of pages of dense text. The overall effect of this kaleidoscopic website is thus continual bafflement.

Like many residents I attended the walk-in sessions with Planning; however the *only* advice we were given by Planning operatives when we raised critical queries was that we had to *consult the details of the online website*. Notably this was also the same case for any paper-based responses. The supposed online evidence documents *had to be* addressed. The website has therefore been the evasive linchpin of this whole debacle. This makes the whole consultation process largely inaccessible to ordinary folk and those who have limited digital skills or limited time due to responsibilities. In point, for those with limited digital skills, the online RLDP offends against basal principles of natural justice. It is intrinsically discriminatory. This is simply not democratic consultation.

It is worth noting here, in passing, the *factual* nature of this timing issue. In running a Microsoft's CoPilot AI full analysis of the current RLDP, in terms of basic reading time, evaluation and assessment of the document. CoPilot concluded that "It would take a single reviewer approximately 1,103 hours (roughly 27.5 weeks of full-time work) to complete this task". This would be reading every day, all day, for 27 weeks. Bizarrely, Vale planning and Council appear to see no problem here whatsoever.

My second major concern is the specific KS1 Weycock Cross site. The need for housing is not the issue; it is rather *where* housing is situated and Weycock Cross KS1 is an inappropriate site. The reasons for this are clear. Weycock Cross is already a traffic pinch point, mentioned in Planning documents and previous inquiries in the 1990s and 2015, as being at or beyond capacity. The proposed 376 houses (on the KS1 site) will eventuate in up to 700 or more cars, whose only *one* exit/entrance (for schools, work, the station) will be directly onto Port Road, about 20 yards from Weycock Roundabout. Vale Planning suggest that a third lane just by the roundabout and a traffic light will solve the issue. However, *two* lanes along the whole length of Port Road remain *two* lanes, until immediately by the roundabout. Gridlock will therefore inevitably worsen. No evidence whatsoever is provided either on the effect of traffic lights, or the exit/entry point for the NW Barry KS1 site. This all remains blank. Further, over the next decade housing growth in St. Athan, Rhoose, Llantwit and airport expansion will funnel further sizeable increases in traffic into Port Road, on their way to Cardiff or the M4. This is a recipe for traffic chaos.

Vale Planning present alleged evidence documents (well over a thousand dense technical pages on traffic). Puzzlingly nothing is said about *how* or *when* this supposed empirical evidence was collected. Documents BP14 and BP14A remain totally silent on this. The Persimmon traffic document indicates that "one" day in September 2023 was used. If the latter embodies their collection method, can it really be viewed as an accurate assessment, namely, one three-year-old snapshot on one day? Consequently the bulk of the highly technical-sounding data remains simply an unwieldy conjecture based on thin and dubious collection methods. Vale Planning admittedly do try to further alleviate this whole traffic issue by suggesting that walking and cycling will replace car use for those going to the station, Barry town, GPs and so forth. However this is unevidenced wishful thinking. A walk from Barry station to Weycock Cross is a tough 35–40-minute uphill push, totally impractical for the majority. Similarly the blunt Vale Planning statement that there are regular bus services from the Weycock site is not just wishful thinking it is just false and there is little to no prospect (in the current febrile financial environment) of any change. Vale Planning do need to stop hallucinating.

In addition to increasing traffic gridlock residents on Port Road, Pontypridd Road and Colcot Road already suffer high pollution and noise levels every weekday morning and evening from very slow moving or idling vehicles. No air quality studies have been undertaken at all by Vale Planning. Traffic pollution will only worsen with the KS1 site. Further, well over a thousand or more new residents from the site will be scrabbling for already way over-subscribed GP and Dental services, which, of course, they will travel to by car. Yet, Vale Planning keep articulating their proposals for KS1 as developing 'high quality places' that work for the 'benefit of community'. I simply fail to see this.

There are a number of further issues relating to, for example, the Green wedge. I attended the previous Public Inquiry in 2014/15 and paradoxically Planning defended the Green wedge (between Barry and Rhoose) as necessary to prevent urban sprawl and coalescence towards Rhoose. Planning have now performed a baffling *volte face*. The developer-based arguments they robustly denied in 2014 have now been enthusiastically embraced. KS1 and the green wedge seem only to figure now in current planning proposals because there was failure to purchase land on the preferred Northeast Barry site. Essentially, KS1 was dropped in at the last moment in December 2025 since it was just administratively easier to proceed with. The destruction of 'green wedge' in this context looks simply like the worst form of expediency. The wedge fields of well-utilised farmland, as well as preventing urban sprawl, also provide a core wild-life corridor into the Vale. They are also crucial areas for rainwater absorption in a time of both accelerating climate change and significantly increased precipitation. Residents are concerned already about problematic drainage, foul water and sewage capacity as it stands. All that Vale Planning have iterated is that Welsh Water and Persimmon are aware of the issues. This is simply not good enough.

A personal comment: I attended a council Scrutiny meeting in December 2025 where a vote was taken to remove KS1 from the RLDP. This proposal was rejected by a one vote majority. Despite the fact that certain Labour councillors spoke for its removal in the meeting, in the voting process they abstained. It appears that Labour whipping enforced the one vote majority. Without this whipping KS1 would have been removed. This could hardly be described as a glowing democratic endorsement of KS1's late inclusion in the RLDP.

Andrew Vincent