

COLWINSTON COMMUNITY COUNCIL

OBJECTION to Candidate Site 4069: Land to the East of Colwinston

Colwinston Community Council has given detailed consideration to the above Candidate Site, and has taken into account views and representations made by individual residents including those at the Colwinston Community Meeting held on 16th February 2026.

The GIS analysis in the ISA report for the Deposit Plan (Nov 25) concludes on **Page 142** that the development of Site 4069 would have an 82% negative impact on the 17 objectives listed:

- 29% major negative effects
- 35% minor negative effects
- 18% impact uncertain

The only two objectives for Site 4069 judged to have a **minor** positive impact were:

- not intersecting with a nitrate vulnerable zone
- being within a reasonable distance to a primary school (albeit a faith school) but not a secondary school.

The only other objective judged to have a **minor** positive impact was the proposed 25 new homes.

This imbalance demonstrates Site 4069 as most unsuitable and likely to cause significant irreversible damage to Colwinston village.

Consequently, Colwinston Community Council formally object to the inclusion of Site ID 4069 as a Candidate Site for housing in the Replacement Local Development Plan 2021 to 2036, and formally request that Site 4069 is removed permanently from the preferred Candidates List (*along with the four other Candidate Sites already rejected – 3834, 2782, 474, 409*). This is further supported by the following justifications:

Context

Colwinston is a small rural village granted Conservation Area status in 1970, and it includes a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC 147) and forms part of the main route of the Valeways Heritage Millenium Trail. It has many items listed as Scheduled Historic Monuments and County Treasures, and its ancient woodland forms part of the National Forest of Wales. The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP) 2009 recommends resisting any development applications for change on the edge of the Conservation Area that would have a detrimental effect on the area's setting. However, Colwinston has experienced recently a housing development with urban-style features - Heol Cae Pwll; a development with 35% affordable housing in addition to other historic affordable housing in the village, unlike some other minor rural settlements in the Vale.

Its infrastructure includes a larger-than-average rural primary school and poorly maintained road system comprising of narrow twisting lanes where two-way traffic is a problem in many places. Utility services are working to capacity; the village continues to have an electricity supply that can be unstable, an unreliable internet service and a mobile phone signal that is exceptionally weak to non-existent. The drainage and sewage system services are failing and there is no mains gas meaning residents pay much higher costs. Connectivity is poor with no public transport system, no adequate village shop, no public telephone box, and poor digital connectivity.

1. Overdevelopment of Colwinston Village:

Comments from Geraint John Planning in the Housing Land Supply and Trajectory Report (Dec 2025) have been omitted from the RDLP consultation but are fully supported by Colwinston Community Council:

“Significant allocations (which have also contributed to significant levels of affordable housing) have been realised and built out in locations (such as Wick and Colwinston). Notwithstanding this, two of the additional sites are now proposed for these recently expanded settlements. Given that the purpose of the affordable housing led allocations is to meet unmet affordable housing need, it is questioned why such new allocations are attributed to settlements that have already seen open market and affordable housing provision, as compared to other comparable settlements that have not received any growth whatsoever over a considerable period of time. It is considered accordingly that the geographic positioning of these allocations is at odds with their underlying purpose - to meet unmet affordable housing need in communities that have seen no provision”.

Before Heol Cae Pwll, there were approximately 155 homes in Colwinston. In addition to the recent Heol Cae Pwll development of 64 units (including 35% affordable homes), another 25 new homes in Colwinston would mean a total **increase by 57% since 2016 – a significant disproportionate expansion**. Development of Site 4069 will result in an unacceptable, cumulative size and density contrary to the village's historic setting, thus damaging its conservation status, rural heritage and identity. It would change from a compact historic settlement to an enlarged urban-style commuter settlement.

Furthermore, the development of Site 4069 will result in an inadvertent imbalance between the wider local needs, and the capacity and needs of Colwinston; no information has been provided on Colwinston's housing needs - either from the housing assessment or housing register - i.e. *specific settlement based future needs*. There is no evidence of demand for additional housing by individuals with a connection to the village.

2. Unacceptable Change to the Settlement Boundary

The special character of Colwinston is intrinsically linked to its scale, rural isolation and the clarity of its boundary. Changes to its Settlement Boundary will expose the village to potential further reshaping of the settlement and further development causing cumulative destruction of its rural character.

The RLDP proposes that the Settlement Boundary for Colwinston to be redrawn to include Candidate Site 4069 (Land to the East of Colwinston). This proposal lacks sufficient evidence, detailed consideration or justification specific to this settlement. There is an absence of any targeted consultation explaining the rationale for altering the established, historic Settlement Boundary. The inclusion of the site within the development boundary represents a material policy change. It is not merely an allocation decision but a redefinition of the spatial extent of the settlement.

- *Why has the Settlement Boundary been amended?*
- *What process has been followed to redraw the boundary to simply accommodate the development?*
- *Why do previous reasons for rejecting Site 4069 no longer apply?*
- *Why is Site 4069 now considered to be suitable for sustainable expansion?*

Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12 February 2024) (PPW) states that planning authorities must prioritise the use of suitable and sustainable under-utilised land/ sites for all types of development located **within** existing settlements in the first instance. Settlement boundaries ensure the delivery of sustainable development **within** sustainable settlements, **protecting the surrounding undeveloped countryside from inappropriate development**. The proposed development of Site 4069 does not align with these requirements or the spirit of planning legislation and guidance, and it deviates from the vision, aims and ten objectives of the RLDP.

The redrawing of the Settlement Boundary to include Site 4069 represents:

- a material expansion of the village's settlement
- a departure from the historic settlement form
- a change lacking transparent justification
- a decision inconsistent with Conservation Area protection and sustainable development
- a lack of evidence demonstrating due process being followed

This specific Settlement Boundary change lacks:

- a robust evidential basis for housing need within the settlement of Colwinston
- specific engagement with the community
- a strategic need for expansion of **this specific settlement**
- consistency with the settlement hierarchy
- compliance with placemaking principles that respect the Conservation status of the village and the need to protect the adjacent landscape
- sustainability credentials set out in the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal
- assessment of reasonable alternatives

The historic pattern of development challenges Site 4069 as a logical extension of growth. This is not an “infill” or “rounding off” opportunity and would be better described as a **RURAL CRAWL** towards the A48, **not conforming to the historic pattern of housing development** in the village; Colwinston consists of sporadic dwellings dotted around the main housing (including Heol Cae Pwll) which follows a linear path along the main lanes so that population density is spread. So, Site 4069 contradicts this, and therefore it would be an incursion into the countryside and an unusual, isolated, urban-style protrusion from the edge of the existing settlement. It would be an intrusion into the landscape causing a visually assertive edge beyond its current natural boundary. Indeed, it is described in the RLDP documentation as “the Land **to the East** of Colwinston.”

Contradictions in the assessment of Colwinston Candidate Sites and their Settlement Boundaries:

The other four Candidate Sites in Colwinston were rejected and not carried forward for consideration for following reasons:

- unacceptable intrusion in to the open countryside
- affected by major highways constraints
- limited services and facilities
- nearest bus stop over 1km but via lanes with no footpath
- on the edge of settlement
- development does not match existing pattern

All of the above also apply to Site 4069. Indeed, Site 4069 was discounted at the Preferred Strategy Stage 2A (Oct 2023) and assessment of the Site 4069 ‘Land to the East of Colwinston’ stated it “would represent unacceptable intrusion in to the **open countryside**.” This still applies as do the reasons above to Site 4069. But it was then taken forward as a candidate site at the Deposit Plan Stage because the Settlement Boundary was manipulated, so what was once “countryside” was now placed within the Settlement Boundary. This is unacceptable and unjustified.

More specifically, Site (ID 3834) was dismissed because it was outside the Settlement Boundary with the road “segregating it from the main village” – this also applies to Site 4069 which is segregated from the main village by Heol Cae Pwll and the **public footpath** running along the hedgerow across fields to the **Conservation Area**. Site 4069 would have a detrimental impact on people enjoying this footpath’s views of the open rolling landscapes and the visible conservation area. This boundary is clear on many maps including historic ones and those on the Vale’s website. But the amended Settlement Boundary maps (BP46 Nov 2025) are misleading; **the public footpath should clearly demarcate the end of the existing settlement of Colwinston. And for the reasons above, the Settlement Boundary for Colwinston needs to be reinstated to its original form and Site 4069 discounted as a Candidate Site for the RLDP.**

3. Irreversible damage to Colwinston’s landscape, environment, identity and historic character

Colwinston’s historic evolution is central to its **identity**; shaped by its medieval and agricultural landscape, incrementally changed and dispersed into a low-density built form embedded within the open countryside, and smoothly transitioning into the landscape. Long views across fields, hedgerows and open countryside form part of the village’s everyday rural heritage and identity.

Housing development on Site 4069 would:

- impact negatively on the **landscape character** by changing the historic views of rolling lowlands in and out of the village especially its Conservation Area;
- bring forward growth into much closer proximity to Colwinston’s **Conservation Area, Scheduled Historic Monuments and County Treasures**, changing how it is viewed in the wider **historic landscape** of the Vale and Wales, and becoming increasingly closer to and visible from the A48; the ISA states the site “*intersects or is adjacent to local or nationally designated historic assets*”
- increase carbon emissions and reduce air quality due to the increase in vehicles;
- detract from the **historical character and setting** of the village which has many historical features as mentioned above plus the restored Old Ford
- cause a loss of **Best and Most Versatile** agricultural land (BP23A)
- potentially worsen **local flood risks (TAN 15: 2021)**
- jeopardise existing **biodiversity** in the immediate area as well as Colwinston’s wider **ecological value** including its thriving **ancient woodland** (now part of the National Forest of Wales); the ISA determined the site “*does not intersect, but is within 1km of a designated site, and there is an element of uncertainty relating to the potential for significant effects.*” Indeed, the impact on the quality and character of Colwinston’s landscape is assessed as “*uncertain.*”

a) Conflict with Country Treasures Report and Conservation Area

The Vale of Glamorgan County Treasures Colwinston Report explicitly acknowledges that development adjacent to the eastern boundary would have a detrimental impact on the character and setting of Colwinston Conservation Area and that it would adversely affect the village and its Conservation Area (see section 14). It would fundamentally alter the historic relationship between the village, its many listed treasures and its surrounding countryside. Site 4069 forms part of the rural setting for the views in and out of the Conservation Area and it contributes to the settlement's special rural character and agricultural setting. Furthermore, development in this location was previously rejected because it *"would have an adverse impact on the character and setting of Colwinston Conservation Area"* – the land forming part of the sensitive setting of the Conservation Area and contributing to its significance, not visually divorced from the Conservation Area; rather, helping define its spatial form and historic context.

Statutory requirements afford this site protection and preservation as do the Placemaking objectives which aim for delineation of settlement boundaries to protect and enhance places that respect local distinctiveness and the existing setting.

b) Loss of Agricultural Land:

BP23A confirms that significant areas of the Vale comprise Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a). Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11, paragraphs 3.58–3.60) requires that BMV land be protected and **only released where there is an overriding need and no suitable alternative previously developed or lower-grade land available.**

The ISA assesses Site 4069 as:

- *"wholly within a mineral safeguarding area"*
- not intersecting *"with a nitrate vulnerable zone,"*
- *"predominantly greenfield land (>50%) and contains high quality agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a)."*

However, the inclusion of this greenfield agricultural land into the settlement boundary contradicts national policy on the protection of Best and Most Versatile land without demonstrating an overriding need. There is no evidence or assessment of the potential impact of the loss of productive agricultural land on the sustainable management of heritage, unique character, environment, biodiversity, landscape, natural resources and food resilience objectives. This loss of land would visually impact on historic field patterns and erode the perception of a compact rural settlement. Mitigation planting would not replicate the historic agricultural context that underpins the Conservation Area's significance.

4. Serious Concerns regarding Sustainability and Growth Strategy

The development of Site 4069 is not supported by the Vale of Glamorgan's preferred strategy for sustainable growth. It does not support the RLP's Vision and ten strategic objectives or six key elements for the following reasons:

a) Climate Change, Flood Risk and Drainage

The village is set on a safeguarded limestone escarpment which forms a watershed falling away from 90m asl. on the northern boundary to 45m asl. to the south. Natural drainage is via an underground (sometimes surface) watercourse through Heol Faen valley, under Beech Park, and joining Colwinston Brook and Ty Draw to the south then along to the Sewerage Pumping Station and Attenuation Tank.

After increasing amounts of heavy, prolonged rain in recent years, the land along the valley becomes saturated, the water table rises and a surface stream appears in the fields and lanes. This flows south towards the head of Beech Park where it enters a drainpipe system running underground to Church Lane where it joins the outflow from the Vines attenuation tank. The overwhelming of drainage in the village has been a historical problem whereby sewerage overflow combines with the surface water run-off. This development would represent a further loss of agricultural land 'sink' value for the site and for the area as a whole. The ISA states the site *"intersects with Groundwater Source Protection Zone."* These wider area drainage and sewerage capacity issues means Site 4069 and the surrounding area would require extensive remediation. The village also experiences low water pressure. The capacity and condition of existing water mains will not

support the further housing without additional investment in infrastructure. The financial viability of the Site 4069 is questionable and any s106 contributions would be insufficient thus detrimental to the village and the Council.

Local residents previously opposed the development at Heol Cae Pwll in 2016 on grounds of flooding risk, suggesting that the ground conditions in this area are known to experience water management issues; this is *evidence of community-recognized local conditions* and should be considered before any new land allocation, especially given climate change projections that increase localised flood risk. The LDP 2011 to 2026 acknowledged the *“historic record of localised surface water flooding”* in this area and problems still exist. Indeed, the Integrated Sustainability Assessment states Site 4069 intersects with high risk flood zones 2 and 3 and the site *“contains or is in close proximity (<1km) to a waterbody”* and *“building on greenfield could exasperate surface water flood risk,”* contrary to **TAN 15**.

b) Inadequate provision for Public Transport and Sustainable Travel

Significant investment in Highway infrastructure is needed for TAN 18 requirements that could potentially urbanise the village and damage its historic character and identity.

Colwinston is a minor rural village significantly lacking in safe and accessible public transport; the nearest bustops to Site 4069 are over 1km on the A48 and are dangerous to access with lack of footpaths and no pedestrian crossings on a 60mph road with 3 lanes. This makes Colwinston a **car-dependent village**. Contrary to the RDLP there are no safe footways, cycle routes or bus routes along the A48 or within the village for Colwinston residents. Greenlinks is an inadequate service due to its unreliability; often times do not suit the person's needs, work patterns, appointment times, or there is an insufficient number of drivers to provide the service. The previous LDP stated *“local highway improvements will be required to ease local parking and congestion problems surrounding the school in early morning/late afternoons given the sites close relationship to the primary school,”* yet this has **not been fulfilled** and has resulted in children's safety being jeopardised as well as grass verges opposite the school being unprotected and ruined; the lack of highway improvements in the village since the Heol Cae Pwll development has exasperated parking problems and congestion, and conditions for cycling or walking have deteriorated. Villagers have grave concerns about the already known highway safety issues around the school and Heol Cae Pwll; the anticipated increase in vehicles will endanger lives further. Visibility splays at entrances/exits on the A48 (Twmpath and Crack Hill) out of the village remain poor and non-compliant for a 60mph speed-restricted road; road surfaces in the village lanes have remained inadequate; and these lanes are hazardous with multiple obscuring bends and narrow sections of less than 1.8 metres. The national and local vision, aims and objectives emphasise **sustainable transport and active travel — development should ideally be located where the need to travel is reduced because residents can walk, cycle or use public transport to access employment, schools and services**. Additionally, the ISA stated Site 4069 was “not within reasonable walking distance (>800m) to a railway station or bus stop, town/ retail centre, or active travel route.”

Severe problem of Social Exclusion

Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11, paragraphs 5.7–5.18) requires the planning system to support decarbonisation and reduce reliance on private vehicles. The settlement's limited public transport provision and distance to higher-order services raise concerns regarding compliance with the sustainable transport hierarchy; active travel integration; locational sustainability principles.

TAN 18 recognises that *“The distinctive characteristics of rural areas including low population densities, the dispersion of job opportunities and the concentration of services in larger settlements restrict travel options. The car is important for accessibility in rural areas and is likely to remain so for the foreseeable future. However significant population groups including women, the young, the elderly and those with low incomes, who do not own a car or have limited access to a car can experience severe problems of social exclusion. Improving accessibility for these groups will help to promote social inclusion and reduce rural isolation.”*

Therefore, Site 4069 is most unsuitable and not in the public's best interests.

c) Inadequate employment opportunities for Economic Growth:

National and Local Planning aims to develop housing in areas to support economic growth and employment. However, Site 4069 would provide affordable homes in the **absence of good employment**, training or higher/further education opportunities. Employment outside the village is **car dependent**, especially for shift workers. In fact, the proposed site would **reduce employment** – the field is rented to a local sheep farmer, and young farmers are often employed to assist with hedge-cutting, hay making, lambing and feeding, thus keeping the agricultural heritage alive. Future generations will lose the opportunity to farm the land and improve the percentage of good soil. This is supported by the ISA which determined “*development at the site could result in the loss of existing employment land.*”

Site 4069 does not support the RDLP’s sustainable economic growth strategy as it will fail to reduce the reliance on cars to access good employment opportunities outside the village.

d) Inadequate Access and Physical Constraints:

The Pantiles and Waterton Lodge candidate sites (ID 2782 and 409) were unsuitable for affordable homes partly due to the “*physical constraints of access*” into the village through the poorly maintained single-track lane with no pavements or cycle paths and “*major highway constraints*” yet these same lanes are used to access Site 4069 via Heol Cae Pwll. The location is landlocked with only one small entrance at the end of a cul-de-sac passing Nos 19, 20, 21 with an unsafe visibility splay for more traffic. It would also require removing the rare grass verges, trees and shrubs for footways contrary to the original habitat planning stipulations for the Heol Cae Pwll development. Traffic congestion at Heol Cae Pwll exists due to the majority of children and staff travelling by car to school from outside the village. Staff and parents/carers park deep into Heol Cae Pwll and use the first and second cul-de-sac for parking and turning. With an increase of potentially 50 cars or more and with an expected increase in home deliveries, **this development is unsustainable and will exasperate current traffic problems.**

e) Inadequate access to essential key facilities and services:

Employment zones/areas exist outside the village; key sites and service centres exist outside the village; secondary schools are outside the village with no school transport for those pupils using Extended Schools activities; all health services and leisure centres are outside the village. Accessing essential key services and facilities are **car-dependent** requiring a journey of between 5km to 8km. Indeed, the ISA found “*The site is not within 800m of a health service or an active travel route.*” Additionally, it determined “*The site is not within 1,600m of a formal leisure and open space.*”

In summary, Colwinston is a minor rural location with poor connectivity to essential services and facilities **undermining the strategy’s sustainable travel objectives** (increasing car dependency and congestion), and additionally will not contribute to tackling **deprivation**, ensuring **equity** and **social inclusion**. As part of the ISA, it has been assessed as “*The site falls within one of the 40% least deprived (4th/ 5th quintile) LSOAs in Wales.*”

f) Parents have a limited choice of education:

Residents with primary-aged children may be car dependent for education if they require non-denominational education, fulltime Nursery education (aged below 3) or Welsh medium education which only exists outside the village. Extended School activities for Secondary school pupils are **car-dependent**. So, this site would negate the Welsh Government’s attempts to place affordable housing in the right areas for the right reasons - **to support diversity in communities, tackle deprivation and provide equity.**

5. Conflict with National and Local Planning requirements and policy

a) Proper consideration of reasonable alternatives has not been “sound” CE4

The land has been judged to be partially Grade 2 and 3 for agriculture (good to moderate quality greenfield), and therefore it should not be proposed as a candidate site when more suitable brownfield alternatives exist; the ISA states:

“there are no suitable sites in Colwinston that are completely unaffected by a BMV designation”

and therefore in line with National and Local Policy, Site 4069 should be removed from the Deposit Plan.

The RLDP ISA identifies alternative sites for residential housing; option 3 Cowbridge (para 5.4.10) was assessed but it was the lowest ranked alternative site. Should such a site specific assessment be conducted for Colwinston, then it would without doubt have a significantly more adverse comparative scoring to that assessed for Cowbridge.

It is not clear whether there has been an assessment of suitable alternative sites within the rural vale. Colwinston has provision for affordable housing currently, yet many other minor rural locations have none. No community-based housing need assessment information has been published to support the selection of the **specific settlement of Colwinston** for strategic growth as would be required under the Planning (Wales) Act 2015 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development Plan) (Wales) Regulations 2005 (as amended).

Additionally, GJP's Housing Land Supply and Housing Trajectory Report (Dec 2025) stated:

“Land to the East of Colwinston: The site was rejected and considered not suitable for further consideration. In fact, and unlike ‘Land at Heol Fain, Wick’ and ‘Land to north and west of Westwind’s Business Park’ it was stated that this site “could not be considered as a suitable affordable housing led development site”. Despite this, this site is identified to be allocated as an Affordable Housing Led Allocation. As such, the inclusion of this site is unsound.” Colwinston Community Council supports these very relevant views, and disagrees with their omission from the consultation.

b) Other regulatory requirements

Under the Planning (Wales) Act 2015, Town and Country Planning (Local Development Plan) (Wales) Regulations 2005 (as amended), and Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11) development boundaries may only be altered through the formal Local Development Plan process but the current Deposit Plan lacks:

- Habitats Regulations Assessment for the ancient woodland
- Justification within the spatial strategy and redrawing of settlement boundary
- A strategic need for expansion of the specific settlement of Colwinston
- Sustainability credentials
- Thorough comparative assessment of reasonable alternatives
- Development has not been directed to the most sustainable locations
- Protection of Conservation Areas and their settings
- Protection of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land and safeguarding of minerals
- Certainty of impact on Biodiversity, Net Zero and Landscape

c) Inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the consultation documentation:

The evidence base and assessments used to inform decisions regarding Site 4069 have led to the misjudgement of its suitability for housing development:

- The services and facilities listed are inaccurate as Colwinston has only a small shop/café and all major shopping and facilities exist outside the village.
- The village has no regular, reliable bus service or safe access to a nearby bus stop. It is a car-dependent village with no infrastructure to support cycling or walking.
- The ancient woodland has been omitted from all documentations especially the HRA or ISA.
- Consistency has not been applied to the criteria used to assess sites 4069 (Land East Of Colwinston), 2782 (Pantiles), 3834 (Opposite school), and 409 (Waterton Lodge) in terms of incursion into open countryside, limitation of services and facilities, no access to public transport, or active travel, impact on climate change, access to highways, location of settlement, physical constraints, infrastructure, connectivity and capacity, etc. The sites are in close proximity and some adjoin each other yet Site 4069 has been assessed inaccurately and appears more sustainable and suitable than in reality. An example would be for Climate Change; previously judged to be red in BP18 then appears green in BP18A. Also, Site 4069 has been assessed as green for Active Travel when it should be red like the other sites.

6. Inadequate consultation with the Colwinston residents regarding Site 4069:

And finally, the documents are presented digitally making them inaccessible for many residents in Colwinston, especially with digital infrastructure being so unreliable. The documents are overwhelming in quantity, length and technicality for all to access. The documents are difficult to find as they appear in different places on the Vale website and in different forms. Communication about the consultation meetings has relied solely on digital means, so residents received little to no notification. These meetings were not held in rural locations - especially the areas most affected, requiring residents to travel by car from Colwinston in the absence of public transport services. Many were unable to attend as they were held only during daytimes. Responding to the consultation has been problematic for some; either setting up an account to submit an online comment, or finding the response form for completion. This has denied ALL residents the opportunity to participate easily, fully, inclusively in the consultation about the potential inclusion of Site 4069 in the final RLDP.

Submitted on behalf of Colwinston Community Council

Chairperson: Mr Gareth Jones

Date.....