

HG1 KS1 Land at North West Barry - Proposed Development at Weycock Cross ("WC")

With reference to my email of 10th March 2026 sent @23:29, which enclosed Part 1 and Part 2 of my objections to the proposed development at WC, I enclose below further objections, to be included as part of the consultation process.

Objection 8 – Unacceptable and Detrimental Impact to the local residents

I refer to the Barry Town Council Meeting that took place on 2nd June 2015 at 7:00pm. Minutes of the meeting that took place are enclosed for your consideration.

During this meeting, the Council may recall that it considered and discussed Planning Application No. 2015/00470/OUT, which related to the Land at Walters Farm, Weycock Cross, Barry. The proposed development was for up to 200 residential homes along with associated parking, access, public open space and landscaping and including the demolition of existing buildings.

Whilst the Council will be familiar with the decision that it reached in 2015, I feel it necessary to remind you of the robust and definitive language that was used when reaching its decision to object to the application.

Within the minutes at paragraph (h), it states in black bold capital letters “**STRONG OBJECTION**”.

The minutes state as follows:

“Barry Town Council has previously supported the removal of sites to the northern edge of Barry from the latest deposited LDP and made strong objections to the to the previous proposals for the site (Planning Application No. 2015/00351/OUT) as it considers that the proposed development would result in the following “**unacceptable consequences**”:

- **The development of this site would result in a development outside the established and proposed residential settlement boundary.**
- **Traffic studies undertaken by the Vale Council as background preparation for the most recently deposited plan indicate clearly that developments at this location would exacerbate the traffic congestion in the surrounding areas, particularly along Port Road would be overloaded by the increased traffic generated by such a development would lead to an unacceptable environment for existing residents of this area.**
- **The Town Council believes that the development would result in increased traffic movements to enable the new population of the site to access local services. As the area is currently severely congested with vehicular traffic**

further development in this area would add to increased and unacceptable traffic congestion and pollution thereby resulting in an increasingly poor living environment for the local residents.

- **The development would result in the loss of fertile agricultural land, drainage problems, increased local flood risk and would seriously damage areas of nature conservation and archaeological interest within and adjacent to the site.”**

Comments and observations

1. When objecting to this application, the Council was clear and decisive in its view that this application, “*would result in unacceptable consequences*”. Indeed, this was the view when the application was only to build two hundred houses and if that was deemed unacceptable, then surely the proposal to build 376 houses would be considered entirely intolerable and morally reprehensible.
2. At bullet point 2 of the Council’s objections, it confirms that it undertook its own traffic studies as ‘background preparation’ and those studies provided clear evidence that the building of additional 200 houses would “**exacerbate the traffic congestion in the surrounding areas, which would lead to an “unacceptable environment for existing residents of the area”**”.
3. Within the Consultation Report at A1-6/A1-7, it is noted that the Council is undertaking a Strategic Transport Assessment and that indicates that it will be possible to ‘manage’ targeted highway improvements that ‘are capable of improving traffic flow’ and that ‘the modelling shows that with these improvements, the additional site traffic would only have limited effect on how the Weycock Cross junction operates’.

Given that the Council had already commissioned evidence that in 2015 that entirely contradicts the Council’s position, it is submitted that unless the Council is going to design and build an overpass, then the statements that this proposal could improve traffic flow are misleading and leads to serious questions being raised by the veracity of the statements that have been made within and throughout the Consultation Report regarding the suitability and sustainability of the proposed development at WC.

Questions/requests for information

- i) In the interest of full transparency, please provide a copy of the traffic studies that were undertaken in 2015, and which were used for the purposes of the Council strongly objecting to the proposed development at WC. If you cannot provide a copy, then please provide a link or confirm where this would be located.
- ii) It is noted that in 2015, the Council expressed extreme concern for the local residents and concluded that the building of 200 houses at WC would “**lead to an unacceptable environment for existing residents of this area**” and lead to “**unacceptable traffic congestion and pollution thereby resulting in an increasingly poor living environment for the local residents**”.

(Q) Given the Council’s comments in 2015 and noting that the current proposed development at WC is for 376 houses (almost double the 200 houses that were proposed in 2015), please confirm that the Council’s current position is that it fully accepts that in continuing to include the development at WC within the RLDP, it now finds it acceptable to create an unacceptable, poor-quality living environment for the existing residents of the area.

- iii) Within the Consultation Report at A1-6/A1-7, it is noted that the Council is undertaking a Strategic Transport Assessment and that indicates that it will be possible to ‘manage’ targeted highway improvements that ‘are capable of improving traffic flow’.

This is completely at odds with the previous evidence that the Council commissioned in 2015 which the Council relied upon as evidence to support its objection to the development and concluded that any development at WC would lead to ‘*unacceptable traffic congestion and pollution thereby resulting in an increasingly poor living environment for local residents*’.

(Q) Given that the Council had already concluded that the development at WC would lead to “unacceptable traffic congestion and pollution”, please confirm that if the Council continues with the

development at WC, that it is accepting that it will be breaching its legally binding obligations as set out in the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 (the “Act”).

iv) I refer the Council to the Guidance Document titled ‘*Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015: the essentials*’ (published 23 June 2015 and last updated on 7 January 2025 (www.gov.wales)). Within this document, it sets out the legally binding well-being goals, which are as follows:

- A prosperous Wales
- A resilient Wales
- A healthier Wales
- A more equal Wales
- A Wales of cohesive communities
- A Wales of vibrant culture and thriving Welsh Language
- A globally responsible Wales

Under the heading ‘Why do we need this law’ (as set out in the guidance note), it states:

‘Wales faces a number of challenges now and in the future, such as climate change, poverty, health and well-being, coronavirus, jobs and economic activity. To tackle these we need to work together. To give current and future generations a good quality of life we need to think about the long-term impact of the decisions we make.’

In addition, the guidance note goes on to explain what the Act means by “sustainable development”. It provides:

‘In this Act “sustainable development” means the process of improving the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales by taking action, in accordance with the sustainable development principle, aimed at achieving the well-being goals’.

Under the heading ‘Healthier’, it states that the aim of this well-being goal is to create a society in which people’s physical and mental well-being is maximised and in which choices and behaviours that benefit future health are understood.

Given that the Council commissioned its own evidence in 2015 that categorically concluded that any development at WC would “lead to an unacceptable environment for existing residents of this area” and lead to “unacceptable traffic congestion and pollution thereby resulting in an increasingly poor living environment for the local residents”, please confirm that in allowing the

development to proceed that this would be in breach of Council's obligations under the Act as this would clearly impact the physical and mental well-being of the local residents.

- v) During the Council's meeting on 7th July 2015, it was categorical in its assessment that the development would 'result in the loss of fertile agricultural land, drainage problems, increased local flood risk and would seriously damage areas of nature conservation and archaeological interest within and adjacent to the site'.

(Q) Given the Council is obligated to be fully transparent in this development consultation, please provide the documents and information that the Council considered in 2015 so this may be reviewed and considered alongside any subsequent reports that may be commissioned in the future (for example any flood risk assessments, drainage assessments etc).

Objection 9 – Impact of increased congestion will have in delaying emergency services being able to attend any major incidents at Cardiff International Airport ("CIA") and MOD St. Athan.

Within the Consultation Report at A1-6, it is noted that the Council's response to queries on this topic states that the South Wales Fire Service and Rescue Service and the Welsh Ambulance Service have not objected to the principle of the development.

It is also noted that there is also no suggestion that these services are in support of this proposal either as if they were, then I am sure any comments endorsing the proposed development at WC would be included within the Consultation Report and they are not. It also appears that no actions are contained in the 'Actions' column regarding the Council seeking reports and/or assessments from the South Wales Fire Service and Rescue Service and the Welsh Ambulance Service in respect of how this development at WC could impact and/or delay their ability respond to any major incidents at the CIA and/or MOD St. Athan.

Questions:

- i) **It is well publicised that the RAF and other air force aircraft frequently use CIA for the purposes of conducting operations. As such, and given the heightened current political climate, please confirm whether a full risk assessment has been made by the aforementioned services in respect of**

this issue and their ability to respond to major incidents at CIA and MOD St. Athan.

- ii) **The CIA hosts various RAF and U.S Air Force military aircraft for training, operational stops and refueling. Port Road acts as the main and only route to the CIA, and given that the National Threat Level of terrorism to the UK (England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland) is recorded by the UK Government as being ‘substantial’, please explain the rationale for not undertaking an assessment in respect of how any form of congestion or road accident could hinder/delay the emergency services from being able to respond to any major incident given that CIA regularly hosts military aircraft.**

To not undertake such an assessment, would be considered a dereliction of duty.

Summary

Given the conclusion that was reached by the Council in 2015 regarding the adverse and detrimental impact that any development at WC would have on the local residents and the surrounding areas and noting the rather perverse position that the Council is now seeking to rely on new evidence that disproves their original findings that this site was wholly unsuitable, it is submitted that the change in stance is irrational and unreasonable and will be subject to challenge.

Whilst it may be the case that Local Councils are permitted to change their view, this would need to be justified by new, material evidence that demonstrates that the proposed development at WC is sustainable and would not negatively impact the well-being of the local residents and the surrounding area. No such evidence has been provided and the reasons why the Council so strongly objected to the application in 2015 still exist today.

For all the reasons stated in Part 2 (submitted by email to ldp@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk on 10th March 2026)) and Part 3 of my objections, the correct decision would be to remove this development from the RLDP.