

HG1 KS1 - LAND AT NORTH WEST BARRY

RLDP public consultation feedback

Rebekah Vincent-Newson

Reference: RLDP-OBJ-RVN-001

Objection re: HG1 KS1: Affordable Housing

I object to the proposals and intent set out within the *Weycock Cross Vision Statement (June 2025 by Persimmon)*. The document is written primarily from the perspective of future residents, offering limited and non-specific benefits for those residents already living in the community.

The Vision focuses almost entirely on delivering a “high-quality... residential extension... of up to 376 dwellings” and highlights the “significant opportunity for future residents” accessing nearby amenities. This emphasis sidelines the needs, expectations, and lived experience of existing residents, who will shoulder the immediate impacts.

Public open spaces are pitched as general ‘wider community’ assets but with no detail of how existing residents benefit (access, parking, management, safety, programming). Benefits are framed as making a ‘new neighbourhood’ rather than improving conditions for the existing one: “Create a distinctive new neighbourhood for Barry...” (Objectives of Good Design – Character, p.21)

Although the Statement claims the development will “consider the amenity of existing residents,” it fails to provide any concrete commitments— it lacks specifics on buffer widths, overlooking/overshadowing distances, acoustic mitigation, or lighting controls along the eastern boundary backing onto existing homes.

“Rear gardens to adjoin current development edge” is described as a sensitivity measure, but it can also reduce permeability for current residents and offers no detail on boundary treatment quality, overlooking controls, or anti-social behaviour design— only: “Rear gardens to adjoin current development edge to secure boundary and provide a sensitive response to existing residences” (Concept diagram, p.3). Without specifics, this reads as minimal mitigation.

Noise and air quality sections appraise conditions for the *site* rather than for existing residents. For example: “The only part of the site sensitive to increased noise levels is the northern boundary... Although within a reasonable proximity to Cardiff Airport... [it] does not prove to be of any significant impact to development.” (Site & Context – p.11). This is framed around feasibility for *new housing*, not the net impact on existing residents’ exposure (construction and operational phases).

The Vale’s Healthy Placemaking Draft SPG (2025) emphasises that placemaking should deliver health, well-being and inclusive benefits and includes checklists and Health Impact Assessment expectations. If a scheme’s vision does not set out tangible, locally-relevant benefits (access, safety, active travel, quality open space with inclusive design, etc.), it risks falling short of those placemaking standards applied in practice.

This is the wrong site for this proposed housing development. We need further consultation based on assessing information in relation to:

Amenity & privacy on the eastern boundary (existing homes):

- Minimum buffer width and landscape/woodland edge specification.
- Overlooking/overshadowing parameters (e.g., minimum separation distances, height transitions).
- Lighting and acoustic design standards for boundaries

A Construction Environmental Management Plan covering:

- dust suppression
- noise limits
- HGV routing/turning and contractor parking
- complaint response times

Public open space that truly benefits existing residents:

- Guaranteed public access points for current residents (with wayfinding),
- Maintenance/management arrangements and safety design (overlooked routes, lighting),
- Inclusive facilities (seating, nature play, accessible paths) and programming that local groups can use. (Vision promises “wider community” access but gives no detail.)

Traffic and community infrastructure capacity to be highlighted in other areas of objection.