

Vale of Glamorgan

Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan

Public Consultation

Local resident RLDP consultation feedback based on review of RLDP information and supporting documents as hosted on RLDP website <https://valeofglamorgan.oc2.uk/>

Site : HG1 KS1 North West Barry (Weycock Cross)

Objection

Topic: **KS1: Summary of Objections to Proposed Development**

Ref: NWB_RLDP_JVN_001

Submitted by: [REDACTED]

Date: 10th March 2026

RLDP Consultation: HG1 KS1 - LAND AT NORTH WEST BARRY

Summary of Objections

I object to the allocation of HG1 KS1 (North West Barry / Weycock Cross) on the grounds that the proposed site development is **unsound, unjustified, and undeliverable**. The Council's own RLDP supporting evidence, together with the developer's technical reports, demonstrates that the site proposal fails key tests relating to **Transport, Drainage, Biodiversity, Green Wedge protection, Landscape Character, Heritage, and Community Infrastructure**.

Transport & Air Quality:

Weycock Cross is already over capacity at peak times. The RLDP transport evidence is incomplete, based on limited data, and omits an Air Quality Assessment entirely. Active-travel and public transport options are weak, indirect, or impractical. The site would generate significant car-dependent traffic growth and site-related congestion & pollution contrary to PPW/Well-being Act.

Green Wedge & Landscape:

The Technical Briefing Note misinterprets PPW by reducing Green Wedge policy to a distance test. The 2015 Inspector found this land integral to openness and separation. The site remains visually exposed, contributes to the rural setting of Barry, and forms part of a continuous landscape corridor. The case for moving the GW boundary is weak and would set a damaging precedent.

Biodiversity:

The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal identifies multiple high-value receptors, including **ASNW, Priority Hedgerows, bats, dormice, badgers, otters, reptiles, and Red-List protected ground-nesting birds**. Impacts of the development (and building process) on these priority concerns cannot be avoided or mitigated. The site cannot deliver PPW's required **net benefit for biodiversity**.

Community Infrastructure:

The RLDP provides no deliverable strategy for GP capacity, social care, education, or community facilities. The Council's own Health Impact Assessments warn of negative health outcomes if development proceeds without infrastructure in place. Vague developer assurances of off-site financial contributions have no real bearing on strategic infrastructure provision.

Drainage & Flood Risk:

The developer's own drainage strategy shows unresolved risks: missing NRW Product 6 data, significant height discrepancies between flood models and ground levels, unknown outgoing watercourse capacity, unviable SuDS infiltration due to soil type, and the need for **over 9500 m³** of attenuation (four Olympic swimming pools). Foul drainage solutions are speculative and require major off-site works. Fundamental viability remains unproven. The site location is unsuitable.

Heritage:

The Heritage Assessment fails to comply with PPW and Cadw guidance. It does not assess significance, setting, cumulative impacts, or mitigation. Conclusions are unsupported and cannot be relied upon for plan-making.

Conclusion:

The allocation conflicts with PPW, TAN guidance, the Well-being Act, and the Council's own evidence base. The site is not sustainable, not deliverable, and should be **removed from the RLDP**.