



For Office use only

Representor No.

Date Received

Date of Acknowledgement

Regeneration
and Planning

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	MS	Title	
Name	Julia Thompson	Name	
Organisation (If applicable)		Organisation	
Address	[Redacted]		
Postcode	[Redacted]		
Email	[Redacted]		
Telephone No	[Redacted]		
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).

2: Your Views

QUESTION 1:

What are your thoughts on the Deposit RLDP (e.g. policies, site allocations)?

Please state which site reference, policy or paragraph number your comments refer to. If you are commenting on more than one site, policy or paragraph, please use a separate sheet for each one.

SITE REFERENCE/POLICY/PARAGRAPH NUMBER:

Agree/Support	☐	Disagree/Object	☒	Comment	☐	No Comment	☐
---------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	---------	--------------------------	------------	--------------------------

Comments:

my comments are specifically in relation to the Waycock Cross, Accessing proposal. HGI KSI - North West Barry Site.

I have added a printed sheet of key points.

In summary I believe that the land in North West Barry is not a suitable location for Development but I also object to errors / flaws throughout the whole RLDP.

The sheer Volume of Documents to understand on the web pages has made it very difficult for average locals to understand fully

Please attach additional pages if required.

HG1 KS1 – Land at North West Barry

1. Traffic and mitigation

- Congestion on Port and Pontypridd Roads will worsen
- Emergency access will be compromised
- No adequate mitigation exists

Increased queueing on Pontypridd Road will directly extend blue-light response times on an identified hospital and airport route.

Traffic capacity on Pontypridd road is already at 100% at peak times there is no room for improvement.

The widening on Pontypridd road is unsuitable and encroaches on Local residents land, it will also make crossing the road to the petrol station/shop practically impossible.

SP10 – specifically in relation to distance to Barry Train station on foot, this regularly takes me 30-40 minutes and requires at least two steep hills.

2. Pressure on services (health, schools, infrastructure)

All evidence states that:

- GP, dental, and school capacity is already stretched.
- Waiting lists and capacity limits exist.
- Additional housing would exacerbate this.

The development fails the test of deliverable social infrastructure, as no funded or timetabled expansion of GP, dental or school provision is identified – this would equate to policy failure in this area.

3. Housing numbers and population argument

The statistics are repeated consistently:

- Housebuilding rate cited as **7.55%**.
- Population growth cited as **4.1%**.
- Birth rate cited as **1.38**, described as declining.

The scale and type of housing proposed is not supported by demographic drivers, indicating supply-led development rather than needs-led planning.

This would constitute a clear planning objection.

4. Type of housing vs. stated need

The argument that:

- The Vale of Glamorgan needs housing suited to **older single people**, and
- The proposed development **does not meet that need**

The proposal therefore fails to meet the stated housing mix priorities previously identified by the Vale of Glamorgan. This reinforces internal inconsistency **within the council's own position**.

5. Previously Refused Proposals still Stand

- Similar proposals declined in 2013 and the concerns raised then are still in existence with no sensible mitigation

The persistence of identical unresolved issues since the 2013/16 refusal demonstrates a failure to address material planning objections over time. This shows a lack of understanding and willingness to consider alternatives.

This is a significant point as none of the submissions include sufficient mitigation to previous points

6. Green Wedge Land with impacts to wildlife

The proposed development would result in the irreversible loss of designated **Green Wedge land**, which plays a critical role in preventing urban coalescence, maintaining landscape character, and supporting biodiversity. The site currently functions as an important ecological buffer between settlements and contributes to the wider network of green and environmental spaces in the area.

DNP2 – Incorrectly assumes this is not Green Wedge Land

There is documented local concern regarding **skylark activity on the site**, including potential nesting within the fields affected by the proposal. Skylarks are a recognised ground-nesting farmland species that is highly sensitive to habitat loss and disturbance. The permanent development of this land would remove suitable breeding and foraging habitat, with no clear or credible mitigation identified to offset this loss.

SP19 – It feels that this has not been taken into consideration at all.

In addition, **otter sightings have been reported locally**, indicating the potential use of connected habitats and watercourses in and around the site. This is in direct contradiction to the point **CC6 point 3 " Avoid significant adverse effects on designated habitats, species and landscape character"**.

The fragmentation, lighting, noise and increased human activity associated with the development would be likely to degrade habitat connectivity and increase disturbance risks for protected species. **The proposal therefore raises serious concerns regarding compliance with**

environmental protection objectives and represents a significant and unmitigated environmental harm.

Once lost, the ecological and landscape function of this Green Wedge land cannot be realistically recreated elsewhere

CC6 – Increasingly frequent pollution alerts on our local beaches will worsen with development in this area.

7. Welsh Assembly / governance position

References to criticism or lack of support from the **Welsh Assembly** are aligned in tone and conclusion across documents. None of the material claims formal endorsement elsewhere.

Planning Harm Summary:

- **Transport harm (no mitigation, emergency access risk)**
- **Social infrastructure harm (health, schools)**
- **Environmental harm (green space, ecology)**
- **Policy harm (housing mix mismatch, demographic misalignment)**
- **Governance harm (prior refusal, lack of cross-agency coordination)**

Unless these harms are demonstrably mitigated, the proposal should not be approved.

Implications for the Welsh Language (Use and Opportunities)

Although the objection does not explicitly reference the Welsh language, several of the identified planning harms would indirectly but materially affect opportunities to use, sustain and grow Welsh within the community.

1. Pressure on Schools and Services → Reduced Welsh-language Provision

The objection highlights that school capacity is already stretched, with no funded or timetabled expansion proposed.

Welsh-language implication:

Where local schools are at or over capacity, Welsh-medium and bilingual provision is often disproportionately affected, as it relies on forward planning and specialist staffing.

Additional housing without parallel education investment risks:

Larger class sizes

Reduced choice of Welsh-medium places

Increased travel distances to access Welsh-medium education

All of these factors reduce daily opportunities for children and families to use Welsh.

2. Demographic Mismatch → Weakening of Existing Linguistic Communities

The objection argues that the scale and type of housing is not supported by demographic drivers and is supply-led rather than needs-led.

Welsh-language implication:

Developments that do not align with local need can:

Disrupt existing community networks

Dilute established linguistic patterns

Without measures to support integration and community cohesion, such development can reduce the density of Welsh speakers, making everyday use of Welsh less visible and less viable.

3. Lack of Deliverable Social Infrastructure → Fewer Everyday Welsh-language Spaces

The objection states the proposal fails the test of deliverable social infrastructure, with no committed expansion of health, dental or community services.

Welsh-language implication:

Community facilities (GP surgeries, schools, local services) are key domains for everyday Welsh use.

Over-stretched services reduce:

Time

Quality of interaction

Capacity for bilingual delivery

This weakens the practical, lived experience of using Welsh in daily life.

4. Transport and Accessibility Harm → Reduced Community Interaction

Severe congestion, compromised emergency access, and poor walkability are highlighted as unmitigated harms.

Welsh-language implication:

Reduced walkability and local accessibility can:

Fragment communities

Increase car-dependency

Reduce informal social interaction

These informal, local interactions are often where Welsh is naturally used and transmitted, especially between generations.

5. Loss of Green Wedge Land → Erosion of Cultural as well as Environmental Assets

The objection emphasises the irreversible loss of Green Wedge land and its role in maintaining settlement identity.

Welsh-language implication:

Landscape and place are closely linked to Welsh cultural identity and language confidence.

Loss of distinctive local environments can weaken:

Sense of belonging

Cultural continuity

Intergenerational transmission of Welsh connected to place

Overall Welsh Language Risk

Taken together, the objection suggests that the development, as currently proposed, risks:

Reducing access to Welsh-medium education

Weakening community structures that support everyday Welsh use

Failing to create new Welsh-language opportunities to offset population growth

Undermining long-term linguistic sustainability through unplanned demographic change

In planning terms, this points to a potential failure to support the Welsh language in line with sustainable community objectives, unless explicit mitigation is introduced.

Implications for British Values

The concerns raised in this objection also have relevance to **British Values**, particularly **democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect and tolerance**.

- **Democracy and the rule of law:**

The persistence of unresolved issues previously identified in refused proposals, alongside a lack of adequate mitigation, raises concerns about whether planning decisions are fully reflecting community consultation, established policy, and prior determinations. This risks undermining confidence in transparent and accountable decision-making processes.

-

- **Individual liberty and equal access:**

Severe transport congestion, compromised emergency access, and overstretched public services may limit residents' ability to safely access healthcare, education, and community facilities. This can restrict practical freedoms and equitable access to essential services for both existing and future residents.

-

- **Mutual respect and tolerance:**

Pressure on schools, health services, and local infrastructure without planned expansion risks increasing competition for limited resources. This can place strain on community cohesion, making it harder to sustain inclusive, respectful communities where diverse needs—including cultural and linguistic needs—are supported.

Overall, the objection suggests that unless the identified harms are properly mitigated, the proposal may conflict with the principles of fairness, inclusion, and accountable governance that underpin British Values.