



Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan 2018-2033



Deposit Plan Representations
Register: Volume 3

REP NO	CONSULTEE TYPE	REP NO	CONSULTEE TYPE	REP NO	CONSULTEE TYPE
816	Member of the Public	941	Member of the Public	1081	Member of the Public
764	Member of the Public	942	Member of the Public	1082	Member of the Public
817	Member of the Public	943	Member of the Public	1083	Member of the Public
818	Member of the Public	944	Member of the Public	1084	Member of the Public
819	Member of the Public	945	Member of the Public	475	Member of the Public
820	Member of the Public	946	Member of the Public	1086	Member of the Public
821	Member of the Public	947	Member of the Public	1087	Member of the Public
822	Member of the Public	948	Member of the Public	1088	Member of the Public
823	Member of the Public	951	Member of the Public	1089	Member of the Public
824	Member of the Public	952	Member of the Public	1090	Member of the Public
825	Member of the Public	953	Member of the Public	1091	Member of the Public
826	Member of the Public	954	Member of the Public	1092	Member of the Public
827	Member of the Public	955	Member of the Public	1093	Member of the Public
828	Member of the Public	956	Member of the Public	1094	Member of the Public
829	Member of the Public	957	Member of the Public	1095	Member of the Public
830	Member of the Public	958	Member of the Public	1096	Member of the Public
831	Member of the Public	959	Member of the Public	1099	Member of the Public
832	Member of the Public	960	Member of the Public	1100	Member of the Public
833	Member of the Public	961	Member of the Public	1101	Member of the Public
834	Member of the Public	962	Member of the Public	1102	Member of the Public
835	Member of the Public	963	Member of the Public	1103	Member of the Public
836	Member of the Public	964	Member of the Public	1104	Member of the Public
837	Member of the Public	965	Member of the Public	1105	Member of the Public
838	Member of the Public	966	Member of the Public	1106	Member of the Public
839	Member of the Public	968	Member of the Public	1107	Member of the Public
840	Member of the Public	969	Member of the Public	1108	Member of the Public
841	Member of the Public	970	Member of the Public	1109	Member of the Public
842	Member of the Public	971	Member of the Public	1110	Member of the Public
843	Member of the Public	594	Member of the Public	1111	Member of the Public
844	Member of the Public	972	Member of the Public	1112	Member of the Public
845	Member of the Public	973	Member of the Public	1113	Member of the Public
849	Member of the Public	974	Member of the Public	1114	Member of the Public
850	Member of the Public	975	Member of the Public	1115	Member of the Public
851	Member of the Public	976	Member of the Public	1116	Member of the Public
586	Member of the Public	977	Member of the Public	1117	Member of the Public
852	Member of the Public	978	Member of the Public	1118	Member of the Public
853	Member of the Public	979	Member of the Public	1119	Member of the Public
854	Member of the Public	980	Member of the Public	1120	Member of the Public

REP NO	CONSULTEE TYPE	REP NO	CONSULTEE TYPE	REP NO	CONSULTEE TYPE
646	Member of the Public	457	Member of the Public	1121	Member of the Public
855	Member of the Public	981	Member of the Public	1122	Member of the Public
856	Member of the Public	982	Member of the Public	1123	Member of the Public
857	Member of the Public	983	Member of the Public	1124	Member of the Public
858	Member of the Public	984	Member of the Public	1125	Member of the Public
859	Member of the Public	985	Member of the Public	1126	Member of the Public
860	Member of the Public	986	Member of the Public	1127	Member of the Public
788	Member of the Public	987	Member of the Public	1128	Member of the Public
861	Member of the Public	988	Member of the Public	1129	Member of the Public
862	Member of the Public	989	Member of the Public	1130	Member of the Public
863	Member of the Public	990	Member of the Public	857	Member of the Public
864	Member of the Public	991	Member of the Public	1131	Member of the Public
865	Member of the Public	992	Member of the Public	1132	Member of the Public
866	Member of the Public	993	Member of the Public	1133	Member of the Public
867	Member of the Public	994	Member of the Public	1134	Member of the Public
868	Member of the Public	995	Member of the Public	1135	Member of the Public
869	Member of the Public	997	Member of the Public	1136	Member of the Public
796	Member of the Public	998	Member of the Public	1137	Member of the Public
870	Member of the Public	999	Member of the Public	1138	Member of the Public
871	Member of the Public	1000	Member of the Public	1139	Member of the Public
872	Member of the Public	1001	Member of the Public	1141	Member of the Public
873	Member of the Public	1002	Member of the Public	1142	Member of the Public
875	Member of the Public	1003	Member of the Public	1143	Member of the Public
876	Member of the Public	1004	Member of the Public	1144	Member of the Public
877	Member of the Public	1005	Member of the Public	1145	Member of the Public
878	Member of the Public	1006	Member of the Public	1146	Member of the Public
879	Member of the Public	1007	Member of the Public	1147	Member of the Public
880	Member of the Public	1008	Member of the Public	1148	Member of the Public
881	Member of the Public	1009	Member of the Public	1149	Member of the Public
882	Member of the Public	1010	Member of the Public	1150	Member of the Public
883	Member of the Public	1011	Member of the Public	1151	Member of the Public
884	Member of the Public	1012	Member of the Public	1152	Member of the Public
885	Member of the Public	1013	Member of the Public	1153	Member of the Public
886	Member of the Public	1014	Member of the Public	1154	Member of the Public
887	Member of the Public	1015	Member of the Public	1155	Member of the Public
888	Member of the Public	1016	Member of the Public	1156	Member of the Public
889	Member of the Public	1017	Member of the Public	1157	Member of the Public
890	Member of the Public	1018	Member of the Public	1158	Member of the Public

REP NO	CONSULTEE TYPE	REP NO	CONSULTEE TYPE	REP NO	CONSULTEE TYPE
891	Member of the Public	1019	Member of the Public	1159	Member of the Public
892	Member of the Public	1021	Member of the Public	1160	Member of the Public
893	Member of the Public	1022	Member of the Public	1161	Member of the Public
894	Member of the Public	1023	Member of the Public	1162	Member of the Public
895	Member of the Public	455	Member of the Public	1163	Member of the Public
896	Member of the Public	1024	Member of the Public	1164	Member of the Public
897	Member of the Public	1025	Member of the Public	1166	Member of the Public
898	Member of the Public	1026	Member of the Public	1167	Member of the Public
899	Member of the Public	1027	Member of the Public	1168	Member of the Public
900	Member of the Public	1028	Member of the Public	743	Member of the Public
901	Member of the Public	1029	Member of the Public	1169	Member of the Public
902	Member of the Public	1030	Member of the Public	1170	Member of the Public
903	Member of the Public	1031	Member of the Public	1171	Member of the Public
904	Member of the Public	1032	Member of the Public	1172	Member of the Public
905	Member of the Public	1033	Member of the Public	1173	Member of the Public
906	Member of the Public	1034	Member of the Public	1174	Member of the Public
907	Member of the Public	1035	Member of the Public	1175	Member of the Public
908	Member of the Public	1036	Member of the Public	798	Member of the Public
909	Member of the Public	1037	Member of the Public	1176	Member of the Public
910	Member of the Public	1039	Member of the Public	1177	Member of the Public
911	Member of the Public	866	Member of the Public	1178	Member of the Public
912	Member of the Public	1041	Member of the Public	1179	Member of the Public
913	Member of the Public	1042	Member of the Public	1180	Member of the Public
914	Member of the Public	1043	Member of the Public	1181	Member of the Public
915	Member of the Public	1044	Member of the Public	1182	Member of the Public
916	Member of the Public	1045	Member of the Public	573	Member of the Public
917	Member of the Public	1047	Member of the Public	454	Member of the Public
918	Member of the Public	1048	Member of the Public	1183	Member of the Public
919	Member of the Public	1050	Member of the Public	976	Member of the Public
920	Member of the Public	1052	Member of the Public	1184	Member of the Public
921	Member of the Public	1053	Member of the Public	1185	Member of the Public
922	Member of the Public	1054	Member of the Public	1186	Member of the Public
712	Member of the Public	1055	Member of the Public	1187	Member of the Public
880	Member of the Public	1056	Member of the Public	1188	Member of the Public
923	Member of the Public	1057	Member of the Public	1189	Member of the Public
924	Member of the Public	1058	Member of the Public	1190	Member of the Public
925	Member of the Public	1059	Member of the Public	1191	Member of the Public
926	Member of the Public	1060	Member of the Public	1192	Member of the Public

REP NO	CONSULTEE TYPE	REP NO	CONSULTEE TYPE	REP NO	CONSULTEE TYPE
924	Member of the Public	1061	Member of the Public	1193	Member of the Public
927	Member of the Public	1062	Member of the Public	1194	Member of the Public
928	Member of the Public	1063	Member of the Public	1195	Member of the Public
929	Member of the Public	1064	Member of the Public	1196	Member of the Public
930	Member of the Public	1065	Member of the Public	1197	Member of the Public
931	Member of the Public	1066	Member of the Public	1198	Member of the Public
932	Member of the Public	546	Member of the Public	1199	Member of the Public
933	Member of the Public	1067	Member of the Public	1200	Member of the Public
949	Member of the Public	1068	Member of the Public	1201	Member of the Public
950	Member of the Public	1069	Member of the Public	1202	Member of the Public
934	Member of the Public	1070	Member of the Public	1203	Member of the Public
935	Member of the Public	1071	Member of the Public	1204	Member of the Public
786	Member of the Public	1073	Member of the Public	1205	Member of the Public
936	Member of the Public	1074	Member of the Public	1206	Member of the Public
937	Member of the Public	1075	Member of the Public	1037	Member of the Public
938	Member of the Public	1077	Member of the Public	1207	Member of the Public
566	Member of the Public	1078	Member of the Public	1208	Member of the Public
939	Member of the Public	1079	Member of the Public	1210	Member of the Public
940	Member of the Public	1080	Member of the Public	1211	Member of the Public
				1214	Member of the Public

LDP Rep: 816

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
816	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
816	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
816	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
816	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
816	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
816	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
816	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
816	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
-----------	--

816	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
816	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
816	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
816	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
816	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: - maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; - reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; - provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; - guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and - ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: "Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth." It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: - fail to command community support; - would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; - would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; - frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
816	

LDP Rep: 764

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
764	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
764	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
764	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
764	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
764	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
764	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
764	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
764	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

764	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
764	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
764	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
764	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
764	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
764	

LDP Rep: 817

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
817	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
817	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
817	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
817	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
817	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
817	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
817	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
817	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

817	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
817	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
817	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
817	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
817	<p>Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and</p>

would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough; and •Goes against the principles of the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
817	

LDP Rep: 818

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
818	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
818	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
818	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
818	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
818	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
818	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
818	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
818	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

818	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
818	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
818	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
818	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
818	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
818	

LDP Rep: 819

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
819	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
819	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
819	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
819	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
819	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
819	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
819	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
819	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

819	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
819	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
819	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
819	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
819	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
819	

LDP Rep: 820

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
820	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	A lot of thought needs to be given to the already high levels of traffic on the A48 as well as the overloading of already overloaded health and education provision.
820	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	There is very little useable space south of Bridgend. There is already heavy traffic and more traffic on the A48 will render it unusable.
820	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
820	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Housing development is all very well but the traffic concern should be paramount. Nobody will be able to move on and off existing developments and any new development during rush hour periods.
820	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
820	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
820	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
820	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
--	--

ID	Traffic will run any of these aims.
820	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
820	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
820	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
820	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	Improved public transport and improvement to the highway network will definitely be needed.
820	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	I think there will be too much new housing development in areas where the traffic is already congested.
820	

LDP Rep: 821

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
821	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
821	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
821	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
821	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
821	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
821	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
821	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
821	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

821	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
821	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
821	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
821	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
821	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
821	

LDP Rep: 822

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
822	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
822	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
822	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
822	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
822	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
822	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
822	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
822	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

822	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
822	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
822	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
822	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
822	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
822	

LDP Rep: 823

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
823	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
823	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
823	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
823	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
823	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
823	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
823	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
823	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

823	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
823	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
823	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
823	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
823	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
823	

LDP Rep: 824

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
824	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
824	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
824	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
824	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
824	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
824	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
824	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
824	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

824	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
824	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
824	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
824	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
824	<p>Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ - maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; - reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; - provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; - guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and - ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current</p>

and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
824	

LDP Rep: 825

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
825	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
825	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
825	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
825	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
825	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
825	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
825	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
825	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

825	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
825	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
825	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
825	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
825	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
825	

LDP Rep: 826

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable): ██████████

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
826	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
826	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
826	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
826	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
826	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
826	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
826	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
826	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

826	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
826	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
826	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
826	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
826	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
826	

LDP Rep: 827

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
827	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
827	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
827	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
827	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
827	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
827	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
827	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
827	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

827	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
827	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
827	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
827	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
827	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
827	

LDP Rep: 828

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
828	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
828	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
828	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
828	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
828	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
828	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
828	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
828	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

828	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
828	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
828	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
828	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
828	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
828	

LDP Rep: 829

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
829	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
829	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
829	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
829	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
829	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
829	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
829	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
829	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

829	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
829	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
829	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
829	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
829	<p>Good evening, Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: '· maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
829	

LDP Rep: 830

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
830	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
830	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
830	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
830	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
830	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
830	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
830	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
830	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

830	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
830	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
830	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
830	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
830	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
830	

LDP Rep: 831

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
831	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
831	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
831	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
831	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
831	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
831	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
831	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
831	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
-----------	--

831	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
831	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
831	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
831	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
831	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
831	

LDP Rep: 832

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
832	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
832	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
832	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
832	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
832	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
832	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
832	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
832	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

832	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
832	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
832	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
832	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
832	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
832	

LDP Rep: 833

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
833	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
833	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
833	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
833	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
833	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
833	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
833	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
833	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

833	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
833	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
833	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
833	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
833	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
833	

LDP Rep: 834

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
834	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
834	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
834	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
834	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
834	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
834	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
834	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
834	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

834	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
834	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
834	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
834	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
834	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
834	

LDP Rep: 835

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
835	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
835	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
835	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
835	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
835	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
835	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
835	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
835	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

835	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
835	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
835	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
835	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
835	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
835	

LDP Rep: 836

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
836	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
836	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
836	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
836	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
836	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
836	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
836	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
836	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

836	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
836	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
836	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
836	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
836	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
836	

LDP Rep: 837

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
837	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
837	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
837	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
837	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
837	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
837	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
837	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
837	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

837	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
837	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
837	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
837	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
837	<p>Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and</p>

would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
837	

LDP Rep: 838

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
838	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
838	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
838	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
838	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
838	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
838	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
838	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
838	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

838	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
838	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
838	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
838	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
838	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
838	

LDP Rep: 839

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
839	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
839	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
839	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
839	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
839	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
839	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
839	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
839	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

839	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
839	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
839	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
839	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
839	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
839	

LDP Rep: 840

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
840	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
840	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
840	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
840	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
840	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
840	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
840	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
840	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

840	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
840	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
840	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
840	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
840	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
840	

LDP Rep: 841

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
841	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
841	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
841	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
841	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
841	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
841	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
841	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
841	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

841	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
841	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
841	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
841	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
841	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
841	

LDP Rep: 842

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
842	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
842	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
842	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
842	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
842	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
842	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
842	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
842	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

842	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
842	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
842	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
842	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
842	<p>Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ - maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; - reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; - provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; - guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and - ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current</p>

and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
842	

LDP Rep: 843

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
843	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
843	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
843	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
843	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
843	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
843	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
843	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
843	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

843	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
843	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
843	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
843	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
843	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
843	

LDP Rep: 844

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
844	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
844	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
844	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
844	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
844	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
844	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
844	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
844	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

844	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
844	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
844	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
844	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
844	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
844	

LDP Rep: 845

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
845	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
845	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
845	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
845	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
845	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
845	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
845	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
845	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

845	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
845	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
845	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
845	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
845	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
845	

LDP Rep: 849

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	SOBJ4: To protect and enhance distinctive and natural places - the proposed building of 847 houses on the beautiful countryside which surround one of Wales' most unique and beautiful natural landscapes do the exact opposite of objective SOBJ4. Why can we not protect our beautiful green spaces in this unique and picturesque environment. Once its gone, its gone forever.
849	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
849	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
849	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
849	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
849	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
849	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
849	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
849	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

849

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

849

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

849

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID

849

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

849

The building of 847 houses on the Island Farm site would be a disaster in every way for the countryside, the community and the local people. The idyllic countryside around Merthyr Mawr is part of its unique appeal. Building 847 houses right up to the boundary of the estate would ruin the whole remote and picturesque appeal of one of Wales' great natural treasures. That is before we get on to the daily reality of supporting circa 2000 extra people living in the area. Already the A48 is at a standstill every morning, Ewenny roundabout simply can not cope with the weight of traffic and the queues stretch half way to the M4. New Inn Road and the historic Dipping Bridge can not cope with extra traffic that will be diverted onto the partial single track road in an effort to avoid the gridlock of the A48. As a result the extra traffic will also be diverted through the quiet country villages of Ewenny, Corntown and St Brides as they look for alternative routes which will directly affect me as a resident of Corntown. As I understand the Island Farm sports complex was rejected on the basis of insufficient transport links in the area and this proposal would be facing exactly the same issues again. Health Services are already massively oversubscribed in the area with residents having difficulty booking doctors appointments and no NHS dentist being available anywhere in the area so how will they cope with 2000 more residents. There seems no logical reason for this development and I can't imagine a local resident would be in support of such proposals so strongly object to these plans. There are massive areas of land around Bridgeend that are not considered sites of outstanding natural beauty, with better transport links and existing infrastructure that would make much more sense as a site for such a development like the site surrounding the old Ford factory or proposed Ineos site where the road network has already been established.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

849

LDP Rep: 850

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
850	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
850	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
850	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
850	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
850	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
850	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
850	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
850	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

850	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
850	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
850	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
850	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
850	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
850	

LDP Rep: 851

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
851	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
851	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
851	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
851	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
851	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
851	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
851	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
851	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

851	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
851	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
851	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
851	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
851	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
851	

LDP Rep: 586

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
586	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
586	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
586	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
586	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
586	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
586	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
586	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
586	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
-----------	--

586	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
586	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
586	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
586	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
586	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
586	

LDP Rep: 852

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
852	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
852	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
852	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
852	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
852	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
852	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
852	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
852	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

852	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
852	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
852	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
852	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
852	<p>I wish for the following to be a true representation of my personal feelings regarding the above proposal and await your reply in respect of my formal objection. Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the</p>

LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough. Thank you for considering and acting in the interests of everything listed above and trust that this will not be given the planning consent.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
852	

LDP Rep: 853

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
853	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
853	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
853	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
853	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
853	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
853	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
853	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
853	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

853	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
853	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
853	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
853	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
853	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
853	

LDP Rep: 854

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
854	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
854	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
854	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
854	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
854	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
854	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
854	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
854	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

854	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
854	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
854	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
854	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
854	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
854	

LDP Rep: 646

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
646	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
646	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
646	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
646	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
646	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
646	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
646	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
646	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

646	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
646	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
646	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
646	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
646	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
646	

LDP Rep: 855

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
855	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
855	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
855	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
855	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
855	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
855	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
855	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
855	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

855	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
855	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
855	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
855	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
855	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
855	

LDP Rep: 856

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
856	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
856	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
856	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
856	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
856	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
856	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
856	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
856	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

856	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
856	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
856	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
856	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
856	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
856	

LDP Rep: 857

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
857	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
857	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
857	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
857	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
857	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
857	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
857	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
857	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

857	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
857	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
857	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
857	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
857	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
857	

LDP Rep: 858

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
858	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
858	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
858	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
858	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
858	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
858	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
858	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
858	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

858	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
858	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
858	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
858	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
858	<p>Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ - maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; - reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; - provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; - guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and - ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current</p>

and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
858	

LDP Rep: 859

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
859	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
859	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
859	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
859	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
859	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
859	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
859	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
859	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

859	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
859	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
859	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
859	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
859	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
859	

LDP Rep: 860

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
860	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
860	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
860	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
860	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
860	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
860	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
860	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
860	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
-----------	--

860	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
860	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
860	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
860	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
860	<p>I would like to register my objection to the below plan for development below. The roads in the area are already badly congested. It also takes away places for local people to walk, in what has been the country side close to their homes. This has been a vital and necessary resource during the pandemic which we find ourselves in at the moment. I live at 78 Fairfield Road, Bridgend and this will impact greatly on our lives</p> <p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental</p>

capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
860	

LDP Rep: 788

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
788	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
788	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
788	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
788	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
788	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
788	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
788	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
788	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

788	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
788	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
788	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
788	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
788	<p>Please do not approve this development of 847 houses... Remember we are just the guardians of this beautiful countryside and if we let it go there's no going back. Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: '· maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As</p>

stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
788	

LDP Rep: 861

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
861	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
861	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
861	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
861	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
861	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
861	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
861	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
861	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

861	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
861	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
861	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
861	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
861	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
861	

LDP Rep: 862

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
862	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
862	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
862	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
862	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
862	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
862	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
862	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
862	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

862	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
862	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
862	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
862	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
862	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
862	

LDP Rep: 863

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
863	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
863	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
863	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
863	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
863	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
863	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
863	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
863	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

863	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
863	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
863	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
863	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	<p>I am totally against this proposal and this outstanding landmark beauty should stay for Bridgend. Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local</p>
863	

diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
863	

LDP Rep: 864

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
864	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
864	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
864	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
864	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
864	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
864	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
864	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
864	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

864	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
864	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
864	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
864	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
864	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
864	

LDP Rep: 865

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
865	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
865	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
865	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
865	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
865	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
865	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
865	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
865	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

865	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
865	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
865	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
865	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	<p>As a local resident of the oldcastle ward I wish to register my objection to the planned housing development at Island Farm and South Broadlands. My objections are based on a number of areas most notably</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Safety and traffic - Increased traffic and pedestrians along both the A48 and surrounding roads which act as arterial roads through the south of the town. We already have issues with congestion and antisocial driving and have had a number of tragic deaths along the A48 which have been highly documented. In addition traffic along new inn road as a single track road will become dangerous for cyclists and people exercising. 2. Effects on Tourism and Natural habitat - As I understand it a number of protected species of bat, owl and rodent live in this particular area. The development of the area for residential use will undoubtedly cause this wildlife to be displaced. In addition to this, tourism will be greatly effected by the congestion on the roads as well as developed areas encroaching on ancient villages such as Merthyr Mawr. The construction of around 1800 properties and the construction traffic that will be present for many years will cause a great deal of inconvenience to local businesses and residents. I hope that my comments will be taken into account regarding consultation on this land development plan
865	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
865	

LDP Rep: 866

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
866	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
866	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
866	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
866	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
866	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
866	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
866	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
866	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

866	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
866	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
866	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
866	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
866	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend. I wish to comment on the LDP review currently taking place. Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ - maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; - reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; - provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; - guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and - ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive</p>

environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

Would you please note my comments when considering the Bridgend LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
866	

LDP Rep: 867

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
867	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
867	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
867	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
867	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
867	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
867	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
867	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
867	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

867	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
867	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
867	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
867	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
867	<p>I have recently learned of the Bridgend Local Development Plan Review 2018-33. I suspect you have received lots of emails today regarding this. You will see that people are unhappy with your plans which disregard many of your own safeguarding concerns. Focussing on the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. Craig Y Parcau (North of the A48) is a Nature Reserve. It is unsuitable for any new and quickly rushed through housing plans, it will also be illegal as environmental legislation is at a later stage of preventing such development. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘· maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed</p>

Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough. Frankly, the Councils constant thirst for 'growth' mistakenly achieved by building more and more houses and cutting down more and more trees will only ever lead to one thing, flooding. See the flooding in Germany over the last week, coming to a valley near you soon. Lara Warlow, disabled Housing Association resident unable to afford private rent, and will never own a house

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
867	

LDP Rep: 868

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	The possible development of Site PLA3 meets none of the strategic objectives.
868	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Growth must be balanced against environmental and community issues.
868	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	The proposed Site PLA3 will not meet the infrastructure improvements and will have a detrimental impact on transport, green infrastructure, health and education.
868	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
868	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	The proposed Site PLA3 will have a detrimental impact on education provision, leisure facilities and transport volumes and infrastructure.
868	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	None
868	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Agree.
868	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Agree.
868	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

868	The proposed Site PLA3 does not met this key function. It contradicts this function because it would destroy ancient woodland, historical rights of way and open spaces, and obliterate the green wedge which maintains Laleston as a village.
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	None
868	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Agree
868	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	None
868	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	None
868	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	None
868	

LDP Rep: 869

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
869	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
869	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
869	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
869	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
869	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
869	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
869	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
869	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

869	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
869	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
869	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
869	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
869	<p>I regularly walk in and around the proposed areas of new housing and have many objections to building on the areas . Obviously keeping a green area for wildlife and all it represents is of prime importance, but also encouraging walking and cycling in such an amazing environment for future generations to enjoy is also key to saving it. I am also alarmed at the thought of extra traffic on our already congested highways around Bridgend with nothing already in place the ease the current congestion. Also the inadequate facilities at A&E which can't cope with the current population, let alone waiting times for appointments in hospitals, surgeries, operations etc. I enclose the following objections raised also: Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ' · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly</p>

having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
869	

LDP Rep: 796

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
796	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
796	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
796	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
796	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
796	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
796	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
796	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
796	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

796	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
796	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
796	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
796	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
796	<p>We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for the site to be deleted from the LDP, on the following grounds:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. Significant further housing is also currently being built adjacent to this proposal in Bryntirion. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called 'affordable' housing would be beyond the means of most young people. - Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the house-building of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful because of road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer therefore would be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly addressed. - Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. - Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. - The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. It would also be in conflict with the principle of maintaining at least two fields between the two communities established when the Broadlands proposal was first approved. - The site has an inherently rural aspect, it forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be urbanization of the entire district. Urbanization would violate the council's objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. - This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its

surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrim's way, Ffordd y Gyfraith ('The Way of the Law'), and a drover's road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archeology on site. -

The proposed site criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanizing them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. - No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. - The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. - This urbanization would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanization to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would further coalesce, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west. - The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous. a) Undesirable, because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists along a lane that would require considerable upgrading and maintenance due to its current poor state for vehicular traffic and regular flooding throughout the winter months. Alternative vehicular movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated. b) Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a 'natural' boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of a slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards. - In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
796	

LDP Rep: 870

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
870	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
870	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
870	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
870	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
870	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
870	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
870	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
870	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

870	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
870	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
870	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
870	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Sp2 (2) The proposed housing development is far to big for the present infrastructure.
870	The A48 would have to be turned into a dual carriageway, more schools needs, more GP surgeries etc.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
870	

LDP Rep: 871

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
871	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
871	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
871	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
871	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
871	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
871	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
871	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
871	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

871	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
871	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
871	<p>I regularly walk in and+L485:V485o encouraging walking and cycling in such an amazing environment for future generations to enjoy is also key to saving it. I am also alarmed at the thought of extra traffic on our already congested highways around Bridgend with nothing already in place the ease the current congestion. Also the inadequate facilities at A&E which can't cope with the current population, let alone waiting times for appointments in hospitals, surgeries, operations etc. I enclose the following objections raised also: Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: '· maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor.</p> <p>This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the</p>

	<p>natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County</p>
--	--

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
871	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
871	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: '· maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being</p>

orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

871

LDP Rep: 872

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
872	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
872	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
872	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
872	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
872	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
872	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
872	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
872	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

872	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
872	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
872	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
872	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
872	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
872	

Idp

From: consultation
Sent: 19 July 2021 08:32
To: ldp
Subject: FW: South of A48

Categories: Input online form

Nicola Bunston

Rheolwr Ymgynghori, Ymgysylltu a Chydraddoldeb | Consultation Engagement and Equalities Manager.
Cyfarwyddiaeth y Prif Weithredwr / Chief Executive's Directorate Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr |
Bridgend County Borough Council Ffôn / Phone: (01656) 643 664 E-bost / Email: nicola.bunston@bridgend.gov.uk
Gwefan / Website: www.bridgend.gov.uk

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 July 2021 22:45
To: consultation <consultation@bridgend.gov.uk>
Subject: South of A48

Dear Sir / Madam,

I write with regard to plans to develop new housing on the south side of the A48.

I am shocked that the council would even consider destroying such a naturally beautiful area. There are not many places of such beauty in Bridgend. This is a place where people can walk and enjoy nature and leave all the traffic, housing and noise behind. We often walk here as a family and love this area. My daughter loves spotting wildlife and flowers, we call them our nature walks. We see animals and flowers here that we can't see anywhere else we are able to walk to.

Not to mention the awful effect this would have on the animals and eco systems living here.

Then there would be the concern of pollution, extra traffic, congestion.

When relatives come to visit us we take them here and they are amazed by this little bit of heaven we have just on our doorstep.

I am appalled that Bridgend Council would even consider destroying this area for the construction of houses or anything else.

I beg you to reconsider. For the sake of the animals, plants, my family, all the other families and my children who love this area dearly.

Yours sincerely
[REDACTED]

E-bost yn cael ei logio, ei monitro a/neu ei chofnodi yn awtomatig am resymau cyfreithiol.

Peidiwch ag argraffu'r neges e-bost hon oni bai fod hynny'n gwbl angenrheidiol.

Rydym yn croesawu gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg. Rhowch wybod i ni os mai Cymraeg yw eich dewis iaith. Byddwn yn ateb gohebiaeth a dderbynnir yn Gymraeg yn Gymraeg ac ni fydd gohebu yn Gymraeg yn arwain at oedi.

E-mail may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

Please do not print this email unless absolutely necessary.

We welcome correspondence in Welsh. Please let us know if your language choice is Welsh. Any correspondence received in Welsh will be answered in Welsh and corresponding in Welsh will not lead to a delay in responding.

LDP Rep: 873

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
873	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
873	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
873	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
873	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
873	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
873	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
873	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
873	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

873	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
873	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
873	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
873	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I think that the proposed development around Island Farm off the A48 would be very detrimental to Merthyr Mawr. In my opinion, traffic is already very busy in this area and further development would lead to gridlock. Please let us keep our green spaces, beautiful places like Merthyr Mawr unspoilt and not over develop Bridgend.
873	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
873	

LDP Rep: 875

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
875	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
875	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
875	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
875	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
875	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
875	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
875	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
875	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

875	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
875	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
875	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
875	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
875	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
875	

LDP Rep: 876

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
876	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
876	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
876	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
876	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
876	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
876	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
876	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
876	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

876	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
876	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
876	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
876	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
876	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Is a great to have more homes because people will spend in and around the Bridgend area. People always seem to have a moan when there is a new development and come up with every excuse for homes not to be built. It will create employment and boost our local economy.
876	

LDP Rep: 877

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
877	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
877	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
877	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
877	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
877	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
877	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
877	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
877	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

877	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
877	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
877	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
877	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	<p>Proposed site: SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds;</p> <p>Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the</p>
877	

SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area. Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 - The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedence on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk. Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmore Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmore) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
877	

ldp

From: consultation
Sent: 19 July 2021 08:33
To: ldp
Subject: FW: Objection to the proposed Bridgend Local Development Plan

Categories: Input online form

Nicola Bunston
Rheolwr Ymgynghori, Ymgysylltu a Chydraddoldeb | Consultation Engagement and
Equalities Manager.
Cyfarwyddiaeth y Prif Weithredwr / Chief Executive's Directorate
Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr | Bridgend County Borough Council

Ffôn / Phone: (01656) 643 664
E-bost / Email: nicola.bunston@bridgend.gov.uk
Gwefan / Website: www.bridgend.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 July 2021 19:09
To: consultation <consultation@bridgend.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to the proposed Bridgend Local Development Plan



18 July 2021,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to object to the proposed developments on the following grounds :-

Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33

Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend

Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including:

- maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking;
- reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders;
- provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions;
- guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and
- ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term.

It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long

been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve.

In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there.

The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations.

In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to.

The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as:

'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.'

It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'.

The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies.

In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;

- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.
- Increase noise pollution
- Increase the risk of accidents

Yours sincerely



This email has been scanned by BullGuard antivirus protection.
For more info visit www.bullguard.com

E-bost yn cael ei logio, ei monitro a/neu ei chofnodi yn awtomatig am resymau cyfreithiol.
Peidiwch ag argraffu'r neges e-bost hon oni bai fod hynny'n gwbl angenrheidiol.
Rydym yn croesawu gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg. Rhowch wybod i ni os mai Cymraeg yw eich dewis iaith. Byddwn yn ateb gohebiaeth a dderbynnir yn Gymraeg yn Gymraeg ac ni fydd gohebu yn Gymraeg yn arwain at oedi.
E-mail may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.
Please do not print this email unless absolutely necessary.
We welcome correspondence in Welsh. Please let us know if your language choice is Welsh. Any correspondence received in Welsh will be answered in Welsh and corresponding in Welsh will not lead to a delay in responding.

LDP Rep: 878

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
878	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
878	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
878	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
878	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
878	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
878	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
878	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
878	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

878	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
878	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
878	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
878	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
878	<p>Proposed site: SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds;</p> <p>Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the</p>

SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area. Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 - The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedence on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk. Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmores Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmores) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
878	

ldp

From: consultation
Sent: 19 July 2021 08:33
To: ldp
Subject: FW: Objection to the proposed Bridgend Local Development Plan

Categories: Input online form

[Nicola Bunston](#)
Rheolwr Ymgynghori, Ymgysylltu a Chydraddoldeb | Consultation Engagement and Equalities Manager.
Cyfarwyddiaeth y Prif Weithredwr / Chief Executive's Directorate
Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr | Bridgend County Borough Council

Ffôn / Phone: (01656) 643 664
E-bost / Email: nicola.bunston@bridgend.gov.uk
Gwefan / Website: www.bridgend.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 July 2021 19:10
To: consultation <consultation@bridgend.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to the proposed Bridgend Local Development Plan

[REDACTED]

18 July 2021,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to object to the proposed developments on the following grounds :-

Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33

Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend

Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including:

- maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking;
- reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders;
- provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions;
- guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and
- ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term.

It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long

been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve.

In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there.

The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations.

In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to.

The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as:

'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.'

It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'.

The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies.

In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;

- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.
- Increase noise pollution
- Increase the risk of accidents

Yours sincerely



This email has been scanned by BullGuard antivirus protection.
For more info visit www.bullguard.com

This email has been scanned by BullGuard antivirus protection.
For more info visit www.bullguard.com

E-bost yn cael ei logio, ei monitro a/neu ei chofnodi yn awtomatig am resymau cyfreithiol.
Peidiwch ag argraffu'r neges e-bost hon oni bai fod hynny'n gwbl angenrheidiol.
Rydym yn croesawu gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg. Rhowch wybod i ni os mai Cymraeg yw eich dewis iaith. Byddwn yn ateb gohebiaeth a dderbynnir yn Gymraeg yn Gymraeg ac ni fydd gohebu yn Gymraeg yn arwain at oedi.
E-mail may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.
Please do not print this email unless absolutely necessary.
We welcome correspondence in Welsh. Please let us know if your language choice is Welsh. Any correspondence received in Welsh will be answered in Welsh and corresponding in Welsh will not lead to a delay in responding.

LDP Rep: 879

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
879	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
879	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
879	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
879	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
879	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
879	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
879	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
879	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

879	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
879	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
879	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
879	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
879	<p>How can you possibly think of allowing more homes to be built on roads that already struggle with existing traffic? The Dipping Bridge is a beautiful area which should be preserved for recreation purposes - not used as a rat run with traffic trying to avoid what would be the A48 on a standstill? Merthyr Mawr has a wonderful biodiversity but you are happy to increase pollution in an already polluted environment, again with traffic avoiding the A48? You seem to be isolating wildlife by hemming them in. How long will the dormice, lesser horseshoe bats and barn owls survive, and will we see any more lapwings, fieldfares or redwings visiting an area filled with artificial light and pollution? I cannot think about how my life adjacent to the Ewenny Road roundabout on sunny weekends, in the summer, on bank holidays, at the start and end of every school day will be impacted when there are much wider consequences for the beautiful locality to consider. A locality that provided respite during the pandemic. Beautifully tranquil walks around Hut 9, walks across Newbridge fields to the Dipping Bridge, looping back on quiet lanes to join up and be jolted back into reality with the A48. Are you happy for Bridgend to be turned into a suburb of Cardiff and lose our identity? Beth amdanno hedd? Beth ydych chi'n meddwl?</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
879	

LDP Rep: 880

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Yes, and how some aspects of the draft LDP contradict these proposals.
880	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	With BCBC facing reduction in job opportunities I'm surprised at the figures quoted above. You do not consider people changing jobs in your assessment of the need for new housing.
880	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	The strategy has fine words but the actual plan places nearly all of the major proposed housing development around greenfield sites to the west and south of Bridgend ignoring the valleys. Sustainable means a reduction in the use of greenfield sites. The plan shows the opposite.
880	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Ultimately this has little control over what is actually built on these sites. Parc Derwen was mean to be a "New Village" development. Anyone who has visited this estate sees small housing on narrow street overrun with parking and no social cohesion at all. The building looking good but no centre or "sense of place" just high density and expensive housing.
880	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Sorry don't agree with this. Bridgend is developing into a satellite town for Swansea and Cardiff were we, the residents, suffer all the increased pollution and lost of green sites with out any benefits to the town or our local amenities.
880	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Just to say sustainable seems to be getting overused in your justifications.
880	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Agree, town centres need to re-imagine themselves but lets face it BCBC has allowed out of town development to adversely affect all its major town centre be it Bridgend, Maesteg or Porthcawl.
880	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID

880

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

880

I'm afraid this is where I fundamentally disagree with this proposed LDP. Bridgend is taking an easy option and building over valuable and valued green field sites. Fine words above but the LDP will destroy acres of green sites if it goes through in its current form. How is that going to "conserve and enhance valued countryside, landscapes," Little value has been put on sites that need to be protected from overdevelopment and simple greed.

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

880

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

880

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID

880

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

880

All the development (and we know that means housing) is taking place in Bridgend to the detriment of the valleys. The size of the proposed developments in Bridgend dwarf those in all three valleys, for the simple reason that they are easy wins and unfortunately result in the loss of valuable green areas.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

880

I wish to submit a letter expressing some of my concerns, hopefully at the end of this there will be the opportunity to do this.

LDP Rep: 881

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID 881	<p>There is great play throughout the document that Porthcawl is a 'premier seaside and tourist destination' (Obj 1d), 'recognising the role of leisure and tourism' (Obj 3h) etc, but how does the LDP address some key issues? What will entice people to come to the 'seaside resort' when the removal of the whole of Salt Lake for housing/retail/leisure and the removal of the fair for housing means that parking will be impossible for the main beaches (all car parks have a high density on a sunny day and are full on Bank Holidays) and there will be no entertainment for young children is available. Other areas have a swimming pool or leisure centre but Porthcawl has not. Trecco Bay (Parkdean) has nearly 2000 units, many are privately owned and some are used as a permanent address - hence a limited a somewhat self-contained tourist area which will not assist with any regeneration. When all of the housing currently depicted is constructed, only Trecco and Rest bay will be available for any tourists which means that visitors will go elsewhere. The sale of land for housing is normally an income generator - is that the reason for 1115 properties by 2033 which is a higher provision than any other area in the Borough? Is the purchase of housing land required to provide money to buy the fair and remove a lease? Housing in Porthcawl does also generate a high level of Council tax - is this also a driver? Many questions exist on the financial viability of what is being proposed. The housing density is on the low to medium side - is there something I have missed? Could a higher density be used for the Sandy Bay site and leave part of Salt Lake for car parking? I feel that if the LDP is delivered in its current form Porthcawl will, obviously remain as a seaside resort but tourism will effectively have been dramatically reduced if not eliminated - apart from Trecco Bay.</p>

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID 881	<p>Part of CARM does apply to Porthcawl. The age profile is distorted with more retired people than elsewhere in the Borough. There isn't any industry or large business firms in Porthcawl, employer expansion or move into is, therefore, unlikely. In fact, the development plans - apart from the food store - do not show land for 'business'.</p>

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID 881	<p>The last sentence is probably the most interesting. 'Greatest positive impacts and benefits of growth' are correct, because development will produce income which over time will represent a fairly high figure towards BCBC annual budget. Will Porthcawl benefit from the development, as a tourist resort with 'visitors' the answer has to be no as visitors are not being encouraged to travel to Porthcawl. Drive in, drive around and leave because nowhere to park in holiday periods when the current car parks are full. There is one surgery in Porthcawl, will this be expanded? Primary education will have to be increase if the intention is to attract a younger generation - especially with 30% affordable housing to offset the restrictions caused by current high property values.</p>

	What social facilities are planned? The requirement for the current population of 15,000 are extremely limited.
--	---

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	This is a very standard piece of text straight out of the text book - have been there!
881	The key is how this is transmitted into reality by the masterplanning of the various sites and individual project design briefs which are produced - plus looking for value not cheapest price to give a higher return.

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	This section tests to answer some of my earlier questions i.e. the housing is need to pay for infrastructure and facilities for local communities (plural). As for Porthcawl, more housing should result in a higher level of local spend in the town centre but this would be offset due to the loss of income from tourism. Trecco itself does not provide a high financial return to the town as there are facilities on the site. Has a cost/benefit analysis been undertaken on a projection basis over the life of the LDP?
881	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	There are no strategic sites in Porthcawl - other than the one for ALDI. Any growing of business would be on a fairly small scale in the town and also with people working from home. Will housing briefs include the home working idea? Will infrastructure support this? Current Internet and Wi-fi in Porthcawl is 'variable'.
881	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Porthcawl not really affected by this section. Aldi will create a slight change but people from Porthcawl will still travel to Sarn and Waterton - no change.
881	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Waste reduction has to take place but how this is encouraged and executed is a difficult area. Porthcawl does not generate sufficient waste for a waste to energy plant (Cardiff has one). 'In-building waste management facilities? The Building Regulations already require higher standards of insulation and the fact that gas fired boilers will not be allowed in new buildings will require energy requirements to be considered in great detail. Will development automatically have PV's or heat pumps?
881	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	'Attract investment and promote tourism' - see earlier comments.
881	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
881	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	Most comments already made. Porthcawl car parking provision totally removed from Salt Lake and the fair has disappeared. How will this help or maintain tourism? Is everyone expected to park and ride into Porthcawl? We do not have a train station to help.
881	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
881	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
881	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	My response has concentrated on my community, Porthcawl, as I have lived here for 60 years and have seen all of the changes and the failed development proposals. My comments may appear to be totally negative but if they are reviewed correctly could result in changes without a total revision - or worse, rejection. For information, in my former 'employed life' I was involved in the creation of Planning Studies, Design Briefs etc for a number of development sites in Wales and I am certainly interested in the future of Porthcawl and financially sound development.
881	

LDP Rep: 882

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
882	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
882	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
882	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
882	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
882	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
882	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
882	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
882	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

882	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
882	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
882	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
882	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
882	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
882	

LDP Rep: 883

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
883	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
883	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
883	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
883	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
883	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
883	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
883	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
883	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

883	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
883	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
883	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
883	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
883	<p>I write to express concern and object to: -SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and -Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses Please can you remove the sites from the final LDP as; Settlement Boundary - the sites are outside the settlement boundary as defined by the A48. Traffic - proposals will increase traffic however no appraisal has been adequately completed. Currently congestion between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity; Ewenny road backs up below the potteries; air quality at Ewenny Roadabout exceed legal limits; New Inn Road is a rat run and dangerous for walkers/cyclists. cumulative impacts with other strategic developments need to be assessed. Nature - much of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area. Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 - The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedence on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic</p>

	landmark and potentially pose a safety risk. Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmore Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmore) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. Bridgend CBC have a duty to pass it on to the next generation.
--	---

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
883	

LDP Rep: 884

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	too much green spaces are being sacrificed for housing at a time when there much emphasis on climate change and people being urged to plant trees, and grow more of their own food etc
884	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	no
884	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	housing developments appear to be the priority before the infrastructure is in place
884	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	if the 'Bottle Bank' in Porthcawl is an example of good design, it does not auger well for any other development1
884	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	we appreciate people need homes to live in, but as stated earlier, it also needs infrastructure and that seems to a very after thought once the houses are erected
884	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	it is good that local people have jobs
884	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	Porthcawl may require an additional supermarket for choice and competition, but salt Lake is not the place for either a supermarket or more housing
884	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	no
884	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	sounds good but when put into practice, based on past works, it does not bode well for the future
884	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	no
884	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	see previous comments re Porthcawl Waterfront. loss of parking in salt lake needs to be addressed before any development progresses
884	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	no
884	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	no
884	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	we would like to think any comments would be listened to. however based on BCBC lack of consultation with residents in Porthcawl regarding previous and ongoing developments, we do not hold out much hope
884	

LDP Rep: 885

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
885	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
885	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
885	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
885	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
885	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
885	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
885	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
885	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

885	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
885	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
885	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
885	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
885	<p>Yesterday I had an interview with National Theatre Wales and Natural Resources Wales as a possible recipient in a project to engage the local community in Bridgend in thinking about key priorities in NRW's South Central Wales Area Statement https://naturalresources.wales/about-us/area-statements/south-central-wales-area-statement/?lang=en Key areas included connecting people with nature and air quality. This is also something aspired towards in the LDP for Bridgend. I am therefore - like very many others in the area - vehemently opposed to developing even more housing in the area. The roads cannot sustain more traffic. Many of my neighbours also find it dangerous walking our children to school and the air quality is bad due to the volume of traffic on the school run. See my further objections below:</p> <p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. <p>It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case</p>

particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough. Can we look instead to develop housing in disused buildings in Bridgend town centre if needed, and encourage people to walk and enhance public transport provision.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
885	

LDP Rep: 886

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
886	This plan (Island farm Development) was proposed several years ago. It went to a Public hearing and was rejected. It appears that the lack of provision of additional infrastructure is the only thing missing from this proposal. My objection is on the grounds that this plan does not take into account the need for a "Green Wedge" between Bridgend and Ewenny, it does not offer any enhanced facilities and were it to provide a roundabout at the meeting of Merthyr Mawr Road and the A48 it would make the A48 almost unmanageable for through vehicular traffic

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
886	Yes. Had the Senedd passed the M4 by-pass around Newport that would have meant that the Ineos development would now be underway, and the British Volt factory in St. Athan, which would indeed have provided the additional employment opportunities this plan speaks of. As someone who worked in industry all my working life, I can say that I have seen the diminishment of 'proper' employment opportunities in this area. The expected job opportunities in this plan are in my view highly unlikely.

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	No
886	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	this plan speaks of creating places where people want to live. Not sure if you have been into Bridgend town centre recently? It is not somewhere anyone in their right mind would want to live.
886	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	The plan talks about the economic growth across Bridgend being driven by the creation of more housing. there are not enough jobs to go round as it is. We need a plan that will reverse the ruralisation of South Wales that seems to be the Senedd plan.
886	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Yes. it is just that, a 'strategy' with little or no hope of meaningful implementation when the need for just in time delivery as spoken about by Sir. Jim Radcliffe has been snatched away by the Senedd by the refusal to give the go ahead to the M4 by-pass around the Brynglas tunnels in Newport. A better employment strategy would be the petitioning of the Senedd to change it's decision regarding the M4
886	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	This a shutting the stable door after the horse has bolted. Allowing the Pines retail development to go ahead was a disaster on a monumental scale. My earlier comment regarding the Town centre of Bridgend is pertinent here, we are confronted by closed shops, and a plethora of charity shops. Charging fees for parking is like shooting oneself in the foot. Allow free parking and stop the private parking lots that spring up and then prosecute innocent motorists who either fail to correctly display their ticket or overstay by a few moments for huge sums of money. If the Council is looking for a shopping deterrence proposal you have it right now.
886	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	It is quite clear that there is no understanding of Carbon in the environment. We are a Carbon based life form, if you start from the premise that Carbon is essential to life, then it is clear that both the local council and National and Globally the current narrative is wrong and is going to cost every single person more than they can afford. Do your own research. Dr. Patrick Moore late president of Greenpeace no less says exactly that. Don't waste ratepayers money on this nonsense.
886	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	<p>If the council cared a jot about the environment it would provide adequate litter bins. There is on Merthyr Mawr Road 1 - One litter bin that is within hours full of 'doggy bags' and then these are dumped on the road/pavement around. This is despite that fact that there is an enormous school less that 100 yards from this solitary litter bin.</p> <p>Travelling on the continent it is quite a shock to realise that traipsing through discarded litter is not the norm, there are bins every few meters and people use them. The council use of an outside contractor to collect refuse is the wrong decision, you only have to walk on a street that has just had it refuse collected to see that, they do not take sufficient care in ensuring the refuse all goes in the refuse lorry. Seeing country lanes cluttered up with litter and household waste because of the high charges for commercial firms to use landfill is also no way to improve the environment - make access to landfill free then the cost of cleaning up would be a thing of the past</p>
886	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	No
886	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	No
886	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	No
886	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Already made elsewhere in this survey
886	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Why is this being put forward again when a very similar proposal went through a very thorough public enquiry and was rejected?
886	

LDP Rep: 887

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
887	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
887	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
887	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
887	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
887	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
887	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
887	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
887	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

887	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
887	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
887	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
887	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
887	<p>I am writing with regard to the above proposed developments. I am a resident of Broadlands and I fear that these proposed developments are going to cause considerable difficulty with excess traffic on the A48. Trying to leave Broadlands at present is bad enough with the traffic from Porthcawl and through traffic from Cefn Glas. The grass upon entry to Broadlands is often overgrown which makes visibility poor and extremely dangerous. It can take 10 minutes or more to get off the estate now. God help us if your plans go ahead. The A48 is not suitable to take anymore traffic. It can sometimes take us 18 mins to get to J35 instead of 8 minutes It is dangerous enough now plus the extra pressure on facilities. Please note that we are not at all happy with your proposals.</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
887	

LDP Rep: 888

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
888	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
888	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
888	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
888	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
888	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
888	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
888	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
888	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

888	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
888	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
888	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
888	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
888	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
888	

LDP Rep: 889

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
889	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
889	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
889	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
889	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
889	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
889	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
889	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
889	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

889	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
889	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
889	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
889	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
889	<p>We would like to register our appeal for the development of 847 houses on Island Farm and 110 houses South of Broadlands roundabout. Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP</p>

	<p>Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.
--	--

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
889	

LDP Rep: 890

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
890	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
890	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
890	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
890	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
890	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
890	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
890	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
890	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

890	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
890	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
890	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
890	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
890	As a resident of Heol Gam which is on the other side of the A48 to the proposed developments, I have the following concerns on the effect to the environment for both of these developments; 1. The increase in traffic at the Ewenny Road roundabout and New Inn Road 2. Safety concerns for children and other pedestrians crossing the A48 which has a 50mph speed limit. 3. Effect on already stretched local schools, doctors surgeries and the POW hospital. 4. Adverse effect on the Dipping Bridge and Merthyr Mawr which are visited by cyclists, joggers and tourists and families and young adults. I shall be grateful if these concerns can please be considered.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
890	

LDP Rep: 891

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
891	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
891	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
891	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
891	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
891	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
891	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
891	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
891	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

891	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
891	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
891	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
891	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
891	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
891	

LDP Rep: 892

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
892	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
892	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
892	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
892	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
892	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
892	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
892	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
892	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

892	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
892	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
892	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
892	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
892	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough. Stop treating our town and surroundings as nothing more than a commuter zone for Cardiff where our green spaces and wildlife count for nothing. We are overrun with houses and totally lacking in facilities already.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
892	

LDP Rep: 893

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
893	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
893	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
893	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
893	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
893	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
893	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
893	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
893	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
-----------	--

893	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
893	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
893	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
893	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
893	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
893	

LDP Rep: 894

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID 894	This is not a straightforward document and it is confusing. It does not support ease of expressing opinion. The consultation I do not believe is set out to allow people to have a voice. I am having to ask a neighbour to help me fill this in. I am in my 80's and think i would need to be a bachelor of science to fill this in. I have had to get a hard copy through facebook to enable to see what is being asked as on line it does not let me see the next question.
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID 894	Urbanisation of Sandy Bay and Salt Lake will reduce parking. Porthcawl is a tourist town which relies on visitors throughout the year to survive. There is not the infrastructure to cope with such urbanisation. Extra housing will only satisfy the all ready rich allowing them to buy and let or set up holiday homes. It is a seaside town and the priority should be leisure. What about green spaces - the LDP does not seem to be considerate of this. There is I believe a policy that covers this called the Green Wedge Policy. They need to recognise the significant value of the costal town.
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID 894	What about the 1937 health and physical training act which is for leisure camping and caravan sites not residential, has this been dissolved in parliament? The LDP has shown green spaces in the plan far smaller than is required within the Green Cities recommendation.
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID 894	I have not seen any design in the plan. All I have seen blocks of land for development not detail. The strategy has identified 40 jobs through Aldi. There will be more cars and people will still have to travel for work. We are not coping with the roads now so how on earth with all these extra houses will we manage you can at least double the amount of traffic on the road.
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID 894	The surgery's, hospitals, and schools are full to capacity already. The infrastructure is not going to meet the needs of the people. We have many cars wanting to come to visit but there already is not enough parking. We have the beach but we need other facilities as this is a tourist town and should encourage visitors winter and summer.
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	

894	<p>I do not believe that employment will be significantly increased. There is likely to be loss of employment with other business as it is suggested that park and ride is an alternative to parking within Porthcawl but many visitors visit to go to beach with considerable equipment which they are unlikely to leave to go to visits the shops. This will impact on employment. The considerable number of houses that are proposed will again increase traffic on the roads, this will put people off visiting the town as already the roads on a sunny day are bumper to bumper. The crossing of roads is not safe because of the amount of traffic already in the town even in winter. I have experience long waits to cross the road on my mobility scooter. I have my dog travelling with me and it is a considerable risk to elderly people and animals that sometimes is their only company. Employment is not a significant reason for making our town unsafe.</p>
-----	---

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
<p>ID 894</p>	<p>Local shops are important to me I can access them on my mobility scooter. It is important to me to have a variety of shops because this is often entertainment to me and it gives me the opportunity to make friends or otherwise spend long hours on my own Big shops do not offer this personalisation and allow me to make friends. I do use out of town shopping when i have transport with my family who give up their time to take me. I worry considerably that my social life will be affected by the local development plan which will no doubt impact on small businesses for the reasons explained. The important for me is the lack a good infrastructure and impact on my social life and the safety for me re the roads.</p>

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
<p>ID 894</p>	<p>I fully support the low carbon footprint strategy for Porthcawl but every household having a electric car is a long way off but whatever car it is it will still need car parking spaces. Park and ride not suitable as people carry loads of equipment, such as prams, barbeques chairs etc, they will not leave them to go shopping people will not visit our town and will go elsewhere. I do not want Porthcawl to be overcrowded with residents or cars. It would not be a healthy place to live, because of dangers on the roads particularly to elderly and disabled people who may be hard of hearing or with sight problems because electric cars cannot be heard. For elderly and disabled people this plan does not work.</p>

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
<p>ID 894</p>	<p>We do not need more houses. This will bring about more people and more vehicles. These people will cause problems with hospitals, surgery's which is already overstretched. It will impact on the environment which I hold very close to my heart such as disturbance of small animals and birds and their habitat along with the disturbance of the relic dunes. Sandy bay is a favourite place to go as i can use my scooter alongside walk my dog. It is safe and lots to see, peaceful and life enhancing. I am extremely concerned that the elderly and the young have not been considered when this space could be used to bring young and elderly together to enjoy be it participating in activities or observing.</p>

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
894	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	I believe from looking at all maps in circulation including this one that the LDP weighs heavily on housing where there are more appropriate places other than a seaside town that should be enhanced for leisure. Any regeneration should consider the young and the elderly views but in my opinion if i had not had the support of a neighbour i would not have been able to have my voice heard.
894	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
894	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
894	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	I want to stretch the point that more facilities for the young people and the elderly and disabled should be considered as a priority ie the pump track which i would love to watch the children and adults have fun and this would give elderly so much entertainment that cost nothing. Seeing younger people enjoy will make me enjoy - soo much fun could be given to all with some insight from the local authority. I know that you are stretched for income to provide services in the county but Porthcawl should be promoted for for tourism and current residents that have contribute considerably over the years for positive regeneration. I don't believe that the LDP is in the best interest of residents.
894	

LDP Rep: 895

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
895	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
895	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
895	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
895	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
895	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
895	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
895	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
895	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

895	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
895	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
895	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
895	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
895	<p>I wish to register my objection if the above proposed housing development Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ - maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; - reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; - provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; - guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and - ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive</p>

environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
895	

LDP Rep: 896

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
896	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
896	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
896	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
896	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
896	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
896	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
896	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
896	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

896	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
896	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
896	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
896	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
896	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
896	

LDP Rep: 897

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
897	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
897	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
897	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
897	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
897	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
897	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
897	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
897	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

897	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
897	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
897	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
897	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
897	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
897	

LDP Rep: 898

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable): [REDACTED]

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	SOBJ4: To protect and enhance distinctive and natural places. If you go ahead with plans to build 1000 homes on land on Craig y parcau and island farm I fail to see how you are protecting our natural places. Weve already lost land to broad land from a natural corridor from Bridgend town to Merthyr mawr and now you intend to take more. I can not believe you think this will have no impact on Merthyr mawr village as a lover of nature nd a Walker I'm heart broken you are thinking of stealing this away from us, I can only assume you are not from this area.
898	
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	It's been ill advised, stop being influenced by developers and consider the people of Bridgend who you are supposed to represent. You plans do not match you vision. Protect, protect protect, it's your duty.
898	
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	I think your stretching things by saying a world war 2 site to house workers and the prisoners of war and a site of an old peoples home are brown field sites, you're not fooling anyone.
898	
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	During the pandemic ive seen a high increase in numbers of the public utilising the area around Merthyr mawr, this has been invaluable for peoples wellbeing.
898	
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	How can you improve liesure facilities by destroying our environment. Has anyone considered how people will cross the A48 without becoming human hedgehogs. An underpass is dangerous, and lights will cause disruption to a major road.
898	
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Placing this development elsewhere will not affect employment.
898	
7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Open up Bridgend town to traffic and parking. Admit you were wrong to pedestrianise it.
898	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	Solar panels for all new homes. Support people to install natural heating systems.
898	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	Protect our natural spaces, resist developers plans to build on the jewels of County and be aware of unscrupulous lobbying by Councillors with alternative agenders.
898	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
898	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
898	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
898	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	I dont feel development on island farm and Craig y parcau is in keeping with you policy to protect our natural spaces and is yet another attempt by developers to get their hands on prime building land for executive housing.
898	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
898	

LDP Rep: 899

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
899	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
899	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	What a disappointment to hear of plans to build houses on land adjacent to Newbridge Fields In the past we've regrettably supported the destruction of our town and the surrounding countryside with the need of housing for the next generation. We will never support the loss of the final barrier between Bridgend and Merthyr Mawr estate this will destroy the last character of the County. You probably already of the anger locally and a few of the reasons are listed below. Green spaces Protection of wildlife Mental Health and the access to open spaces Traffic is horrendous today without adding additional volume We would be interested to hear of your plans in how you're dealing with the already over stretched schools, GPs and traffic volume. Today as elected representees you could campaign to remove the proposed land from the list of local development and look towards rewilding our town centre and County.
899	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	What a disappointment to hear of plans to build houses on land adjacent to Newbridge Fields In the past we've regrettably supported the destruction of our town and the surrounding countryside with the need of housing for the next generation. We will never support the loss of the final barrier between Bridgend and Merthyr Mawr estate this will destroy the last character of the County. You probably already of the anger locally and a few of the reasons are listed below. Green spaces Protection of wildlife Mental Health and the access to open spaces Traffic is horrendous today without adding additional volume We would be interested to hear of your plans in how you're dealing with the already over stretched schools, GPs and traffic volume. You should campaign to remove the proposed land from the list of local development and look towards rewilding our town centre and County.
899	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
899	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID

899

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID

899

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID

899

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

899

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

899

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

899

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID

899

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

899

What a disappointment to hear of plans to build houses on land adjacent to Newbridge Fields. In the past we've regrettably supported the destruction of our town and the surrounding countryside with the need of housing for the next generation. We will never support the loss of the final barrier between Bridgend and Merthyr Mawr estate this will destroy the last character of the County. You probably already of the anger locally and a few of the reasons are listed below. Green spaces Protection of wildlife Mental Health and the access to open spaces Traffic is horrendous today without adding additional volume We would be interested to hear of your plans in how you're dealing with the already over stretched schools, GPs and traffic volume. You should campaign to remove the proposed land from the list of local development and look towards rewilding our town centre and County.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
899	

LDP Rep: 900

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	No I totally agree with the proposals.
900	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	No.
900	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	No
900	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Would be nice to see more modern styles homes rather than duplicating what we have. Would be nice to houses with rain water harvesting and solar panels and other eco ideas designed in.
900	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	We would need more medical services of doctors, dentists, physiotherapists, hospital beds and improving the town centre.
900	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	No
900	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	I agree
900	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
900	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	
900	

ID	
900	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
900	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	The only barrier to development in Porthcawl are the resident NIMBY's in Porthcawl. Everything planned nearly always gets rejected and the seafront desperately needs modernisation around Coney Beach.
900	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
900	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Let's get them implemented
900	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Theres been a lot of misleading social media scare mongering about housing plans for Bridgend by local councillors. Let's get the LDP implemented and start building more homes asap.
900	

LDP Rep: 901

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	The council doesn't take into consideration existing properties when allowing developments causing great problems to existing property and causing a great intrusion of privacy
901	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	All ready stated
901	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	All ready stated
901	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	All ready stated
901	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	All ready stated
901	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	No
901	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	Yes all ready stated
901	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	No
901	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	Yes all ready stated
901	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	Yes already stated
901	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
901	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	Yes all ready stated
901	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Yes all ready stated
901	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Residents should be fully aware that as previously stated that council doesn't take into consideration existing properties when allowing developments which causes great problems
901	

LDP Rep: 902

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Traffic control of A48 through Bridgend
902	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	To many homes on South Side of Bridgend
902	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Sustainable growth of South Bridgend
902	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
902	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
902	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
902	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
902	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
902	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

902	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	No more homes needed on South Side of Bridgend
902	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
902	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
902	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
902	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
902	

LDP Rep: 903

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
903	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
903	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
903	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
903	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
903	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
903	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
903	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
903	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

903	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
903	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
903	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
903	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
903	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
903	

LDP Rep: 904

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
904	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
904	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
904	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
904	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
904	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
904	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
904	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
904	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

904	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
904	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
904	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
904	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
904	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
904	

LDP Rep: 905

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
905	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
905	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
905	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
905	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
905	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
905	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
905	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
905	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

905	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
905	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
905	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
905	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
905	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
905	

LDP Rep: 906

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
906	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
906	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
906	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
906	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
906	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
906	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
906	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
906	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

906	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
906	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
906	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
906	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
906	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
906	

LDP Rep: 907

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
907	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
907	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
907	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
907	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
907	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
907	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
907	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
907	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

907	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
907	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
907	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
907	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
907	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
907	

LDP Rep: 908

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
908	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
908	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
908	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
908	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
908	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
908	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
908	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
908	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

908	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
908	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
908	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
908	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
908	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
908	

LDP Rep: 909

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
909	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
909	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
909	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
909	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
909	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
909	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
909	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
909	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

909	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
909	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
909	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
909	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
909	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
909	

LDP Rep: 910

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
910	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
910	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
910	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
910	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
910	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
910	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
910	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
910	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

910	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
910	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
910	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
910	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	We strongly object to the plans Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals
910	

would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
910	

LDP Rep: 911

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
911	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
911	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
911	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
911	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
911	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
911	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
911	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
911	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

911	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
911	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
911	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
911	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ - maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; - reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; - provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; - guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and - ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current
911	

and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
911	

LDP Rep: 912

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
912	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
912	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
912	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
912	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	I am totally against the local development plan to build on greenfield land between Bryntirion and Laleston due to the enormous amount of damage it will do to the natural features of this area and because there is limited infrastructure and public services to support it. Another 850 cars added to the narrow roads around Laleston and Bridgend does not bear thinking, about so it's a definite "NO" from me.
912	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
912	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
912	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
912	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	I am totally against the local development plan to build on greenfield land between Bryntirion and Laleston due to the enormous amount of damage it will do to the natural features of this area and because there is limited infrastructure and public services to support it. Another 850 cars added to the narrow roads around Laleston and Bridgend does not bear thinking, about so it's a definite "NO" from me.
912	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
912	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
912	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
912	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	I am totally against the local development plan to build on greenfield land between Bryntirion and Laleston due to the enormous amount of damage it will do to the natural features of this area and because there is limited infrastructure and public services to support it. Another 850 cars added to the narrow roads around Laleston and Bridgend does not bear thinking, about so it's a definite "NO" from me.
912	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
912	

LDP Rep: 913

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
913	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
913	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
913	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
913	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
913	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
913	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
913	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
913	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

913	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
913	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
913	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
913	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
913	Strongly object to the Island Farm development which puts at risk an area of outstanding natural beauty, will make the already congested A48 a nightmare and increase the amount of people using New Inn Road as a shortcut. Also would not want to see Broadlands merge into Laleston, losing the integrity of existing communities.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
913	

LDP Rep: 914

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
914	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
914	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
914	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
914	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
914	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
914	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
914	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
914	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

914	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
914	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
914	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
914	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
914	<p>Please see below my feelings regarding the building of more homes around the A48 and Merthyr Mawr. Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ - maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; - reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; - provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; - guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and - ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive</p>

environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
914	

LDP Rep: 915

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
915	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
915	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
915	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
915	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
915	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
915	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
915	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
915	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

915	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
915	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
915	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
915	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
915	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
915	

LDP Rep: 916

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
916	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
916	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
916	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
916	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
916	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
916	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
916	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
916	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
-----------	--

916	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
916	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
916	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
916	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
916	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
916	

LDP Rep: 917

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
917	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
917	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
917	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
917	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
917	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
917	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
917	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
917	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
-----------	--

917	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
917	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
917	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
917	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
917	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
917	

LDP Rep: 918

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
918	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
918	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
918	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
918	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
918	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
918	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
918	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
918	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

918	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
918	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
918	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
918	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
918	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

	<p>the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.</p>
--	---

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
<p>ID 918</p>	<p>It is disappointing that Hut 9 is only mentioned once in the draft LDP documentation, and this in a single sentence in Appendix 5. Given that this is a Grade 2 listed building, with unique historical significance, the LDP should make it very clear that this asset will be given special attention and protection. At the very least the LDP should specify that Hut 9 will form the centre of a designated open space, with a surrounding area sufficient and suitable for exhibitions and open days, and space allocated for day to day car parking for volunteers. There should also be a car parking strategy for visitors to Hut 9 on open days, including special provision for disabled visitors.</p>

LDP Rep: 919

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
919	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
919	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
919	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
919	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
919	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
919	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
919	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
919	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

919	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
919	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
919	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
919	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
919	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
919	

LDP Rep: 920

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
920	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
920	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
920	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
920	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
920	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
920	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
920	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
920	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

920	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
920	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
920	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
920	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
920	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
920	

LDP Rep: 921

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
921	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
921	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
921	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
921	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
921	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
921	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
921	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
921	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
-----------	--

921	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
921	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
921	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
921	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	<p>All of below- not to mention the strain on the hospital! Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: '· maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive</p>
921	

environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
921	

LDP Rep: 922

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
922	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
922	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
922	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
922	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
922	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
922	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
922	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
922	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

922	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
922	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
922	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
922	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	<p>I am extremely worried having read about the latest plans to build 847 houses on the island farm/Craig y parcau area. I have lived within a quarter of a mile from there all my 62 years. It is already very difficult getting out from Merthyr Mawr Rd left onto the A48 as the traffic is so busy. The whole area from Broadlands roundabout to Waterton is also very congested (especially during commuter times. The area around the dipping bridge and Merthyr Mawr village is definitely a huge tourist draw because of the wildlife and scenery plus accessible roads for walking and dog walking. We just had visitors from Yorkshire staying nearby and they had been reading about all the sights in South Wales.They asked to go to both the dipping bridge,swing bridge and Merthyr Mawr village as they had been highly rated as places of beauty. I walk my dog through Newbridge fields and across to the dipping bridge often and enjoy a stroll to Merthyr Mawr as it's so peaceful. To summarise-I am appalled to think that this area of natural beauty and tranquility will be spoiled by yet another housing "blot on the landscape".The roads will never cope and the whole area will become gridlocked with people using lanes to try and avoid the traffic which in turn will add to pollution levels and accidents. I am totally against this proposition</p>
922	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
922	

LDP Rep: 712

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
712	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
712	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
712	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
712	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
712	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
712	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
712	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
712	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

712	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
712	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
712	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
712	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
712	<p>I/We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds; Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural</p>

context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the “Dipping Bridge” and arguably include the “Showground Field” which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, “To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places”. Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area.

Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 -

The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedance on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk.

Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmore Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmore) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
712	

LDP Rep: 880

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
880	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
880	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
880	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
880	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
880	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
880	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
880	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
880	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

880	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
880	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
880	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
880	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
880	<p>I hereby object to the above proposals and ask that the two sites be deleted from the final LDP, for the following reasons. Settlement Boundary Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. This was set up for a reason to allow resident of Bridgend to have a green lung right on their doorstep. We need to protect this area for future generations. These developments will destroy that protection. Bridgend has lost so many green areas in the last few years, Broadland and Parc Derwen to mention just two. The UK government has recommended that Authorities look at the less used of greenfield sites for development and to look to brown field and re-development of existing sites. Bridgend seems to have taken the easy route and only look for easy win on greenfield sites. The two mentioned above being recent examples of this outdated policy. The boundary of the A48 is mean to protect valuable green field areas around Bridgend and should not so easily be removed. Traffic The traffic congestion at the junctions/roundabouts between Broadlands and Waterton exceed their design capacity during the AM and PM rush hours periods resulting in long lines of queuing traffic. It should be noted that in the area around Ewenny Roundabout the pollution levels already exceed government standard and mitigation has been required for a long time. Traffic on the B4265 towards Ewenny also backs up to beyond the potteries and summer traffic levels see both the B4265 and the A48 total congested. As a result of this existing congestion at the junctions/roundabouts, New Inn Road/ Hernston Lane have become rat runs for motorist avoiding he congestion on the A48. This addition traffic on what can only be called country lanes is already presenting a danger to both walkers and cyclists. This development will dramatically increase traffic on the A48, B4265 Ewenny Road and hence on New Inn Road/Hernston Lane. The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP without any technical assessment is both reckless and at worse a dereliction of your duties as Officers of the Authority. The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence of the cumulative effect of all</p>

these developments, on the highways network and without robust assessments it will leave the LDP open for further challengers and accusation of unprofessionalism. The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, and cannot support the claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. A sports village would have caused random peaks in capacity on the local highways but a housing development will obviously create a constantly increasing demand on the already congested network. The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area. The green wedge offered by the area shown in the draft LDP provides the southern area of Bridgend with easy and immediate access to the countryside. Once you have allowed development to cross the A48 any protection of other areas toward Merthyr Mawr will be severely weakened and degraded. Safety To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48. The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will only deteriorate if this development is allowed to be developed. This definitely contradicts the aims of the Authority to develop and encourage more green transport corridors. The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and will inevitable increase the risk of damage to the structure and adversely affect pedestrians. Placemaking The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmores Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmores) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. It is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation. The only way to achieve this is to remove these areas from the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

880

LDP Rep: 923

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable): [REDACTED]

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
923	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
923	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
923	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
923	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
923	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
923	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
923	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
923	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

923	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
923	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
923	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
923	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
923	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
923	<p>We hereby object to any further development along the Llynfi Valley and surrounding area and ask for BCBC to consider the potential direct and indirect impact these developments would have on the Tondu and Aberkenfig area, which form part of the Valleys Gateway and believe more local consultation is required on these issues. •We believe any proposed significant residential developments in Maesteg and LLangynwyd would have a significant effect on an area which BCBC has within the LDP already acknowledged, has major capacity issues when looking at the access to the M4 corridor at J36. •The LDP states - 'Unspecified improvements to the A4063 between Tondu and Maesteg' - this suggests that BCBC recognises this road is at capacity but has no idea how to resolve it. The extra volume of HGV traffic from WEPA when their expansion is complete, along with further developments along the route, will punish the homeowners in both Tondu and Coytrahen with excessive noise and air pollution. •Whilst pleased to see that the LDP acknowledged that there are capacity issues which would constrain further significant residential development, we are concerned the LDP lacks insufficient plans for affordable housing and that the targets set are far too low and that the suggestion that S106 will deliver social and affordable housing is unrealistic. •We feel a lack of consideration has been given to the provision of medical facilities. At present there is already a 2 -3 week waiting period for a call back from most local surgeries. The electorate will not accept that this is dismissed as out of BCBC authority. We want to see and take confidence that these concerns are being address or are BCBC prepared for the backlash when surgeries reach capacity? •More housing means an increase in noise and air pollution, the LDP shows a lack of attention to the impact these developments will have! This leads us to question how this LDP fits with BCBC's promotion of improving the environment and people's health and well-being? •We consider policies over green spaces and play areas should be strengthened to ensure more of them and better access to walk/cycle</p>

routes and more investment in public transport! •We must raise concerns about the significant residential development planned near PYLE (estimated 2000+ new homes) and whether they are needed. The growth strategy in the Deposit Consultation document states that with an expected population growth of 500, 505 new homes are required. However, we consider this statement is not evidence based and simply speculative. •Sites for housing should be revised in light of the pandemic as the likelihood is that fewer people will be regularly commuting to the town centre offices post pandemic. This will lead to more empty office space and the LDP should focus on converting this to housing and arts/cultural/hospitality to create a vibrant town centre. •Targets for affordable housing are far too low – all the evidence suggests relying on S106 is not delivering affordable or social housing.

LDP Rep: 924

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
924	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
924	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
924	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
924	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
924	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
924	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
924	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
924	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

924	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
924	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
924	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
924	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I am against the proposed at Merthyr Mawr which would result in traffic chaos (847 reasonable houses would result in about 1000 vehicles, most of them SUVs). But above all this would destroy an absolutely beautiful part of Bridgend. There would also be a deleterious effect on wildlife.
924	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
924	

LDP Rep: 925

Representor Name: ████████████████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
925	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
925	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
925	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
925	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
925	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
925	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
925	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
925	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

925	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
925	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
925	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
925	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
925	<p>I as a member of the public living on Ewenny Road, Bridgend, will find these developments, causing more and more traffic using Ewenny Road at all hours of the day and night. If more and more commercial lorries travel down this road, my home will be shaken so much. I do not believe bcbc will cover any cost incurred because of this. As a council you cannot deal with keeping these roads in good condition as it stands now. Then we move to the issue of parking in the town centre. Currently side streets around my home are packed with parents collecting children from school, and workers parking to go into town. I know a permit parking scheme is being thought about, but where will these cars go?. Moving on to facilities for these new home owners. Riversdale surgery cannot cope with the amount of patients they have now, and I don't believe broadlands has a gp practice, so where will these new people get medical care from??? Similar statement for the schools in Bridgend, all full or almost. Then there is employment. Yes affordable housing, but usually these people are unskilled workers, where will they work. Of course we come to council tax, more people paying, means everyone else's council tax is reduced, doubt that. Will cctv be installed In these new areas, that is a joke, bcbc cannot afford to keep town centre cctv working. How about solving the other issues in Bridgend before bringing more unsuspecting people in. Also, I am sure some of these areas are very close to or are classed as flood plains. With rainfall increasing, has this been taken into consideration. This email is just the tip of the iceberg. I am also disappointed to see that local residents need to find out about this, from other local residents not via bcbc directly. Also you do all the consultation during a pandemic.</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
925	

LDP Rep: 926

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
926	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
926	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
926	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
926	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
926	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
926	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
926	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
926	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

926	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
926	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
926	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
926	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
926	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
926	

LDP Rep: 924

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
924	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
924	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
924	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
924	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
924	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
924	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
924	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
924	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

924	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
924	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
924	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
924	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I strongly object to these proposals. This development at Merthyr Mawr would destroy a beautiful part of Bridgend affecting wildlife. Further the increase in traffic would cause complete chaos in the area - this number of houses would result in a considerable number of extra cars added to the already heavy flow. Medical services are already over-stretched by the existing levels of population.
924	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
924	

LDP Rep: 927

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	I think the plan to build over 1000 new houses in bridgend makes SOBJ4 completely unachievable
927	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	Bridgend is already saturated, too many new houses with no additional infrastructure such as doctors surgery's, dentists, congested roads, hospital capacity. What are we mopping up Cardiff's excess population
927	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	Grown is not sustainable when it does not include adequate supportive infrastructure- roads, facilities, schools,
927	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	The readability of this survey far exceeds the literacy level of a lot of people in Bridgend which precludes them from fairly being able to contribute to this.
927	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	You have already failed epically in the design of part Derwen- it's congested narrow roads lead to streets of crammed in houses with not enough parking space for the number of cars a modern household realistically owns, apart from a few parks there are no facilities on site- not even a public bin, non existent bus route, saturated school, congested access points at main roundabout. Why not concentrate on fixing poor design of this to enhance the local community, and connecting this to the town and train station before making the same mistake in laeston and Islam farm
927	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	You seem to be creating a commuter belt for Cardiff, not jobs for bridgend
927	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	Retail will not thrive in the local area until you remove the social housing and drug rehab premises on coity road- the inhabitants of which hang around the town centre and bus station intimidating other members of the public. Bridgend needs a massive facelift, with a number of building demolished and some of the older buildings restored. Out with poundworld and in with independent shops
927	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID

No comment

927

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

Do not destroy Merthyr mawr! It's already used as a rat run for cars trying to avoid the ridiculous ewenny roundabout, making the area unsafe for walkers and cyclists

927

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

927

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

Instead of building an Aldi and other tacky leisure facilities in porthcawl use the space to build a non-tidal marina, this would put porthcawl on the map. Also before embarking on any further development you need to sort out a strategy for completing whatever was being constructed and developed by the Jenner's building that has now ground to a halt

927

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID

Agree with improved cycling routes

927

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

No more house!! Saturday population already. Agree need better and more joined up cycling routes

927

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

927

LDP Rep: 928

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	By building so many houses in Porthcawl you are ripping the heart of the community right out of it, this is a tourist driven town and BCBC are determined to kill it by making it a commuter belt town for Cardiff
928	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	How can building a load of over priced houses on a car park that is solidly full during the summer in a tourist town going to add more jobs? It will kill the employment in this lovely town
928	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	I cannot see how having over priced houses on a plot of land that sustains wildlife now is sustainable growth, greed for greeds sake
928	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	You really think a load of cookie cutter houses being placed right at the heart of a tourist driven town is a great asset to it in design or quality! Don't be ridiculous
928	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	One thing I can assure you of is this community will fight you all the way with these plans. Porthcawl is here for families to enjoy a day out, how can they if you take the biggest car park away and they can't get down here anymore, that's splitting communities apart
928	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	You will be taking tourists away, taking businesses cash away and loosing jobs with this plan
928	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	Now you are being silly, this is a tourist town, take away the car park you take away the tourists, you kill local businesss, you lower employment, less money, no shops!
928	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	More houses more waste!
928	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	Oh yeah a load of ugly brick houses on what is now a natural haven for birds and plant life great way to support the environment!!
928	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID
928

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	All my previous comments have been to address this area, your being greedy and you will ruin what you yourselves has called the jewel of Bridgend
928	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID
928

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID
928

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID
928

LDP Rep: 929

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
929	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
929	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
929	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
929	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
929	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
929	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
929	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
929	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

929	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
929	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
929	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
929	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
929	Please be informed of my concerns regarding the building of 2 new housing developments (847 dwellings on island farm and 110 on Craig y parcau). Regarding this I would like to lodge a complaint also concerning a failure to keep the grass and trees in order on Broadlands Estate as it is. Let alone building more houses in the area with more trees and grass for the local council to not maintain.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
929	

LDP Rep: 930

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
930	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
930	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
930	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
930	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
930	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
930	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
930	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
930	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

930	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
930	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
930	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
930	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I am totally against building of these houses the congestion will be horrendous and the wildlife will be badly effected.
930	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
930	

LDP Rep: 931

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
931	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
931	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
931	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
931	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
931	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
931	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
931	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
931	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

931	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
931	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
931	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
931	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I would like to register my opposition to the proposed housing development at Island Farm and Craig y Parcau, South of Broadlands. There are so many reasons why this should not be allowed to happen, some of which are outlined here: Broadlands development was stopped in recent years because it had reached capacity for a functional development. The proposed sites are merely extensions of Broadlands across the A48 and a way of extending by stealth. Traffic on the A48, Ewenny roundabout and entrances to shopping at Tesco, McDonald's, etc are already causing major backups at busy times. Getting out of Broadlands at peak times is currently difficult and this would be made even worse. Services such as schools and dentists cannot cope with existing demand and would necessitate investment and further building. The proposed sites are some of the few areas of greenfield available to residents without the need to travel. Congestion and pollution will increase as a result and this is contrary to environmental goals.
931	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
931	

LDP Rep: 932

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
932	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
932	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
932	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
932	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
932	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
932	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
932	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
932	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

932	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
932	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
932	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
932	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I would like to register my opposition to the proposed housing development at Island Farm and Craig y Parcau, South of Broadlands. There are so many reasons why this should not be allowed to happen, some of which are outlined here: Broadlands development was stopped in recent years because it had reached capacity for a functional development. The proposed sites are merely extensions of Broadlands across the A48 and a way of extending by stealth. Traffic on the A48, Ewenny roundabout and entrances to shopping at Tesco, McDonald's, etc are already causing major backups at busy times. Getting out of Broadlands at peak times is currently difficult and this would be made even worse. Services such as schools and dentists cannot cope with existing demand and would necessitate investment and further building. The proposed sites are some of the few areas of greenfield available to residents without the need to travel. Congestion and pollution will increase as a result and this is contrary to environmental goals.
932	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
932	

LDP Rep: 933

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
933	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
933	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
933	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
933	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
933	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
933	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
933	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
933	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

933	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
933	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
933	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
933	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	<p>Who ever propose this amount of development on the above areas, obviously do not live nearby to witness the amount of traffic, congestion, air pollution , traffic noise etc. Making this area saturated as it is. Not to mention the loss of protected wild life, beautiful walks and scenery. Us residents voted our local councillors in for their views against such proposals. Will not be voting for them again if this abortion goes through. Please, please stop theses developments.</p>
933	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
933	

LDP Rep: 949

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
949	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
949	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
949	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
949	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
949	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
949	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
949	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
949	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

949	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
949	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
949	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
949	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I Object Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce
949	

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
949	

LDP Rep: 950

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
950	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
950	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
950	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
950	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
950	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
950	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
950	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
950	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

950	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
950	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
950	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
950	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
950	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
950	

LDP Rep: 934

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
934	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
934	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
934	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
934	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
934	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
934	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
934	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
934	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

934	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
934	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
934	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
934	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
934	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce</p>

the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
934	

LDP Rep: 935

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
935	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
935	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
935	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
935	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
935	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
935	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
935	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
935	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

935	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
935	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
935	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
935	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
935	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 I am writing to object to the proposed changes/allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend. Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ - maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; - reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; - provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; - guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and - ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive</p>

environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
935	

LDP Rep: 786

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
786	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
786	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
786	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
786	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
786	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
786	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
786	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
786	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

786	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
786	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
786	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
786	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
786	<p>To whom it may concern, I am Michael Wright of 25, Kennedy Drive Pencoed CF35 6TW. I write to make observations on your LDP proposals specifically for the Pencoed area which I have lived in since 1979/80 some 42 years. I am married and we have two married daughters. The youngest lives in the Penprysg ward. We have a great deal of experience of Pencoed, bringing up children, schooling, working and driving.</p> <p>SCHOOLS There are several areas in the plans that are detailed as Residential. Some are to the north of the "crossing" and I know that the moratorium remains in place preventing building at present. Above the crossing towards the top of Hendre and to the east Ref303.C1 Trebryn Farm (land at) is a substantial plot of land, marked as residential. My guess at 300/400 houses. Ref 352.C45 Green Acre Drive (land off) marked as education (formally 49.B1 Marked as Play area) Plus I have knowledge of other sites for development either side of Ystadwaun. Cattle grid end on the right travelling towards the seat/bench and the left just before 150/200 metres to the seat area. Waiting for the moratorium to end I assume. The residential possibility for anything other than the foregoing is vast if the rest of the development goes ahead. But you have not identified one school. On 219C1 Mixed use; Housing. Education. Public open space. "Education" is again used as in 352.C45. Am I to believe that these are both schools? Because they are needed. Indeed, these two and more if all sites are developed. If these are infant schools. Where is any indication of any junior schools? Because I'm told the new one, recently opened, is nearly at capacity. The natural progression to secondary education, unless there are plans to vastly extend the present Pencoed Comp, are not seemingly catered for. You are asking for forward looking sustainable plans surely education has to be available day one to any family of four moving into the area. This cannot be a make do and mend. When it gets built type of scheme two bums to a seat because there is no room. Surly not? Yet you chose to defer this part of planning to the next stage before consulting the Education Authority. DOCTORS SURGERIES Pencoed is desperate for the expansion of or more doctors' surgeries. I have failed to find any provision for any medical establishment. Instead, you have chosen to defer this to the next stage of planning before consulting the Health Authority. DRIVING We are all aware of the problems the level crossing causes and there now seems to be a strong possibility that a</p>

replacement for the Penprysg Road Bridge will mean the road over rail will be shut. This will mean all the traffic that went over the crossing will go across the "New Bridge" down Min-Y-Nant to the lights at the Social Club. Some turning left but the majority right. Only to come to a standstill because they cannot pass the parked cars and vans and the traffic coming down Hendre Road because all the crossing closure has managed to do is move one traffic jam to another place. Hendre Road. This stretch of road has been a bone of contention for several years. Vehicles travelling away from the crossing must negotiate the parked vehicles. Vehicles travelling into the crossing reluctant to give way. Resulting in traffic jams or crashes. Councillor Julia Williams has worked tirelessly to try to resolve the issue but has been blocked at every suggestion she has seen as a solution. The opinion is now that the problem will remain until a fatality highlights the matter. Unless this problem is removed either before or as part of the new bridge construction the estimated cost of 17 Million pounds will be a waste of public money, and you will have a disaster at the heart of the proposed plans for Pencoed. It will be a disaster before the moratorium is removed. If the plans go ahead for housing at Ref303.C1 Trebryn Farm (land at), the possibility of a school at Ref 352.C45 Green Acre Drive (land off) and housing on Ystadwaun. The number of vehicles is going to increase on that road daily by 40% off peak 60% peak periods. God forbid a fatality on the child run to or from school. Now the road is being used as a "rat run" from where it joins Heol By Eastwood/Heol Lass and Small Holdings at peak times adding to the problem. Many suggestions have been made over the years but I am not aware of any serious study being made. There are many solutions available but none without upsetting some residents. But none the less there must be something done before the crossing closes. On 219C1 Mixed use; Housing. Education. Public open space and 219.C2. When this area is finally finished with its 770 homes and its rather after thought road. The A473 from the Dragon Studios through to the M4 junction 35 is going to be a constant flow of traffic as it stands now and Pencoed is as good as going to be at a standstill. A lot of thought is going into junction 36 but with the proposed developments alongside of the A473 from Coity J35 is going to be a log jam. Just how any emergency service vehicles are going to get into Pencoed is pure guess work. There was a rumour that the open cast site would have a junction onto the motorway (J34A?) and that would be helpful. You could consider putting a weight limit, except for access, on the Felindre Road to and from Pentre Meyrick making the HGV's take the A48. But something needs to be done even before building starts, particularly if the industrial sites take off. Nearly all roads to and from Pencoed converge on the A473, the B4280. Hendre Road being the exception that makes it a popular "rat run" The A473 onto J5 and 4280 onto J6. So if you do not address the road systems before completing any of the proposed building works you are creating for me and my fellow residents a nightmare for which you will never be forgiven.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

786

LDP Rep: 936

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
936	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
936	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
936	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
936	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
936	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
936	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
936	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
936	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

936	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
936	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
936	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
936	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
936	<p>I am responding, during your consultation period, to express concerns regarding the Island Farm development particularly and also the development near Broadlands roundabout. I am a resident in Island Farm Close. Even while typing this, I can hear the steady sound of traffic on A48. And 2pm is not a busy time. Unless you live here you cannot understand how, even with no new development, the road is busy and fast the majority of the time. To cross the road as a pedestrian and access the public footpath can take between five and ten minutes, while cars regularly go over the speed limit. New Inn Road is also a well-used road, more similar to A48 than a small country road. As you are probably aware it is used as a way of avoiding Ewenny Roundabout. The Dipping Bridge was never meant to take the number of cars that it does daily. Local people already struggle to walk along New Inn Road as there is no pavement. Any increased traffic on New Inn Road will cause havoc at the junction with Ewenny Road. Even with a conservative estimate of the increased number of cars, the local roads will be impossibly congested. Drivers, especially those using vehicles for work and deliveries, are usually driving fast down New Inn Road, and often take only last second action to avoid pedestrians. I hope the Council is planning a pavement right along New Inn Road to help service these new housing estates. And the inevitable increase in cars will, of course, mean further car emissions and pollution. We have young children in Island Farm Road and Close who use and will be using the footpath to access the schools. You have a duty to ensure their safety and well-being. BCBC no doubt encourages walking rather than using cars for school children going to school. We live on the very edge of the countryside in a lovely part of Bridgend. We are lucky to live here and fully appreciate that. I think most people understand the need for more housing in the area, but a development of potentially over 800 houses dramatically changes the area, the wildlife and what makes the area a draw for visitors. Why not smaller developments? Island Farm itself is a small established community with most residents knowing each other. Surely it a model for other potential housing developments. Please consider smaller developments, well screened with greenery, plenty of footpaths and hopefully, limited traffic increase. And what of Merthyr Mawr? Last Summer there was gridlock in the village. There is bound to be a significant knock-on effect for this iconic and very special community.</p>

	<p>Bridgend town itself has suffered from lack of support and bad decisions over the years. You have only to walk through the town centre to see how many shops and commercial properties are shut. BCBC should get the town centre re-invigorated and successful before passing plans to effectively make Bridgend one huge dormitory town. There must be plenty of spare capacity where industry has left or is leaving Bridgend. Have you considered using those sites for small developments instead of destroying green field and wildlife habitats in the pursuit of massive developments? Once the countryside has been destroyed there is no going back.</p>
--	--

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
936	

LDP Rep: 937

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	No - seems a sensible listing of priorities to protect the local population from poorly planned developments in the area
937	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	No
937	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	No
937	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	No
937	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	No
937	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	No
937	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	No
937	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	No
937	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	No
937	

937	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
937	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
937	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
937	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	<p>I understand there is a proposal to build 700 houses east of Pencoed off the St Mary Hill road. Observations:- 1. There will be a hunger increase in traffic ... the access road will need to be much improved from the site to the A473 (a road that is already very busy at peak times). 2. Current doctors' surgeries and dental practices are unable to cope with demand now so new facilities will need to be in place well before the housing is occupied. 3. Re education facilities, if a Welsh school is built what about the parents (and there could be many) who wish their children to attend an English school? Pencoed Primary & Croesty would not be able to accommodate them nor would Pencoed Comprehensive school. If this proposed development is given the green light, the infrastructure in and around Pencoed (particularly roads) needs to be in place first - not as an add-on at a later date! There will be a knock on effect to the town centre itself and current 'green areas' in and around the town MUST be maintained.</p>
937	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	<p>It's comforting to note that the overall strategy covers all needs both domestic and business. It is vital to have an agreed Big Picture in place before detail planning commences.</p>
937	

LDP Rep: 938

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
938	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
938	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
938	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
938	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
938	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
938	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
938	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
938	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

938	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
938	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
938	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
938	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
938	<p>To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I/We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds; Settlenamot Boundary - Both these sites are outside of theifttimifict-boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the</p>

development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area.

Safety To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48

The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impendance on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this grade 2* listed iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk. Placemaking The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmore Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmore) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. This is a place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

938

Idp

From: consultation
Sent: 19 July 2021 08:34
To: Idp
Subject: FW: SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm)
Attachments: LDP Island Farm.pdf; LDP Island Farm 2.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Input online form

[Nicola Bunston](#)
Rheolwr Ymgynghori, Ymgysylltu a Chydraddoldeb | Consultation Engagement and
Equalities Manager.
Cyfarwyddiaeth y Prif Weithredwr / Chief Executive's Directorate
Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr | Bridgend County Borough Council

Ffôn / Phone: (01656) 643 664
E-bost / Email: nicola.bunston@bridgend.gov.uk
Gwefan / Website: www.bridgend.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 July 2021 14:06
To: consultation <consultation@bridgend.gov.uk>
Subject: SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm)

Dear Sir/Madam

Please find attached our objection to this proposal in your BCBC LDP.

We completely agree with all points on all accounts listed in the attached document. In addition we wish to add that being a 4th generation Merthyr Mawr/Ewenny family we have witnessed many developments over the years made by BCBC which have negatively impacted on our every day activities and living, mainly traffic issues, but also witnessed increased flooding, littering, noise pollution, accidents all due to the increase in housing developments , traffic , fast food outlets.

We accept that housing is needed and we have seen Brackla, Parc Derwyn, Broadlands, Waterton developments as a result. We are also aware of the proposal for the Laleston development. We are sure that many of you who work for BCBC planning dept live locally will be aware of the incredible traffic issues witnessed daily around Ewenny roundabout. In recent years this has become a major problem for anyone attempting to drive to and enjoy our beautiful coastline, and those attempting to access the M4 , or indeed get to work locally.

The queuing of traffic down Pottery hill on sunny days, tail backs as far as the Pelican and beyond, is now ridiculous with cars idling for anything up to 40-45 mins . To build a massive development of nearly 1000 houses alongside this stretch of the A48 will mean an additional 2000 cars on average all using the same bottleneck at the various roundabouts along that A48.

But the major issue is the affect this will have on the area of outstanding beauty and nature reserve that is Merthyr Mawr and its warren.

We urge you to reject this as part of your LDP and keep this green belt south of the A48 free from development for the following generations to enjoy.

If BCBC accept this proposal then you should hang your heads in shame for allowing the ruination of such a beautiful heritage area enjoyed by so many in Bridgend and beyond. Our home falls into the Vale of Glamorgan BC by a mere 250 yds but we consider Bridgend to be out home town. Please don't sell the residents out on this one!

Sincerely



E-bost yn cael ei logio, ei monitro a/neu ei chofnodi yn awtomatig am resymau cyfreithiol.
Peidiwch ag argraffu'r neges e-bost hon oni bai fod hynny'n gwbl angenrheidiol.
Rydym yn croesawu gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg. Rhowch wybod i ni os mai Cymraeg yw eich dewis iaith. Byddwn yn ateb gohebiaeth a dderbynnir yn Gymraeg yn Gymraeg ac ni fydd gohebu yn Gymraeg yn arwain at oedi.
E-mail may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.
Please do not print this email unless absolutely necessary.
We welcome correspondence in Welsh. Please let us know if your language choice is Welsh. Any correspondence received in Welsh will be answered in Welsh and corresponding in Welsh will not lead to a delay in responding.

LDP Rep: 566

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
566	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
566	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
566	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
566	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
566	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
566	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
566	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
566	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

566	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
566	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
566	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
566	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
566	<p>The reasons for the original rejection of the Island Farm Development have not changed: Traffic During weekday rush hour mornings the traffic already stretches from the Ewenny roundabout to the southern entrance to Broadlands, and along the B4622. On weekends the traffic often backs up from the Ewenny roundabout to Waterton Cross, especially in hot sunny weather. There are also long queues into Tesco and McDonalds on the opposite carriageway. Again during the summer season the traffic from Ogmore by Sea holidaymakers will lead back to the Ewenny Potteries. The New Inn road is regularly used as a "rat run" with the dipping bridge acting as a pinch point, an area frequented by dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>Environment More traffic will lead to increased pollution and create safety concerns, especially at the New Inn Bridge and the Newbridge Fields section of the A48. This area is also heavily littered, thrown from from cars and discarded by passers-by. During the summer the bins are constantly full and require clearance on an almost daily basis. This litter can find its way into the River Ogwr and will wash up along the Merthyr Mawr Beach strand line. I am a Litter Champion for the area and every week I pick up rubbish that has been left there. I also take part in the quarterly litter picks on Merthyr Mawr Beach and can find hundreds of plastic bottles and metal cans that have been washed up there. Additional housing will reduce natural water run-off and lead to increased flooding. The New Inn Road which is already heavily flooded several times during the year, can only expect to get much worse, exacerbating the existing traffic issue. Further flooding could have an impact on the local ecosystem, along with actual development itself, an area that includes a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). To be honest I cannot understand how an LDP such as this ever came up for reappraisal given the reasons listed above and that the council must be clearly aware of. It is quite astonishing that this is even being considered.</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
566	

LDP Rep: 939

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	I would be very concerned that Sandy bay was being used for up 1500 houses given the area was given to the town for leisure purposes
939	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
939	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
939	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	Yes good design is essential and thought and discussion with what communities want. Porthcawl is a tourist town and yet when people excitedly post that they are coming to stay in Porthcawl and can we tell them what to do on a rainy day.....nothing, no pool, no cycle track. Please when designing your town look at the success of Abergavenny, they continue to grow and bloom.
939	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	I want Porthcawl to grow but don't let it get too big just because you can
939	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	It needs to ensure youngsters have got job opportunity's.
939	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
939	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
939	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	Please do not do anything to destroy the look of Porthcawl s beautiful beaches and commons. The wildlife is diverse and will continue to be so if left alone.
939	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
939	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	You state that there will be community facilities in Porthcawl but what does that mean ? Why can't you give a plan of just how Porthcawl will look. We can't possibly comment on whether the regeneration plan should go ahead when we have no idea of what you're planning other than Aldi's and 1500 houses
939	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
939	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
939	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	There are flocks of Skylarks on Sandy Bay which are on a list of endangered birds, so I would be very grateful if you would give this a huge amount of thought before you think of building anything on that wonderful area of wildlife heaven. Which was actually left to Porthcawl community for leisure Not houses.
939	

LDP Rep: 940

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
940	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
940	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
940	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
940	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
940	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
940	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
940	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
940	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

940	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
940	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
940	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
940	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
940	<p>Please regard this email as my objection to the LDP concerning the above sites. Traffic I fail to understand how you intend to build a dual carriage way along the A48 from Laleston to the Watertown round a bout and negotiate a bridge over the the river Ogwr, Ewenny round about and the railway bridge. How will the residents of Island Farm be able to enter and exit the A48 with the added traffic.? This is already a problem for them. I cross the A48 every day on my bicycle (active travel) to work in Merthyr Mawr and take my life into my own hands, dodging the traffic to cross the road. In the last planning application for Island Farm, high levels of nitrogen dioxide was recorded. How does the plan consider this challenge.? I fear for our community crossing this busy road visiting our local beauty spots on foot, bicycle and on horse back . Merthyr Mawr One of the great jewels in the Borough and an opportunity to bring visitors and tourists to this area of natural beauty and historical value. The impact of a large housing conurbation will have a disastrous effect on the area. This area is home to important wildlife, dormice and lesser horse shoe bat, both protected. Our hedge rows are important to the dormice will be destroyed and light pollution will harm the lesser horse shoe bats. The introduction of domestic animals will also jeopardise the delicate natural infrastructure . My greatest sadness is that objections to these proposals will be disregarded. Planning consultants and developers will find clever ways to negotiate the legalities of the planning regulations and the hope for future generations for a better world will be dashed.</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
940	

LDP Rep: 941

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
941	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
941	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
941	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
941	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
941	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
941	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
941	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
941	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

941	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
941	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
941	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
941	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
941	<p>I/We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds; Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural</p>

context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the “Dipping Bridge” and arguably include the “Showground Field” which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, “To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places”. Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area.

Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 -

The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedance on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk.

Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmore Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmore) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
941	

LDP Rep: 942

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
942	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
942	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
942	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
942	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
942	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
942	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
942	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
942	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

942	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
942	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
942	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
942	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
942	<p>Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include</p>

the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area. Safety To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedance on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this grade 2* listed iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk. Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmore Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmore) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. This is a place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
942	

LDP Rep: 943

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	1.6.1-5 1st June 2021 to 27th July
943	The consultation period is not a long enough period of time for this consultation. The proposed changes will impact on every person who is currently living in Porthcawl and those who visit. Residents of Porthcawl had a longer consultation period about the health centre. It is very convenient for the planners that we are experiencing the COVID pandemic and it feels that this is being rushed because there cannot be public meetings. There should be a lot longer period for people to see the proposals. SOBJ4 – states to protect and enhance distinctive and natural places An area of beauty all be it a bit tired is the seafront in Porthcawl. It will be destroyed by over development. Other seaside towns have beautiful gardens and play areas. LDP Proposal states "To realise the potential of Porthcawl as a premier seaside and tourist destination - to - vibrancy of the Town centre. Who will benefit? Much of the appeal of Porthcawl is the quaintness and the fact that you can drive to the sea and park on Salt Lake.

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
943	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
943	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	LDP Proposal States - The key to the area's success is to balance the nature of the development with the interests of tourism and that of the environment. What about the interests of the residents and visitors who may not benefit? Surely they should be considered. Porthcawl is a seaside town and should be valued for what it is, not somewhere to build houses on the sea front. If this area is to be developed it should be made attractive and a place for relaxation, the restorative well being of residents and visitors and pursuit of leisure interests. That is what a seaside town should be. LDP Proposal States - benefiting from a range of leisure facilities What leisure uses. Ratepayers Money from Porthcawl has not benefited its residents. We do not have a leisure centre or swimming pool like Bridgend. If built where would it go? LDP Proposal States - The site will deliver - leisure facilities, a bus terminus, recreation facilities etc Again leisure facilities are mentioned but to have these you have to provide parking for those who use them. A bus terminus may not provide means of transport for everyone. Place Making Principles LDP Proposal States - pursue transit orientated development that prioritises, walking, cycling and public transport use, whilst reducing private motor vehicle dependency. Porthcawl has an ageing
943	

population which is unlikely to change as people retire to the seaside. People cannot change overnight and some may not want to or be physically able to do so. LDP Proposal States - Community led food growing. How will this be maintained and kept tidy. It may become a congregating place for people who are not going to garden. LDP Proposal States - The key to the area's success is to balance the nature of the development with the interests of tourism and that of the environment. What about the interests of the residents and visitors who may not benefit? Surely they should be considered. Porthcawl is a seaside town and should be valued for what it is, not somewhere to build houses on the sea front. If this area is to be developed it should be made attractive and a place for relaxation, the restorative well being of residents and visitors and pursuit of leisure interests. That is what a seaside town should be. LDP Proposal States - benefiting from a range of leisure facilities What leisure uses. Ratepayers Money from Porthcawl has not benefited its residents. We do not have a leisure centre or swimming pool like Bridgend. If built where would it go? LDP Proposal States - The site will deliver - leisure facilities, a bus terminus, recreation facilities etc Again leisure facilities are mentioned but to have these you have to provide parking for those who use them. A bus terminus may not provide means of transport for everyone. Place Making Principles LDP Proposal States - pursue transit orientated development that prioritises, walking, cycling and public transport use, whilst reducing private motor vehicle dependency. Porthcawl has an ageing population which is unlikely to change as people retire to the seaside. People cannot change overnight and some may not want to or be physically able to do so. LDP Proposal States - Community led food growing. How will this be maintained and kept tidy. It may become a congregating place for people who are not going to garden.

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
943	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
943	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
943	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Utilities LDP Proposal States - With respect to foul drainage there are a range of existing pipes that will enable connection to be made to the established network. 1115 houses feed into new foul drainage which it would appear will feed into existing pipes. This will put a strain on existing drainage systems and the inconvenience of laying new drains will fall on current residents.
943	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

943

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

943

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

943

1,115 homes will change the whole of Porthcawl and its current residents. How high will these dwellings be? One of the best features of Porthcawl Sea front is that much of it can be seen as you walk along the Sea front. The open space of Salt Lake is an asset. LEAP's Local areas for play are currently totally inadequate. Griffin Park is often overcrowded and I wonder if a recent Health and Safety risk assessment has been undertaken. Where would children go on wet days? There is no mention of Public Toilets for visitors, presumably the planners are thinking that the refurbished toilets near Griffin Park will be adequate. Transport The planners want to stop the use of private vehicles. What about getting to the doctors surgery you could cycle or walk if you are fit enough. Park and Ride facilities - presumably there will be toilets at the pivotal terminus. Imagine - For those who have decided to bring their family to Porthcawl for the day. 1. Drive your car to the out of town car park 2. Unload your car of children, pushchairs, beach clothes and buckets and spades etc 3. Queue for a bus to take you to Porthcawl, get on with children etc 4. Get to Porthcawl, go to the beach and find you have left required thing in car! 5. At the end of the day get in the queue with children, pushchairs etc and wait for the bus with tired, crabby children If I were them I would take my family somewhere more convenient. What will most likely happen is that the streets will become even more clogged as people will still drive into town. LDP Proposal States - Porthcawl benefits from a wider range of leisure uses than either Bridgend or Maesteg. The Retail Study seeks to reduce the need to travel by car for food shopping etc. So people can travel to Porthcawl but residents will be discouraged from travelling to other centres,, limiting choice. Presumably the planners are expecting us to carry our shopping home on foot or bicycle or order our shopping on line and pay for delivery. Transport Statement LDP Proposal States - would seek to minimise car parking in response to the need generated from the development. It looks as though a strategy plan of 2007 has been reviewed. This is now 14 years out of date and a lot of housing has been built in South Wales and people who live in them want to come to Porthcawl. Parking now is totally inadequate and the park and ride scheme is a pipe dream. I believe visitors will avoid the park and ride and look for places to park in the town roads blocking residents access to their own homes.

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID

943

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

943	
-----	--

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
943	The vision for this proposal is for 2033 so I don't see the need to rush this consultation through. It has been poorly publicised and more residents should have the chance and ability to comment. I think that the consultation period should be extended, now that public meetings will be allowable from 7th August.

LDP Rep: 944

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
944	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
944	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
944	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
944	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
944	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
944	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Access to town centres should be made easier for potential shoppers, with free parking and controlled access for traffic. I believe that pedestrianisation is killing town centres
944	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
944	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	
944	

ID	
944	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
944	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
944	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	Can there be a feasibility study into the re-opening of the Garw Valley railway line?
944	Affordable public transport in my opinion would benefit the local population,would encourage young people to move there, open up the valley to tourists,and improve the environment

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	I am opposed to the proposals in the draft LDP as I believe that the residential developments will increase traffic congestion on the A48,Ewenny Hill and New Inn Road.The proposed Spine Road will impact on the integrity of the SINC and local wildlife.It will also impact on our schools, hospitals and GPs, which are already overfull.Why in times of serious concerns about climate change are we pursuing policies that just increase car use ,leading to further congestion, pollution and increased danger to pedestrians,cyclists and horse riders.
944	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
944	

LDP Rep: 945

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
945	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
945	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
945	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
945	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
945	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
945	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
945	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
945	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

945	<p>I would like to see stone tower on Bear Mountain in Nantymoel (like Glastonbury Tor), with a roof of photovoltaic panels, so it can be lit up at night. And a story attached, that it was the birthplace of Merlin. I would also like Nantymoel to become a stage of the Tour De France (Bridgend to Brecon , maybe?), it might inspire Geraint to great things again. I would have prisoners in chain gangs, litter picking and if they refuse, don't feed them until they change their minds. Don't get me started on what I'd do to fly tippers... Could some holiday cottages be built in the mountains and hills to rent out to rich people looking for a rustic holiday...log burners, shepherds huts etc, for cyclists and walkers, a space for willow weavers, woodworkers, potters and painters, and then a gallery to show and sell the work, and art students and environmental workers could stay in the cottages when the rich folk had gone. Also, if there was a local sawmill, the value to the timber could be added locally and provide employment locally, or doesn't it work like that. I'm also really keen on highland cattle, so some of those would be appreciated So nice chatting Bye for now</p>
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
945	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
945	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	Point 2 doesn't really mean anything to me See my comments in the other section
945	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
945	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	You should do an 'easy read' version if you want more comments
945	

LDP Rep: 946

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
946	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
946	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
946	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Heol y Gyfraith (the section from Laleston) has existed for generations: people stop and read the local information boards, they walk along the lane, lined with the old trees and hedgerows which should be protected and celebrated - why isn't Bridgend Council taking pride to protect what is distinctive and a natural asset of interest and appeal? BCBC often overlook the importance of preserving and promoting areas of historical importance like Island Farm and Cefn Cribbwr Iron Works - these areas could become destinations which would make Bridgend an appealing place to visit. Why doesn't the council want to protect and enhance the area, but is happy to lose a historic area to meet housing targets and green-light easy developments. When will it stop- when all green fields and villages of the area have become one huge estate estate with no sense of place or identity? So many green spaces and places of different value around Bridgend are being lost forever and Bridgend is becoming an unremarkable satellite commuter residence for Cardiff and Swansea. Despite all the new residents in all of the new developments around Bridgend, the town centre is still becoming an empty shell - people clearly prefer to spend their downtime in other healthy, appealing environments therefore please keep the fields between Laleston and Bryntirion - people like them and use them and clearly like the feeling of it being a "village".
946	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Heol y Gyfraith (the section from Laleston) has existed for generations: people stop and read the local information boards, they walk along the lane, lined with the old trees and hedgerows which should be protected and celebrated - why isn't Bridgend Council taking pride to protect what is distinctive and a natural asset of interest and appeal? BCBC often overlook the importance of preserving and promoting areas of
946	

historical importance like Island Farm and Cefn Cribbwr Iron Works - these areas could become destinations which would make Bridgend an appealing place to visit. Why doesn't the council want to protect and enhance the area, why is it happy to lose a historic area to meet housing targets and green-light easy developments? When will it stop- when all green fields and villages of the area have become one huge estate estate with no sense of place or identity? Please be more innovative with old brownfield sites that exist around the borough. So many green spaces and places of different value around Bridgend are being lost forever and Bridgend is becoming an unremarkable satellite commuter residence for Cardiff and Swansea. Despite all the new residents in all of the new developments around Bridgend, the town centre is still becoming an empty shell - people clearly prefer to spend their downtime in other healthy, appealing environments therefore please keep the fields between Laleston and Bryntirion - people like them and use them and clearly like the feeling of it being a "village". proposal to build new houses along the green belt/fields between Bryntirion and Laleston shows the council is either out of touch or has a lack of understanding of the shift in attitude to the needs of the general population during the recent pandemic towards the value and hunger to see green, open space. Despite numerous reports, experts and research proving that people's mental health need and appreciate green space your plan to allow a developer (with profit only in mind) to "persuade" you that they can help meet housing targets even if it means removing and destroying green fields and hedgerows which will be lost forever. The recent pandemic has highlighted how much people seek the outdoors for exercise and solace. The increased footfall on the pavements, lanes and footpaths around the village of Laleston are proof of how much green space is needed and is still being used regularly by the residents of Cefn Glas, Bryntirion, Broadlands and Laleston. Families, individuals, couples of all ages walk, cycle and exercise around the village. They choose to walk away from the monotonous sprawl of their estates to walk around Laleston - reducing or encroaching on the clear "village" seems an absurd way of removing a facility obviously very much needed and appreciated. There will be no benefit or positive impact to losing the fields - nobody who wants peace or space to clear their mind would choose to walk aimlessly around and endless, monotonous urban sprawl of streets and houses. Once gone the irreplaceable value of this green, historic area will be gone and the proposal is not appropriate for the local community. Any body seriously considering the proposal to build new houses along the green belt/fields between Bryntirion and Laleston is ignoring the issues already raised by the residents of all the new developments around Bridgend (Broadlands, Parc y Dderwen etc) - the strain and impact on local infrastructure and resources. Congested roads, increased traffic, oversubscribed schools, lack of health facilities all create daily anxiety and stress but at the top of everybody's list - people want space to live peacefully. We moved away and out of Broadlands specifically because of this situation.

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
946	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
946	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID

946

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

946

The proposal to build new houses along the green belt/fields between Bryntirion and Laleston is absurd. Climate change is supposed to be at the forefront of policies so it's hard to believe that a council is still prepared to green light destruction, despite the impact on nature and the people who love and use this area for what it is. When a green field has gone, it will never, ever be able to return. Families want to move to the village for what it is, and are prepared to pay for a village setting / feeling amongst the countryside.

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

946

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

946

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID

946

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

946

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

946

LDP Rep: 947

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Strategic objective 4 although relevant does not seem to have been taken into account with regard to plans to build between Bryntirion and Laleston on land currently and rightly identified as green wedge. The removal of this green wedge with lead to the coalescence of the settlements and the complete loss of their individual character and sense of place.
947	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
947	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Underutilised or brownfield land needs ot be considered before important green spaces which give a place its character and community - it is not sustainable to link distinct communities and fail to provide sufficient school places and other infrastructure to support them. Th failure to recognise the importance of visual breaks and the sense of place that green wedges create is contrary to Future Wales and other national policies.
947	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	While i support the key principles of good design and placemaking it is clear that the proposed plan does not, by building on the important green wedge between Bryntirion and Laleston, both of these communities are weakened in terms of their sense of place and significantly harmed visually and socially.
947	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	While the principles are laudable, the scheme to develop on land between Laleston and Bryntirion, only proposes a replacement primary school and does not deal with the clear demand that will be generated for school places at the secondary level. Bryntirion comprehensive school is already full and on a very constrained site. It is clear that this allocation is completely contrary to the aims set out in the replacement plan as it will not lead to an active healthy, cohesive community - it will build on much needed farm land and create access issues to country lanes used by residents of both communities to walk and enjoy the countryside and fail to provide sufficient infrastructure to ensure car usage is reduced.
947	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	

947	
-----	--

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
947	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
947	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
947	The proposals in the plan to build on an important area of green wedge located between the communities of Bryntirion and Laleston does not appear to accord with the current policies of the council or indeed those set out above. It also appears completely at odds with national policies set out in Future Wales by the Welsh Government which stress the importance of sense of place and the need for green wedges where appropriate, as in this instance. This development will lead to considerable damage to the natural and historic environment and lead to a coalescence of settlements meaning both communities will be significantly negatively affected.

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
947	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
947	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
947	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
947	Very clear concerns have been expressed against the development which will lead to the coalescence of the settlements of Laleston and Bryntirion, damaging the sense of place and removing an important and much needed green wedge which is enjoyed by both communities. In addition the infrastructure proposed will not meet the needs of the existing communities let alone those new houses that are constructed who will have no access to new secondary school places etc.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	The proposed housing site between Laleston and Bryntirion, sited on what is currently is green wedge, is ill conceived, contrary to national Welsh Government policy and damaging to both the settlements and to the general environment which surrounds these settlements. The Council needs to focus on the large areas of Brownfield land which remains available for development and ensure that edge of settlement growth does not lead to coalescence of settlements which will harm their sense of place and the communities that live there.
947	

LDP Rep: 948

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	All worthy objectives
948	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	As someone coming up to 60, I can see this is sensible but worry that it might mean the loss of easily accessible green space and the natural life that comes with it. Public parks can only provide some of the habitats that wild plants and creatures need. The pressure on places like Kenfig NNR and Merthyr Mawr NNR from their increased use as recreational areas has been immense since the pandemic started and has degraded their value as SSSIs. If you build over the locally available green spaces, whether that be fields with paths, or brownfield sites which are being reclaimed by nature, then people will jump into their cars to go to the special places.
948	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	seems sensible
948	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Again these are sensible. Living on the Barnes Avenue end of Cefn Glas estate, with no local shops or other services to "pop out" to, I find that jumping in the car is the easy choice, and inevitably that means big Tesco gets my trade. Perhaps you should look at what opportunities there might be to improve opportunities for small local shops, cafe's services etc in these existing big estates as well as the new builds.
948	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	I'm concerned that PLA3 will negatively impact on the activity and health of local communities by building in an area which is much used for exercise and the enjoyment of nature. The development at the nearby Maes y Rhedyn has already destroyed three fields which were used by the local community but were also full of wildplants, invertebrate, mammals and birds. As much as we might plan, and even garden, with nature in mind, urban areas can't provide everything to sustain our existing biodiversity, never mind protect it from the effects of climate change.
948	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
948	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	I rarely use Bridgend Town Centre since it has little I need, and less to attract me. I'd love to be able to pop into town but Tesco is an easier option, and Cardiff a much more enjoyable one. As I mentioned before, living on a big estate with no local shops makes driving to the out of town developments the obvious choice.
948	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	agreed
948	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Great words, how they get implemented is the worry. If we only focus on the special and unique natural environments, then we risk losing those local places which are still vital for biodiversity as they get nibbled away, bite by bite.
948	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
948	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
948	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
948	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	<p>The land west of Bridgend, PLA3, is full of wildlife of all shapes and sizes, visiting thrushes from Scandinavia in the winter, summer migrants coming breed, pollinators and other invertebrates and the families of foxes I've seen about. Even if the woodland and hedgrows are protected from building over, they'll inevitably get degraded by becoming public amenities. The fields are also a key part of the ecosystem, populated and visited by insects, and the birds which feed on them whether resident or migrant. I've seen buzzards, Red Kites and Ravens in the fields, using them even if they don't breed in this particular patch. The local development at Maes y Rhedyn has already taken a big chunk out of the local land which was rich in wildlife. Fields which I walked and watched butterflies, bees, Hoverflies, Moths, Spiders and other invertebrates. Wild flowers in profusion which would never get grown on grass verges or roundabouts. Flocks of goldfinches, over sixty strong in the autumn, feeding on the seedheads of those plants. It's all houses and building site. Lastly, during the lockdowns the lanes and public rights of way, eg "Gypsy Lane", as well as Llangwedd road and the lane along the western edge of the area were busy</p>
948	

	<p>with people taking exercise and discovering the nature on their doorstep. Maybe not so busy now, but still busier than prior to the pandemic. With my camera and binoculars, I was sussed as a birder and stopped by many people to tell me about what they had seen or heard, to ask questions and to share their new-found pleasure in nature. Some people would say, "It's great that nature's coming back during lockdown" Inevitably my reply was that it hadn't gone away, it was just that they were now encountering it. This area is so easily, and safely, accessible from Cefn Glas and Bryntirion, it's already been degraded by new development and we risk losing it, despite the idea that closing Llangewydd Road to traffic would attract more people to use it. What would people gain from walking alongside another housing estate?</p>
--	--

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
948	

LDP Rep: 951

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
951	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	I do not want to see Bridgend just become a 'feeder' town to both Cardiff and Swansea which I believe your wording in the plan projects.
951	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	The spatial strategy you propose endangers wildlife on greenfield sites such as SP2 (2) Island farm and COM1 (2) Craig-Y-Parc. These sites are also areas on natural beauty for the local residents.
951	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	I do not believe the Island farm and the Craig - Y- Parcau proposed plans improves the environment or people's health and well being but promotes more traffic on the A48 which is already a congested road.
951	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
951	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	I don't see a 'plethora' of employment. We have already lost Sony & Ford from the area ?
951	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
951	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
951	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	The proposed housing plans for Island farm and Craig - Y - Parcau will swamp both the WWII prisoner of war hut and the Merthyr Mawr village area. Both these are historical icons are Wales at their best.
951	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID
951

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID
951

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID
951

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	I strongly oppose any residential housing or commercial buildings being built on the Island farm or the Craig - Parcau areas. These are wildlife habitats and area of historical and natural beauty. These area are enjoyed by many many people from the local area and also attract visitors from far and wide to Bridgend. The A48 road is already traffic congested and the proposed plans would make the area a bottleneck.
951	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID
951

LDP Rep: 952

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Objection for safety and overcrowding issue
952	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	There are too many houses here schools and hospitals are at capacity
952	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	This will not improve things for residents already here
952	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	This will not improve health and well-being
952	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	It's already struggling more homes will not help
952	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	I can't see how this will work
952	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Free parking and lower rates for business will help
952	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	There is too much dumping of waste because it is now so restricted
952	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	This will not help

952	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	There is too much traffic on the roads currently
952	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
952	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
952	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Too much traffic already
952	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	We are struggling with safe roads. Doctors surgeries schools and dentists we need to stop building on green land. There is too much here already. There needs to be a safe path from new bridge fields to Ewenny roundabout urgently the underpass is disgusting. This needs to be sorted ASAP to stop children regularly running across a very dangerous road. Not spend millions on roundabouts putting in bike lanes that will never be used.
952	

LDP Rep: 953

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
953	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
953	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Surely before anymore developments are sanctioned in the borough the lack of infrastructure has to be addressed. GP surgeries, local hospital, education system and roads are heavily over burdened already
953	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
953	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	As said previously infrastructure needs to be addressed before any further developments are allowed
953	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
953	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Bridgend town centre has been dying for years it has very few retail or attractive outlets to attract shoppers. It has a plethora of charity shops, nail bars & cafes & empty shops. Most people I know who live in Bridgend if they need anything other than a bank go to Cardiff or shop online.
953	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
953	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	I live in a so called historic village which has seen little investment other than from CADWR. The volume of traffic using the village as a rat run is increasing continually, and for a so called conservation area is appalling. It isn't safe to cross the road and the so called traffic calming measures which were installed many years ago are not fit for purpose. There is a lack of safe pathways and pavements and the Parc Derwen development has increased footfall through the village increasing the need for safe and sustainable walkways and traffic calming measures before someone gets seriously injured
953	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
953	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
953	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
953	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	Improve current infrastructure before allowing even more developments
953	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
953	

LDP Rep: 954

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
954	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
954	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Build more disabled housing in Bettws
954	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
954	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Housing land should not go to private market since they sit on there ass for decades refusing to build any housing at all. We need more disabled housing and the bedroom tax needs to go.
954	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Stop the discrimination towards disabled people that ALL employers in Bridgend do. we got more chance getting a job if we are a x con then if we are disabled
954	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
954	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Stop the discrimination towards disabled people by not coming in to the property and removing big items we are forced to live in a pig style thanks to the scum at kier
954	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
--	--

ID	
954	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
954	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
954	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
954	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
954	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	Sack all the disabled hating scum at Bridgend council
954	

LDP Rep: 955

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Keep merthyr mawr for its nature content
955	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
955	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	keep merthyr mawr for its nature content
955	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
955	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	In Bridgend do up run down/ empty properties to make existing areas mor attractive.
955	Don't just build still more houses

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
955	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Encourage existing empty shops to reopen
955	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
955	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	keep merthyr mawr for its nature content

955	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
955	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
955	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
955	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	as for previous proposals. Ensure any new developments do not adversely affect existing localities e.g taking short cuts on existing roads
955	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
955	

LDP Rep: 956

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	I personally believe that there is not enough infrastructure in place for more houses in Pencoed. le doctors surgery's, dentists. There is Too much traffic already, I've lived here in Pencoed all my life & I feel that it's changed so much , not enough places for children in school, they have to go to other parts of Bridgend. Traffic really is horrendous from 8.30 - 9 & from 1/2 past 2 until 3.30 .
956	
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	No no no
956	
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
956	
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	No
956	
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	None
956	
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	None
956	
7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	There is no retail development here
956	
8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	None
956	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

No bc bc are not looking after natural development

956

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

956

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

956

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID

956

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

No no we don't have enough facilities here for population already here let alone any more co Ming to live here !! B

956

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

956

LDP Rep: 957

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
957	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
957	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
957	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
957	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
957	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
957	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
957	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
957	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

957	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
957	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
957	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
957	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
957	I am concerned about the residential development west of Bridgend - between Laleston and Bryntirion. You appear to be supporting urban spread by joining up two distinct villages. Traffic is bound to increase and funnel into already busy Broadlands. Why not leave a gap between Laleston and the new development of say 50 metres otherwise Laleston will be continuously joined to Bridgend.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
957	

LDP Rep: 958

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
958	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
958	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
958	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Having recently visited a few English towns and counties nearly all have parks and gardens at the centre of communities all very busy with families and the young and old a central well maintained green space where anyone could go.
958	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	I object to the proposed 2000 home new development near the A48 by Pyle and Cornelly. The traffic is already considerable in the area , the roads are not maintained as often as they should be with many potholes, pollution will increase
958	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	A local business have been declined planning permission for four new business start up units on Pyle Industrial Estate as traffic is at its limit with the opening of the new Recycling Centre. This goes against your stated aims above , is stifling the local economy and not supporting employment. Employment sites need to be accessible
958	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	More leisure facilities in town centres
958	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Waste management sites should not be sited in or very near residential areas
958	increase in traffic is detrimental to residents well being

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

958

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

958

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

958

I object to the mixed use development East of Pyle. Potentially 2000 new homes with each home having probably a minimum of two cars will be detrimental to the area as traffic is high in the area already and there will be increased pollution. While the people living in the new homes MAY spend money in the surrounding villages the likelihood is they will shop out of town or online and also drive out of the area for work as there are not enough jobs locally to support this many houses therefore there will be little benefit to the established communities just an increase in traffic and pollution

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID

958

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

958

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

958

LDP Rep: 959

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	SOBJ2: "active, healthy" this is very important for this area, a large number of people are obese and healthy eating is not supported well enough.
959	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	It would seem important to ensure that traffic / transport is addressed for this, to make it easier and cheaper to get public transport and make provision for easy walking access. A lot of professionals which enter Bridgend also drive too fast, how will you ensure that jobs go to those new houses rather than people driving in for the jobs and those in new houses driving out?
959	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	It is important to bring personality to these areas that are growing, for example north Cornell's does not have a very nice centre and this could be improved, it also has very little parking for the doctors surgery which seems odd. Transport seems like a key issue for all these communities with the roads being quite difficult with parked cars etc.
959	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	We don't want houses that are green but look really weird with strange modern designs, they need to be environmentally friendly eg completely solar powered, but still look normal. New houses need to have adequate gardens and parking otherwise they feel like a cramped maze and are not enjoyable to live in, more garden space also prevents flooding better. Clean air is important. New developments need to have their own centres and be designed in a way to give the development personality or history or culture. This is important for social growth and also to grow children with aspirations. Sustainability needs to not be a box ticking exercise.
959	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Brownfield sites are preferable to farmland / fields for providing these sites. In terms of health can smoothie, salad bars or similar be subsidised to give options that are not fish and chips or local shops that put chocolate bars on promotion? Housing developments should incorporate a lot of trees and green areas, they should also be shielded from busy roads with small strips of forest. Leisure facilities and walking routes should be built in to developments.
959	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	

959	This is quite vague and wordy and I feel you could have explained this vision more simply - a lot of Bridgend residents do not have the literacy skills to access this. I therefore feel this is not giving everyone who lives here an ability to understand your plans. You haven't actually stated what actual types of business you want to support or create. "To the most appropriate"- appropriate to whom? And how will it be appropriate???
-----	---

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Many people in Bridgend want to drive somewhere easily have space to park and get their kids in and out safely, and not be hassled by people advertising something or canvassing for charity. Whilst the designer outlet does all these things better than the town centre and other centres, it will continue to be more popular. To push it towards a town centre development you need to both ensure there are the same attractions eg high quality restaurants and food outlets, as well as making it more difficult or inconvenient to access out of town shopping centres through traffic calming measures. You could look at developing the town centre to be more like a Mediterranean town by the river. The river could be opened up more and decorated more, with more greenery and blocking off the view to the car park. The town centre needs to have a cohesive feeling, some parts feel historic and other parts feel quite dangerous and dodgy like near the bus station.
959	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Better provision for the free recycling of large goods like sofas and fridges would be good. Greater provision for recycling, reducing waste and emissions, reusing items and rethinking current wasteful systems all sounds great. Curbside recycling for film plastic, crisp packets, textiles and electrical goods would be a good step forwards. Larger waste management sites - this may be concerning to some residents and needs to be placed carefully.
959	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	You can't conserve the environment and the beautiful surrounding and build on it too. You should make clear which parts of Bridgend you view as more important than others in a hierarchy. Otherwise this whole blurb is meaningless.
959	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
959	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
959	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	Cafe facilities at blaengarw calon and more tourism development.

959	
-----	--

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Disagree with development of land between cefn glas and Laleston. Laleston is one of the few places in Bridgend that has any actual character and it should be protected by having fields around it.
959	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Specifically do not want a massive development west of cefn glas that would increase traffic on that route. Your plans are not clearly enough set out for a lot of people to understand specifically what you want to do.
959	

LDP Rep: 960

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
960	The strategic objectives are fine, but do not differ substantially from the aims of the previous LDP, which did not achieve the SOBJ. This draft plan also does nothing to suggest that the strategic objectives will be achieved when it is actually proposing what amounts to over development, merging of small villages and communities, an erosion of distinctive and natural places, and does not really consider wellbeing goals or the wellbeing of future generations act.

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
960	Upgrading and providing business space and enterprise centres is laudable, and may encourage small scale employment, there is nothing in the plan that suggests the attraction of major employers. The house building is substantial and suggests this is to meet population growth estimates, but the growth strategy does not keep pace with the level of development and increase in population

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
960	Agree the Valleys area need regeneration and some development to enable a level of business growth /jobs and new - modern housing to attract young people to stay in the area, and also achieve affordable housing options. The case for Sustainable growth areas is not fully made and does not demonstrate sustainable development. Bridgend being particularly at risk of overdevelopment.

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
960	This plan flies in the face of placemaking. In areas it is destroying natural (green) spaces, and merge communities into a sprawling mass development such as the case between PLA3 Bryntirion/laleston/penyfai - destroying historic villages and areas to the benefit of developers profits/. It is shocking that planning department have put these proposals forward, and I am vehemently opposed to the over development, and erosion of the wedges between these distinct communities, that currently have their own unique identity. there's little in this plan that can be appropriately described as 'high quality, well thought out and sustainable design'.

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
960	Enacting previous LDPs has shown that Planning has failed spectacularly to achieve investment to ensure adequate infrastructure to cope with increased houses and residents, including GP/s dentists, roads, active travel routes, affordable housing levels and facilities. far from providing additional benefits for local communities section 106 monies are at pitiful levels and used for BCBC projects, and often do not

	benefit the communities which are being affected. Coleman Vale being a recent case in point. There is no confidence that Planning department or BCBC will be able to improve obtain levels of investment for infrastructure when it has failed to keep pace with previous development and is already behind the curve.
--	--

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	We are coming out of a pandemic following 10 years of austerity. the LDP does not adequately make a case that a plethora of employment provision and investment will flock to the area. We have seen what has happened with ford and Ineos amongst others. There's some scope in developing the foundational economy, social enterprise and small scale employment and therefore the further development and upgrading of enterprise parks would be beneficial, but there is a need to be realistic with what can be achieved, rather than investing in white elephants. there are masses of empty warehouses and units on a number of industrial estates going to rack and ruin - have a strategy to bring those back into use.
960	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	Mixed use of town centres is the way forward given the changes to how people shop, however, be ambitious and invest properly in town centre management and bring back into use empty shops and spaces (albeit for alternative uses perhaps) should be the priority. There's also an opportunity to develop niche shopping /retail opportunities with a little bit of imagination to attract people back into the town centre. tackle rents that are ridiculously high to re invigorate the town centre experience. and encourage entrepreneurship and new entrants into the retail sector.
960	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	No further comments, this is a step in the right direction.
960	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	I agree with the statement, however have no faith or confidence the letter of the LDP will be followed through based on previous experience. The policies seem to be paper based only, for example traveler sites proposed in areas of natural beauty, teeming with biodiversity and next to NRW woodland areas (Penyfai) does not 'fit' with the ambition (rhetoric) in the plan. Historic sites to local communities, the old quarry in Penyfai - and area around Tondy ironworks have all been eroded through the planning process, and community voice ignored in the process. The stones at Llangewydd/laleston are also at risk with PLA3. the natural environment is important for peoples wellbeing, it is important to encourage tourism, it encourages people to keep active and healthy to be able to spend time in such beautiful environments. I just don't see the plan as evidencing they will be prioritised or protected.
960	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	Junction 36 is at capacity, the main road from Valleys Gateway is narrow, the development at Tondy makes this much more complex, the road network can't cope
960	

	(even with the by pass on Pentre felin, it still is going cause massive congestion, maybe another 'park street; in terms of pollution. however the valley does need regeneration and housing, and a safe walking/cycling route to Maesteg would be advantageous.
--	--

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Improved walking and cycling routes are important for active travel. Three step hill route from Bridgend to Porthcawl needs joining up to enable walkers /runners and cyclists to travel safely to this key tourist spot.
960	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	cooperative housing is a much more interesting proposal that large scale profit making developments that are woefully inadequate in terms of their 'affordable' housing contribution. Improved walking and cycling routes agree with. Hard to see how BCBC will ensure improved public transport when it is essentially out of planning control. Local highway network is essential to improve. Tourism will be beneficial the area.
960	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Completely opposed to these plans, bring empty properties into use first. This County is being over developed. The PLA3 development at Laleston is in an area that has gone through significant growth (way beyond the original plans) and this is a prime example of poor planning. No capacity in schools, GPs or dentists, poor design of estates, one road in and out each end of the estate (Broadlands) and now proposal for another massive site up the road. Increasing traffic through the Park Street throughfare, encroaching on the hamlet of court Colman, and potentially putting pressure on cefn glas lane so people bypass Park Street congestion. This is not place making, this is not sustainable development by any stretch of the imagination. In fact it is shocking to see this in a plan that has outlined the Strategic objectives it has.
960	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	More areas to be designated as green spaces within communities. Surprising given the objectives, that this appears to have been avoided.
960	

LDP Rep: 961

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	By building new housing on green space you are contradicting subj4
961	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
961	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
961	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
961	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
961	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	You have lost 1000s of jobs recently with fords closing, many shops have and will continue to close in the town centre and up mcartherglen, I struggle to see how and where your going to create 500 jobs per year
961	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
961	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
961	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
--	--

ID	
961	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
961	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
961	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
961	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	I object to sp2(2) island farm and com1(2) Craig-y-parcau. Destroying natural area, road links can't cope with the amount of traffic currently. Traffic is usually gridlocked most weekends at ewenny roundabout causing people to speed down new inn road and over the dipping bridge. Child was killed on a48 due to no crossing areas and all bcbs done was put up some pointless signs.
961	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	I object
961	

LDP Rep: 962

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	NO
962	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	There is no clear plan how the bus station and the railway station are connected. I think buses should be routed round the railway station .Putting access on the other platform is no not the answer.
962	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Currently I do not think the borough has adequate medical facilities to cope with present population. Planning must be joined up and hospital and GP surgeries must be included.
962	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	The A48 is jammed in the morning in the Broadlands area .Any future major industrialist hoping to bring major investment to this borough would see it as a major turn off .
962	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	No comment
962	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	The moving of the technical college from its current site on the face of it is not a problem However what needs to be taken into account is does the proposed location offer the same capabilities. i.e can bricklayers , welders, fitters , electricians be developed at the new site.
962	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Bridgend town centre is dead.No comment.
962	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	No comment .

962	
-----	--

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	No comment
962	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
962	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
962	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
962	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
962	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
962	

LDP Rep: 963

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
963	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	The number of new homes needs to be matched by infrastructure investment into more services, retail, schooling, medical etc
963	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
963	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
963	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
963	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
963	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Residents need to be encouraged to shop in the town with free parking to compete with out of town retail. Better active routes too. Keep the centre pedestrianised, it's a far safer environment
963	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
963	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
--	--

ID	
963	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
963	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
963	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
963	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	The plans for Island farm, in particular, will impact existing businesses and services in the area and place much more strain on already congested roads in an area which should remain semi rural for the benefit of local residents
963	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
963	

LDP Rep: 964

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	yes
964	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	yes
964	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	no
964	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	no
964	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	yes
964	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	no
964	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	yes
964	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	yes
964	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	no

964	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
964	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	yes
964	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
964	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
964	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	no
964	

LDP Rep: 965

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	The planned developments in the Tondu and Aberkenfig areas have no plans for upgrading the local road infrastructure, local school's and GP surgeries that already have severe access issues. The new road layout in Tondu is only going to exacerbate the already severe congestion and frequent accidents at the traffic lights for access to the shopping complex by Lidl etc.
965	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	I understand the need to attract skilled households, but this needs to be counterbalanced by the existing issues regarding roads in the area. Maesteg Road is not fit for purpose for the high volume of traffic that travels this route. A significant number of these new developments are on poor access roads.
965	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
965	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
965	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
965	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
965	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
965	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	

965	
-----	--

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	
965	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	Need significant road access improvements.
965	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
965	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
965	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
965	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
965	

LDP Rep: 966

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	A key issue missing is one where you put cleaning up the air pollution currently high in Bridgend at the top of your agenda. All other key issues mentioned are appropriate.
966	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Admirable intentions, but I feel employment opportunities should be acquired before extensive housebuilding. Bridgend will otherwise just be a place to stay and not a place to live, work, shop and socialize,
966	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	The plans that I understand have been made regarding housebuilding in Bridgend are all on green sites, which I believe to be completely wrong. All brown sites should be used firstly, with very little industry left in Bridgend there should be quite a substantial amount available. There seems to be a large number of houses neglected in the area these should be made habitable, and perhaps first time buyers, singletons could have a chance at getting on the housing ladder. While I agree with the plans, admirable in the reading, I worry that the residents in Bridgend are not being considered regarding increased traffic, pollution and noise. I want a town to be proud of, Bridgend certainly isn't at the moment,
966	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Totally agree with the ideas behind this plan.
966	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Just stay true to these sentiments. Speak to the residents whose life is going to be impacted by your plans. I know I sound like a kill joy, but unfortunately any dealings I've had with our local council have been a total waste of time. All traffic related I must add.
966	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Good luck. Even with all the new housing estates built in Bridgend over the years, people still travel out of town to shop for mostly everything other than food. I believe we'd all rather shop fresh and local with a variety of shops to choose from.
966	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	

966	We're a market Town, if possible get our Farmers involved in selling their produce here.
-----	--

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
966	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Agree with everything written here. I used to interact with people from all over Britain, and without exception when they visited this part of the world they were blown away with how lovely it is. The trees we have along our roads and some streets were always commented on. The drive from Bridgend to Maesteg , in parts, is lovely when the trees are in leaf.
966	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
966	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
966	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
966	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Please reduce traffic traveling on Park Street. We know it's the most polluted street already.
966	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
966	

LDP Rep: 968

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	I am a resident of Bridgend, living just off Merthyr Mawr Road, near the A48. As a resident of Preswylfa Court I have no problem with new developments. What concerns me is the size of the proposed developments throughout the Bridgend area but especially near Island Farm. I hear the traffic on A48 quite clearly. My understanding is that you are not building more roads, so how are the existing roads supposed to cope with increased, polluting, traffic? I am far too old to be doing much walking but I notice many more people walking down to Merthyr Mawr and the dunes, and teenagers basing themselves at the Dipping Bridge. What safeguards are going to be put in place to protect people from speeding cars, congestion and pollution? New residents will be 'encouraged' to use the railway system and therefore there won't be much traffic increase. How naive. There is no local bus service in this part of Bridgend. Very few people are going to make their way to the railway station in the morning and back from there in the evening. Are you proposing that they walk there? Preswylfa Court is a conservation area. It is a small estate, around a green and has a real community feel. Have you considered smaller developments with a community atmosphere? How does an estate of over 800 houses fit into this semi-rural part of Bridgend. This proposal is not about benefitting the area but making a great deal of money for developers. It is not in their interests to create smaller, discreet estates because that would cost more. Strategic objective no 4 is 'to protect and enhance distinctive and natural places'. So to do that you are going to destroy acres of green field and wooded areas with their associated wildlife and cause havoc around Merthyr Mawr. Do you not see anything incompatible there? The centre of Bridgend is a sad place. I don't want to spend time there. If you can't regenerate the heart of Bridgend and make it a vibrant successful town then you have no business building vast housing estates around a dying heart. Think again and prioritise the well being of the existing communities here over money making for the few. Elsie Burrows
968	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
968	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
968	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
968	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID

968

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID

968

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID

968

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID

968

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

968

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

968

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

968

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID

968

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

968

It seems to me that you are making this response site so complex that you put people off complaining or commenting. Shame on you.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

968

LDP Rep: 969

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
969	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	The strategy is fine but there is no operational plan, and therefore it is difficult to support broad ranging strategic objectives as "the how" is missing; and implications such as traffic management and school needs are not addressed in detail.
969	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Fine, but how will infrastructure requirements be addressed?
969	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	It is very difficult to respond to abstract notions such as this.
969	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	I support in principle but it is not clear what will be provided actually.
969	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Yes, but how?
969	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Yes.
969	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Fine
969	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
--	--

ID	
969	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
969	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
969	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
969	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Traffic management is an existing problem. These proposals will exasperate the issue. How will this be addressed (detail is required).
969	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	We need to see the detail as to how infrastructural problems will be addressed, for example, with regard to traffic management, school and medical provision.
969	

LDP Rep: 970

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
970	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
970	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
970	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
970	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
970	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
970	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
970	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
970	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

970	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
970	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
970	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
970	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	<p>Yes. I would like to think what counts in our Historic Town (Bridgend) Bridgend is (or was) A Historic Town. The sign as you enter Bridgend off Junction 36 - Highlights This. Some but not all for the better. As to why I'm writing to you is - RE: Island Farm and Surrounding Areas. I wholeheartedly OBJECT To this Development. As you are very well aware...Island Farm Camp has a history of its own, and should be made a place of Historic Interest to bring Tourist to our area and putting Bridgend on the map.</p> <p>Lots of people in the UK and around the World have a great interest in War Time Stories, more often than not because of their own Personal Happenings to Them and They're families wishing to find out more information. I myself and my families have been to one of many historical places and found it to be Nostalgic and a Great Day Out. It seems criminal to have to build 847 houses on this beautiful rural Green Space. There will be a fracture along the spine road interfering with (site of importance for nature conservation area) Beautiful Merthyr Mawr will be ruined if this goes ahead. There is not enough infrastructure in place to accommodate this amount of dwellings in such a small Historic Town. Let alone the Wildlife who resides there. It's the people's Vote! We must have a say.... To save our Heritage from destruction. Our schools are overcrowded as it is, due to a bright spark in BCBC not building new schools big enough to accommodate numbers on over populated (new building sites) Shame on You & Big Mistake to allow it happen. There is land on Golden Mile Drive CF35 5AS which has been prepared with roads and drainage. This would be an ideal site for 847 houses. By going further afield possibly a new town could created which would include everything a new town needs....ie like Milton Keynes. It would be a Sin to even think of spoiling our Beautiful Merthyr Mawr and surrounding areas! Go back to the drawing board Please.</p>
970	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	<p>YES I TOTALLY OBJECT TO THE - DEPOSIT REPLACEMENT OF 847 HOUSES AT ISLAND FARM AND 850 HOUSES AT LALESTON AND ALSO 110 HOUSES SOUTH OF BROADLANDS. THE ROAD/ SAFETY INFRASTRUCTURE IN THIS</p>
970	

	AREA IS NOT SUBSTANTIALLY FIT FOR PURPOSE AS IT STANDS. OBJECT OBJECT OBJECT
--	---

LDP Rep: 971

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
971	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
971	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Schools are already oversubscribed, doctor surgeries are not able to meet the needs of patients in the area due to overcapacity. How will building more homes without building these additional facilities help these area grow?
971	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
971	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	The Leader of the council said in a meeting last night that there were no plans for new schools etc in the proposed development in Pyle/Cornelly area. This makes these statements false.
971	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
971	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Bridgend town centre has already been ruined. It is a no go area for people. Why not work on improving and redeveloping what we already have? Porthcawl is an area which needs development too. Neighbouring council's seem to be doing so much better than ours when it comes to development and recreational areas.
971	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	

971	If Pyle and the horrendous mess beingade of the movement of the recycling tip is anything to go by, then BCBC are going to struggle to provide theses things. The recycling and refuse collection at present is abyssmal.
-----	---

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	
971	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
971	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	No school, no improved medical services. A transport hub is pointless unless you're going to improve the rail network timetable. A train every 2 hours is no good to commuters! Vehicular access to Village Farm is a nightmare and has already severely affected local property prices. There is no safe walking route for school children in the area, despite cutting school transport facilities.
971	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
971	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
971	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
971	

LDP Rep: 594

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable): N/a

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	Porthcawl needs more leisure facilities not housing as proposed
594	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	Why should Bridgend borough be the area used for people who work in Cardiff there is plenty of land near to Cardiff that could be developed or CPO for this
594	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	As an NHS worker who lives in the Bridgend borough I can say from experience that the princess of Wales hospital is unable to take on more admissions through house building and numbers of people moving into the area, the local medical centres are already over capacity
594	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	You have planned far to many houses versus green open spaces and leisure, piling people on top of one another leads to social unrest disobedience drug & drink related problems which increases monies paid out to treat these, this has to be paid through higher council tax, the people of Bridgend borough have made it clear for many years now that they do not want full on building but more environmentally planned areas where they can relax, you have obviously seen houses and taxes please listen before it's to late
594	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	If you as a council want to meet the needs of those that are homeless or are unable to get their first steps on the housing ladder then have a large chunk if this LDP put given to V2C to build affordable houses on a rent to buy scheme, I also suggest that no person that currently owns a home that is not for sale be allowed to purchase any of these homes including their partners should they try that route, second homes create homeless local people
594	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	Bridgend borough has more than enough homes to currently supply all local industries, what we don't need is to concrete over our green space to accommodate workers for Cardiff - Cardiff has plenty availability of land on its boundaries it can use
594	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	History has shown that large retail kills towns and villages, surely you don't need us to show you that as you devastated Bridgend town by allowing Macarthur Glen to go ahead and after several regenerations the town is still a ghost town, please listen to what the businesses are saying and more so what the people are asking for
594	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	I would like that Bridgend would offer to put solar panels on peoples houses the energy could go towards cheaper electricity not only for the council but for the homeowners and reduce our carbon footprint, I would like separate cycle lanes along roads not the silly little painted bike emblems you put, I ride to work to both NPTH & POWH and I can tell you now it's a very scary ride at times, you will not get people on bikes unless they feel safe and are made safe
594	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	You are proposing to build on greenfield sites as apposed to grey I suggest you look at your environmental credentials as they are not working
594	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	I am a Porthcawl resident I have no right to make judgement on an area that I do not live in
594	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	I am happy for the seafront to be developed, but as a tourist resort and not as a housing development, this is all about tax revenue and not about tourism or the environment or the needs of the people of Porthcawl who you have not in since taking over listened to the needs of the people of Porthcawl, Porthcawl needs an indoor leisure facility, you subsidise Halo with millions of local taxpayers money and a large majority of that money comes from Porthcawl residents, please listen before its to late
594	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	Not my hometown not my place to make changes to
594	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Again not my hometown not my place to make changes
594	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	I want you to sit down with the people of Porthcawl in face to face meetings on several dates so that all are included from all areas of Porthcawl to discuss what they want not what you think they want or propose to force on them
594	

LDP Rep: 972

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	No
972	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	No
972	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	No
972	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	No
972	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	No
972	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	No
972	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	No
972	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	No
972	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	No

972	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	No
972	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	As a Porthcawl resident I really hope, at last, that the regeneration will go ahead.
972	Porthcawl needs to be bought into the 21st century!!

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	No
972	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	No
972	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	I want to see something new, modern and vibrant in Porthcawl
972	

LDP Rep: 973

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Yes - regarding SOBJ1, SOBJ2 & SOBJ4. The proposed development in Pencoed is on green land and this will reduce the opportunities for current residents to be active in natural places. More housing will put greater pressure on an already stretched infra-structure e.g. schools and doctor's surgeries.
973	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	The Deposit Replacement LDP may be based on a balanced and sustainable level of economic growth but it will not create a safe, healthy and inclusive community because the current infra-structure will not be able to support more residents. How many new schools, doctor's surgeries and hospitals are planned for Pencoed area?
973	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	The infra-structure needs to be developed with the housing not be a pipe dream for the future. New homes mean a larger community that an already over-stretched education and health service will have to accommodate. Build the new schools and surgeries first. Then consider the homes.
973	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Building on green sites will have a detrimental impact on people's health as there will be less places to walk, to commune with nature which have been a life saver for the majority of people during the Covid 19 pandemic.
973	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	The Pencoed community will have fewer sites where they can be active as the proposed development is on green land. Residents will be limited where they can exercise outside and health issues, especially mental health issues will be impacted in a negative way.
973	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	No
973	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	No
973	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID

No

973

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

How is the diversity of Pencoed being managed if the proposed development builds on green land currently used for exercise, sporting activities, socialising and by dog walkers?

973

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

No

973

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

No

973

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID

No

973

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

Yes. The land east of Pencoed is currently green land and new housing will place a greater strain on an already over stretched infra-structure. The current walking & cycling paths are dangerous because people park cars on them and ride bikes without bells so that pedestrians are unaware the cyclist is behind them.

973

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

No

973

LDP Rep: 974

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
974	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
974	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
974	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
974	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	The proposal to include 800+ new houses on island farm has a problem. I have lived and visit my mum who lives in Bowham Avenue for the past 50 years and the amount of traffic on the A48 has grown incredibly over that time. The proposal to have access to the new development from the A48 will only make a bad situation worst. It can currently take 10/15 minutes to cross the A48 and the underpass in Newbridge field is not an option as there is no pavement on the town side of the A48. Additionally Merthyr Mawr Road has become much more heavily used as a route from the A48 to Bridgend town centre and due to there being no designated crossing points it has become much more dangerous for pedestrians, especially for children/parents at Oldcastle and Brynteg schools that have to cross Merthyr Mawr road several times a day.
974	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
974	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
974	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID

974

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

974

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

974

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

974

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID

974

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

974

See previous comment about development south of Bridgend

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

974

LDP Rep: 975

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	These do not take enough cognisance of the current climate emergency and demonstrate a fundamental lack of understanding of the situation. Driver NR5 is too vague and ignores the significant impact of traffic congestion on carbon emissions. It pins too much reliance on future technology and is not ambitious enough. Not really a surprise when you look at the lack of competent people employed by this authority
975	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	You are foolish to think that people won't move out. How naive that you think you can attract people over Cardiff, Swansea and Bristol.
975	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	These are lies. The proposed developments are in direct conflict with this strategy and abuse the word periphery. The people who drew up this plan should be ashamed of themselves
975	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	All weasel words. I doubt if the muppets employed by this authority are capable of any good design. Look at the full grey and lifeless landscaping in Bridgend town centre.
975	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Building on island farm relies too heavily on car use. The A48 cannot support further car growth, especially as Bridgend council carried out an upgrade which was so poorly executed it is blatantly obvious that they are incapable of creating the necessary infrastructure. The lack of pedestrian crossing points (which Bridgend are fully aware puts pedestrians lives at risk) Is a perfect example of how the council cannot be trusted to make intelligent informed and properly designed improvements to protect the well-being of local residents. The increase in traffic accompanied by an enhanced number of pedestrians needing to cross the A48 Is highly likely to result in an increased the number of casualties.
975	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Puzzled as to how you think you can generate more employment when large swathes of Bridgend industrial estate lie empty and you have failed to attract new employers
975	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	

975	Unless you make Bridgend town centre a more pleasant, greener and less grubby place then you will not attract the changes you want.
-----	---

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
975	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	The development at Island farm proposed is in direct Conflict with this policy.
975	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
975	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
975	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
975	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	As previously stated the proposed development at Island farm is wholly inappropriate and should be removed from this plan. Be assured any attempt to push through planning for this development will be vigorously opposed
975	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Do not underestimate the strength of feeling against the island farm development. Jeff Jones thought he could bully the population into accepting a previous development proposal and look what happened to him. He had to leave politics (before he was kicked out) and now lives his life as a bitter self-important pathetic little man. Does the leader of the council really want to end up going the same way
975	

LDP Rep: 976

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	I object to the plan
976	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	If there is to be "growth" with the proposed houses being built, what about more doctors surgeries, schools and the up keep of our roads. As these are not being met
976	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	I object to the houses being built on green spaces especially on Island Farm and between Bryntirion & Laleston
976	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	To help the people of Bridgend's health and well being something needs to be done about Bridgend town. The antisocial behaviour there in the daytime is scary!
976	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Housing needs to be met but not of the sake of our green spaces and by knocking down our historic buildings.
976	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
976	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Lower the business rates in Bridgend town to attract more new businesses. Employ security by the job centre/bus station to stop the antisocial behaviour.
976	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
976	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

976	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
976	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Outdoor splash park would attract more families & more public toilets are desperately required. More bins and a group of litter pickers are needed in the summer.
976	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
976	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Do not knock down Hut 9 it could be a tourist attraction! It's our history.
976	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
976	

LDP Rep: 977

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	No
977	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
977	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
977	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Ensure that percentage of leisure facilities are sufficient to support residential properties
977	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Ensure quality buildings and adequate leisure incorporated into scheme
977	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
977	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Give local small specialist shops an opportunity to thrive alongside other established commercial businesses
977	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
977	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Maintain and enhance existing historic areas within community

977	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
977	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Establish formal cycle/ walking routes between Porthcawl, Kenfig and Pyle currently unsafe routes
977	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
977	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Improve cycle and walking routes between Porthcawl and Kenfig
977	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Make sure there are enough leisure facilities to support increased housing
977	

LDP Rep: 978

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	Yes all previous proposals have failed no one has taken any notice of public consultations starting with those held by Andrew Parry Jones. We are supposed to be protecting the climate and over population of area does not help
978	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	The people who are in charge do not listen to public opinion What is suggested will in no way bring in growth only with supermarkets which residents are objecting to but no one listens or takes actions. This is the start of community destruction
978	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	Yes no one has explained how Porthcawl will benefit .look at Aberavon that is what is required on our sea front .Again no one will listen or take action. Perhaps a change of decision makers would help. And let's have a vote. Do you accept this proposal yes/No
978	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	There should be a rule no high rise developments. Developments over 2 Stories
978	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	Yes if you look at the average household husband wife 2Children. All will have cars. Affecting parking and over congestion as will happen at already agreed developments in Newton
978	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	You have failed previously look at Bridgend town and learn by mistakes
978	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	We had a shop in Porthcawl for 33 years and attended several meetings via chamber of trade. No one listened to business owners . The key to any shopping area is parking together with parking charges .pedestrianisation killed John st. trading
978	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	No
978	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	Yes. Destruction should not take place to give way to housing or commercial developments
978	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	None
978	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	There should not be residential or commercial developments on Porthcawl sea front. Start listening to Porthcawl residents rather than forcing what you want. Let's have sports and recreation facilities. Not failed projects like Credu
978	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	No
978	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	No
978	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	Yes please give Porthcawl what residents want instead of what you want. No land should be given or sold to developers. It is in your hands for the future of Porthcawl Residents believe no one will read our comments and action projects based on what we say. Be honest and let us have what we want not use the need for housing as an excuse
978	

LDP Rep: 979

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
979	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
979	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
979	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
979	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
979	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
979	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
979	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
979	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

979	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
979	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
979	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
979	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
979	<p>Reference: development of land to the south of Bridgend. This area involves the development of land south of the A48. I object to the land use changes proposed for the old Island farm site plus the Craig y parcau site. whilst i understand the demand for additional housing i consider the choice of these specific areas unwise. The environmental impact will be irreversible. Increased river pollution from surface runoff coupled with the increased flood risk is an unnecessary impact. The impact of increased traffic congestion will result in increased air pollution and road congestion to a level which is unacceptable in todays society. I assume that with the increased vehicle exhaust pollution, public health of the local residents and school children have not been a major factor. Traffic calming measures and a speed limit of 30mph will further contribute to the already congested road situation. as a consequence i assume New Inn road and Merthyr Mawr road will be sacrificed in an attempt to reduce the impact of a road system that will not be fit for purpose. The area south of the A48 is widely used by walkers and cyclists and these proposals will considerably increase their risk of injury. The clammer to develop these greenfield sites will destroy the concept of what was envisaged by "green belts" and replace them with commuter settlements which suck the life out of local services, destroy the character of the local community and start a downward spiral in the environment with long term physical and mental implications. I hope the demand on Bridgend to develop such areas is opposed for the long term future of our town.</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
979	

LDP Rep: 980

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	I am opposed to this plan of 850 houses between Bryntirion and Laleston . This will cause unnecessary strain on our infrastructure and traffic will be unbearable
980	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
980	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
980	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
980	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
980	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
980	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
980	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
980	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

980	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
980	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
980	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
980	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
980	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
980	

LDP Rep: 457

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
457	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
457	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
457	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
457	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
457	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
457	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
457	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
457	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

457	One of the areas I believe is earmarked for housing is Sandy Bay, Porthcawl. The remaining sand dunes are surely protected and the surrounding hedgerows which are full of wildlife should not be destroyed in my opinion.
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
457	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Main concern is lack of infrastructure to Porthcawl. Only two roads in, which get extremely busy in the summer months. Extra housing means more cars. Also we desperately need more facilities for our youngsters. No sports centre. Doctors surgery/schools cannot cope with the existing volume of residents. Please don't just give us thousands of houses a nothing else.
457	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
457	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
457	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Whilst I understand the need for more housing I hope Porthcawl doesn't just end up one massive housing estate with nothing else to attract tourists and no facilities for residents other than Aldi!!!
457	

LDP Rep: 981

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
981	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
981	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
981	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
981	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
981	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
981	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
981	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
981	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

981	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
981	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	The proposal for the development of Porthcawl to include Salt Lake and Sandy Bay MUST include consideration for the transport links. Current proposals show over 1100 homes to be built, a Supermarket and other retail options. This will all be on an area that currently supplies parking for the thousands of day visitors to the town. Where will all these cars go? Will a residents only parking permit scheme be introduced? Will pay and display machines be installed all along West Drive where currently parking is free? What considerations are being discussed regarding the speed of traffic using the A4106 dual carriageway? The noise and pollution created every day is now getting extreme!
981	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
981	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
981	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Regenerating the area is clearly very important for the future of the borough. What must be considered through this process is the fact that Porthcawl draws thousands of visitors to the borough each year, not only summer but throughout the year. The first surfing beaches off the M4 as you come into Wales, many people travel to Porthcawl from England and the eastern areas of Wales for this alone. The seven bays project highlights the stunning scenery and watersports available in Porthcawl, yet the development plan takes away the main parking available to visitors. A park and ride scheme based in Pyle is not going to be routinely used by visitors, the residential streets will be used, causing issues inevitably. The A4229 into Porthcawl is regularly congested with heavy traffic and requires improvement. The A4106 dual carriageway resembles Santa Pod raceway with cars and especially motor bikes speeding between the roundabouts at each end. A 50mph speed limit in the centre of the town is just ludicrous, when the area is built up on either side. Surely in line with Welsh Gov schemes to reduce emissions on the M4, BCBC should look at reducing the speed on this road.
981	

LDP Rep: 982

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	As a first point sounds quite positive. Shame about what has actually evolved from these first objectives
982	
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	This is just standard textbook stuff. Anyone who has ever written objectives as part of their job will recognise the same old terminology
982	
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Can't disagree on the sentiment. Just shame that you have decided to put it all in one space in Porthcawl ie: on the seafront
982	
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Have you actually read the above when considering the seafront in Porthcawl????????? What idiot considered your plans would enhance the seafront in Porthcawl?
982	
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Why do 1115 houses have to be built on the seafront when there are other sites locally which could be used?
982	
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Could you please clarify where in Porthcawl you think all this employment will be generated? Is it only construction work during the programme or will it be long term employment?
982	
7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Just WHY WHY WHY on the seafront ?
982	
8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Don't have enough information to comment
982	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Again how are the plans going to enhance Porthcawl? Tidy up the seafront by all means. Continue with cafes and bars which is what a seaside town should have. But keep the development to support Porthcawl as an upmarket tourist attraction
982	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
982	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Yes. Scrap the existing plans. Get an environmental friendly architect to work with the local residents to develop the seafront into somewhere tourists will want to come. Don't spoil the beauty of what is there naturally
982	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
982	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
982	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	YES!!!!!! Whoever designed this proposal for Porthcawl seafront is obviously not a local resident . To claim the plans will meet the needs of the community is just not true. Once again it is government trying to generate as much income as possible without any consideration for the opinions of the people who matter .Just remember we are the voters when the next local and national elections take place!!
982	

LDP Rep: 983

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	I do not object to the high level strategies and policies in principal.
983	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Growth needs to be managed in a proportionate way
983	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	No
983	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	No
983	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	No
983	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	No
983	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	No
983	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	No
983	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	No

983	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	No
983	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	No
983	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	No
983	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I object to the proposal south of Bridgend - the So called Island farm proposal
983	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	The Island Farm development if realised would hugely impact on the local communities such as Ewenny and Corntown with respect to traffic flows including people taking shortcuts. Traffic volumes would also increase. The development would destroy what is a peaceful rural and farming environment adjacent to Merthyr Mawr.
983	

LDP Rep: 984

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
984	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	These are just sound bites
984	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Too much money spent in the valleys with the income from Bridgend residents
984	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
984	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
984	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
984	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Bridgend town centre a no go area. People drinking etc from early morning horrible
984	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Forcing residents to separate waste is not recycling. Surrounding areas have far simpler collections and I suspect all of our waste goes to the same centres! A complete waste of time
984	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
--	--

ID	Over house building in Bridgend without infer-structure over crowding on roads in shops etc
984	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
984	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
984	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
984	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	I would oppose all of the proposed development west of Bridgend
984	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	No
984	

LDP Rep: 985

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Lack of provision for noise and other pollutants along the dual carriageway into Porthcawl.
985	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Need to publicise the benefits, not seen any progress since it was first announced.
985	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	None
985	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Can we have some statues and street art
985	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Can we have clear bike path routes that connect and a cycle path over three step hill to aid runners and cyclists and the same across the sand dunes to Ogmore
985	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	None
985	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	None
985	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	None
985	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Reduction in traffic, speed and noise.

985	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	None
985	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Hurry up and do it before the next housing market collapse, more non-car transport.
985	Lets go all impsons and try a monorail.

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	None
985	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Nones
985	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	None
985	

LDP Rep: 986

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
986	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
986	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
986	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
986	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
986	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
986	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
986	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
986	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

986	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
986	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	I think the number of houses proposed is too high. Yes build more houses but the volume proposed is huge. Having visited Devon recently, in particular westward ho, seeing the regeneration of the area in respect to leisure opportunities (play areas, open greassy areas, the sea pool etc) shows how this should be incorporated into porthcawls long term plan for both residents and visitors alike. Please don't just build houses and give a cursory nod to other priorities.
986	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
986	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
986	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
986	

LDP Rep: 987

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID 987	y concern with regard to the LDP is the proposed development on what is known as Island Farm (PLA2).It is my considered opinion that this site is of such environmental importance with regard to existing flora and fauna that any residential development, particularly on the scale indicated, will have an irreversibly detrimental effect on the area. I also believe that development on this scale will create problems in the future with regard to land drainage and consequential flooding. Finally, i am not satisfied that Bridgend has adequate infrastructure to satisfactorily accommodate such a large expansion.
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID 987	Please refer to my previous comment regarding existing infrastructure
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID 987	My principal comment relating to "sustainable growth areas" is that the definition of "under-utilised sites" is open to misinterpretation. Island farm and the land immediately surrounding this area is not under-utilised; it is just not available for development. The land more socially valuable if it is not developed
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID 987	i am not familiar with the proposed development designs so I am not in a position to comment. When I have had an opportunity of examining the development designs, I may cooment
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID 987	in my opinion, building 800 houses on land that is currently enjoyed as open space will have a long-term damaging effect on the health and well being and on the social cohesion of the communities in the locality
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID 987	will all the occupants of the homes in this proposed development be working in the Greater Bridgend area? I do not think so; the area is more likely to become a commuter area for people working in Cardiff and Swansea
7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	No

987	
-----	--

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	No
987	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	all my a cynic but I cannot understand how this chapter sits comfortably and appropriately in a policy documents that is designed to not "conserve and enhance the natural and historic environment".
987	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
987	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
987	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
987	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	my previous comments cover most of my objections
987	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	not at this stage
987	

LDP Rep: 988

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Please prioritise nature and quality of life for current inhabitants over building anything new.
988	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	It makes sense from an economical point of view, but 505 homes a year is way too many, we have to put current inhabitants of the borough above new residents.
988	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Please just don't go crazy with the houses like in Coity.
988	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Please make lots of green space, easy access for all modes of transport to services and workplaces (maybe some Netherlands style active travel routes), and make places for nature as well as humans.
988	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	New houses will not necessarily lead to an increase in quality of life or spending for the current Borough inhabitants. If houses are built in appropriate places on a modest scale, with excellent quality of construction and design, and if they are well integrated into nature and the existing town, then I accept this. But if the plan is to mass build estates with nothing on them except for bland, lifeless, single family houses as far as the eye can see, car dependant and boring houses, then I believe this is utterly the wrong thing to do. Unfortunately, this is what appears to have happened in Brynmenyn and Coity. The shops aren't close enough, and the houses are arranged so that walking distances are much longer than as the crow flies, so people always end up in their cars. Sustainable, reasonable and high quality houses, and streets (maybe even with some trees) are the only thing I can accept as responsible development.
988	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	It would be nice to have a huge range of jobs, to create a more varied community.
988	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	

988	Please put as much as possible in the town centres, and discourage any private out of town retail. I would love it if the town centres could be pedestrianized further, as this has been proven to increase sales for local businesses elsewhere in the world. If we make the town centres a pleasant place to be, and allow residents to reach them without a car, then people are bound to spend more in the town. I think the future of town centres is local businesses, on pedestrian streets.
-----	---

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Every community should be able to drop off any recycling at a collection point less than a five minute walk away. A lot of rubbish goes to landfill because people are too lazy to travel to an amenity site.
988	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	As long as we act like WE are the guests in nature, and that untouched land is THEIR space, then it should be fine.
988	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
988	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
988	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
988	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I do not agree with any building south of the A48, this area is well used by residents to access high quality natural scenery. This should not be ruined by houses or development, although an active travel route to Porthcawl from Newbridge Fields would be fantastic. Please leave any area south of Brynteg school and around the Dipping bridge as wild as possible, we all love it as it is.
988	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Plant trees. Build active travel routes. Grow, but respect nature at all costs.
988	

LDP Rep: 989

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Poor planning and lazy thinking on the development of the waterfront area. Specifically the development of salt lake car park. This is a key area that can be used to attract tourism and promote activities to local people and tourists. Building a supermarket and housing on the seafront will be disastrous in maintaining the aesthetics of this area. Parking will become a major issue as the area is always full in busy seasonal times. The area would be better used for developing leisure and retail opportunities. Just look at Aberavon as a fine example of how a waterfront area should be developed.
989	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Poor public transport links from Bridgend to Porthcawl. Housing needs to reflect the location of a seaside town and utilising a waterfront area for homes reflects a clear lack of vision from developers.
989	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Whilst I agree Porthcawl needs more affordable homes I do not agree with the location in a key tourism area. This will impact on the use of the site as a leisure facility which is much needed. Retail, outdoor splash area and play areas for families is a better use of space and regeneration. Sandy bay has been neglected for decades and this would make a more suitable space for housing.
989	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	I cannot see how building a supermarket and housing on a prime waterfront area in Porthcawl is going to add and enhance the surrounding area! It will be another embarrassing ill thought out eye sore. The majority of local residents agree that a supermarket and housing will be a negative impact on the aesthetics of the seafront and creating a building that has a wave on the roof is a poor attempt on trying to 'tie in' a building with its environment. Please look at other Welsh seaside towns to see how a seaside town could and should look!
989	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
989	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
989	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	Agree that Bridgend town centre is in desperate need of an overhaul to attract people back into town centres.
989	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
989	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	Promoting tourism by building a supermarket on a key waterfront location is not keeping in line with the environment and its aesthetics.
989	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
989	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	If you class retail as a major supermarket enhancing the environment then this is ludicrous. The design needs to reflect the opportunities for growth through tourism and residents being able to enjoy well designed open spaces which promotes and protects local businesses rather than a giant retailer. Water parks, food outlets, local artisans is what will enhance the area and attract people into a forward thinking town. Putting a supermarket and housing on a prime site is poor planning and short sighted for the future of the town. How much money was wasted on developing unusable cycle routes on New Road!
989	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
989	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
989	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
989	

LDP Rep: 990

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Whilst Porthcawl does require a second supermarket, surely it is very short sighted use of salt lake car park to build a supermarket and houses on it. There are other places within porthcawl to build a supermarket, to just build houses which yes generate revenue for the council will not re-develop a town
990	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
990	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
990	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
990	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
990	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
990	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
990	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
990	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

990

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

990

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

990

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID

990

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

990

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

990

LDP Rep: 991

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
991	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Would you confirm that you have now reassessed your strategy due to the pandemic?
991	This global event has changed the nature of employment and the resultant demand for employment sites due to increased and potentially permanent home working. There will therefore be a need to assess the impact of this on site allocation

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
991	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	An important part of placemaking is to ensure that the context and integrity of recognised Conservation Areas are maintained and not overwhelmed by development. The allocation between Bryntirion and Laleston (PLA 3) does not seem to be truly sustainable in this respect.
991	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	COM 1(2) housing allocation south of Bridgend - this is a very worrying allocation and will lead to future residential development along the south of A48 as infill between COM 1(2) and the Island Farm allocation mentioned above. Can our highway infrastructure cope? I would argue that existing congestion and traffic resulting from Broadlands, along with summer tourist traffic to Porthcawl could see more fatalities and collisions. In addition, this section of the A48 has become a popular walking access route for residents to the countryside of Merthyr Mawr . Is encouraging further development sustainable and safe for the future? More generally, the pandemic has completely changed 'household needs' over the plan period
991	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	PLA 2 Sustainable Growth Area Island Farm. This allocation seems to be a historic one and has certainly been included in various local plans since the days of Mid Glamorgan County Council. Is this not outdated now? Employment sites may well be about to experience dramatic changes in demand due to home working. The time has come to reassess this site and recognise its historic importance and tourist potential
991	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	I support this approach but is it too late for Bridgend? I hope not.
991	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
991	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	If the historic environment is 'an important cultural asset and a finite, irreplaceable source of information about our past' why is the policy relating to the Island farm site still to develop and erase rather than conserve and enhance?
991	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
991	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
991	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
991	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	PLA 8(9) if this allocation is retained will the residents of BCBC lose part of Newbridge Fields? How will access to countryside and recreation be preserved? How is this a sustainable development in the light of global climate change and carbon emission targets?
991	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	My comments are made as a long term resident of Bridgend. I feel the events of the last year have affected the planning and development environments with fundamental changes to the way we work and the environment in which we live. This plan need to take due regard of these changes and plan in an imaginative way - a way that does not simply carry forward previous ideas pre pandemic.
991	

LDP Rep: 992

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
992	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	There isn't sufficient parking schools medical facilities etc to support lots more housing. Also the land should be used for entertainment facilities for residents and visitors.
992	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Leisure facilities are needed for residents to use in winter time too for adults but particularly for teenagers .
992	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
992	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Infrastructure isn't sufficient for lots of housing in porthcawl. Any housing that is built should be affordable for young people to start out not just retirement flats.
992	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	I do not agree with an Aldi taking prime waterfront land in porthcawl. It is a tourist town and re-development should reflect this.
992	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
992	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
992	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
--	--

ID	
992	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
992	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	Land should be used for leisure purposes and not Aldi.
992	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
992	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
992	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
992	

LDP Rep: 993

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
993	No

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
993	No

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
993	No

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
993	I would prefer to see buildings to be renovated rather than demolished and replaced . I believe this to be more sustainable . I also think that when buildings are left empty for whatever reason they should be maintained and not left to deteriorate which is happening far too often within the county .

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
993	I believe that open spaces should be kept for recreation purposes . All the council plans should contain information on forward planning of any areas they are considering developing . Taking into account affordability sustainability and the impact of the loss of open spaces married against any future development of empty spaces in the future in 10 year leads . The cost versus benefit to the local communities and businesses whether they be based here or elsewhere . Additional housing and businesses have great impact on traffic flow , need for extra schools , medical services etc .

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
993	Additional employment is welcomed but it needs to reflect the needs and abilities of the Borough . I think locating Bridgend College is a brilliant idea to bring in additional footfall to Bridgend Town . I also think that empty shops in all the county towns could be used as classrooms and nurseries . This would bring even more people into our town centres . One way of thinking out side of the box is to look at a cross section of the communities daily / evening routines . Then take this information and look at other potential uses for the empty shops / buildings . Of course we also need to improve public transport , why not introduce free buses to the town centres , which could also continue to Mearthyr Glen or Waterton

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
993	We must continue to support our town centres , weekly regular events , markets or information days are needed . Could we also use the empty shops and buildings for other activities. We need to provide clean safe public toilets and mobility services . Maybe some of the Council departments could relocate to the town centre , this would bring the community back together . Pop up shops are an interesting idea , how about offering Primark a few shops in the Rhiw , to sell their older stock this could be marketed through sustainability and would bring many people into the town . More seating in good repair is needed in town centres , access for cars at agreed times and personally I think all our town centres should have town managers and assistants who actually walk around their areas resolving and answering any questions or difficult problems before they worsen . Parking , safety , unreasonable behaviour etc . If the centres look as if they are being looked after and appreciated I believe they will be respected by the majority of the community.

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
993	We need to continually monitor our use of energy etc , waste and rubbish is something we should aim to reduce , reuse what we can and preserve what we have

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
993	Very often the council doesn't think things through and the future look of buildings and surrounding areas and impacts of their actions and developments has left our towns looking unkempt and sad

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
993	I've made my comments in previous paragraphs the proposals look interesting but sustainability and cost benefits need to be considered.

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
993	I live in Porthcawl and I'm 64 over the last 50 years many proposals have been put forward the town only has buses as a public transport service . The majority of residents use cars to get from A to B . If more houses are built the schools and other public services will be put under more strain . I'm not against additional housing but consideration has to be given to who it will be for . Currently the price of houses is exploding in the area , how will the local young people be able to afford them ? We must not loose our open spaces , clearly they need to be improved and maintained and this is for the benefit for all who live here and come to visit . I think the existing hotels should be improved and new hotels would be welcomed . I know a swimming pool is wanted but if that's not possible why could we not have an open air lido on the seafront or bring back into use the paddling pools on the promenade which were filled in years ago .

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	No I'm not familiar with the area but refer to my previous comments
993	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	No I refer to my previous comments
993	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Refer to my previous comments
993	

LDP Rep: 994

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
994	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
994	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
994	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
994	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
994	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
994	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
994	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
994	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

994	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
994	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
994	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
994	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
994	<p>I find it a disgrace that the council has plans for growth of residential areas without attracting further employment opportunities to the area. The loss of key employment in recent years has had further detriment to the area, which considering the current financial climate and increasing prices in our neighbouring cities, will attract commuter residents to the town in which existing infrastructure cannot cope, trip generations of a further 847 houses adding to an already choked Ewenny roundabout just as a single example, amongst others which will cause further issues. The loss of some of the most beautiful areas with the proposed Island farm development amongst others would be hugely negative not just too the countryside, but to existing residents in the town, whom benefit from use of its beautiful walks promoting positive mental health at an increasing time of phycological issues to many. Not to mention the ecological effects on many of the local flora and fauna, I would love to see the ecological surveys for these areas, which I'm sure shall be discussed at length. Having been a resident of the town the majority of my life I have seen the population grow beyond the capacity of local infrastructure and personally struggle daily to navigate the towns roads without stressful encounters. I would query why areas of the town that are 'brownfield' with many derelict buildings which could benefit from re-developments for new housing are not utilised before destroying our beautiful countryside. Water quality and biodiversity (with use of SUD's) of these sites can be enhanced with great benefit to these local areas and sewerage infrastructure, possible watercourses also. If these developments continue to be considered at this magnitude, we can say goodbye to our identity as a small town with big character and say hello to being a characterless commuter town. To read such proposals leaves me with a bitter heart, the need to write this leaves me with a heavy heart. Please save our character of our town and the countryside that surrounds it. Having worked with Bridgend Highways on a number of residential projects I know how stretched their resources have been, along with all Local Authorities in South Wales, the consideration to further pressurise an already understaffed council can only be negative for the Local Authority. I am happy to read of plans of more green infrastructure and glad to see this is enhanced currently and in the future for all areas of the county, for any new development from experience within the residential sector, these simply cannot by relied upon for use</p>

	and I cannot see how these can realistically be considered to relieve any existing or future pressures on highway infrastructure. I sincerely hope these LDP plans are not sustained moving forward and considerations are made for redevelopment of brownfied sites before Greenfield areas. Please Save Bridgend.
--	---

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
994	

LDP Rep: 995

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	About the new development plan by the Tondu primary school. Council already have taken the massive bit of land in Tondu by Lidl to build 450 houses. And now want to take another bit of a forest !!! It's a very bad idea to get rid of another place where all the animals are living for years. We do not need another crowded spot in Bridgend. People come in this area and to nature reserve next by to rest from all the traffic and all the noise and want to enjoy fresh air peace and quiet. Building behind school and taking that lovely scenery from kids! It's ridiculous!!! Not even mentioning more cars more traffic! Is crazy as it is now to get to Pentre Felin or Aberkenfig during rush hours. It's only going to get worse after 450 houses be build and you want to build more. Absolutely NO. Council!!! Don't be greedy in money and leave us some lovely green space. We don't want to live in a concrete place. Bridgend it's just getting worst and worst with all this new estate being build. Think about the environment and about people who live in the area. About the kids who soon won't know fresh air and trees as you want to take it all away from them. By building unnecessary stuff instead of protecting nature!!!
995	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
995	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
995	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
995	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
995	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
995	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID

995

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID

995

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

995

Yes. Stop building so many new estates and stary to protect wild life. You're trying again to ruin a lovely bit of land in Tondu by the primary shool. It's just ridiculous!

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

995

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

995

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID

995

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

995

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

995

stop overcrowding Bridgend. Leave us some grean places. Don't ruin the beauty of this town by building all this new estates! Tondu and Aberkenfig do not need any more homes. We need our grean lands to be protected not destroyed!!!

LDP Rep: 997

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
997	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
997	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
997	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
997	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
997	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
997	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
997	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
997	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

997	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
997	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	I welcome the Development of Porthcawl as a strategically important location for BCBC, however, I'm concerned by the disproportionate amount of affordable housing being proposed. 30% seems excessively high and a figure around 5-10% would be more reasonable. I'd welcome more facilities for tourists and residents, things like mini golf, swimming pools. splash parks and quality modern attractions to keep pace with other quality UK seaside holiday locations.
997	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
997	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
997	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
997	

LDP Rep: 998

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID 998	<p>My comments are related to the plan for Porthcawl I believe the target statement are being manipulated within the LDP The plan for such vast amount of housing will not create a high quality sustainable place. This in my opinion is a plan of urbanisation and such a plan is to make Porthcawl a domiciliary town for Cardiff and demote the town as tourist attraction. It will not create active, healthy, cohesive and a social community if all it plans is houses, hotels and a couple of green patches. It will not create productive and enterprising places if by making park and rides or by there being no places for people to park. Parking is a major issue - people are not going to visit the town with their bags, children , prams, barbeques on a bus - if they do they will not leave their items on the beach to go shopping. This is not well thought through. It will meet the wider objectives of being a domiciliary town for Cardiff, however this is not what the residents of Porthcawl want. BCBC are making attempts to gather financial gain from grants at the expense of destroying Porthcawl as a tourist town. To protect and enhance distinctive and natural places is not going to happen if BCBC carries out this plan. Sanday bay judgements about area's such as Sandy Bay are being made by people that do not live in the area or have no idea how this is utilised on a daily basis. There is wild flower, birds, animals, children play there, mother walk children, dogs together, children can safely ride bikes. It is no waste ground. I do not believe that BCBC wish to protect and enhance distinctive and natural places within Porthcawl. The fact that they are CPO land shows disregard and disrespect to local people.</p>

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID 998	<p>My response is in relation to Porthcawl Again this is about making Porthcawl into a dormitory town for the larger cities. It for financial gain. It is tailored toward grants but do not meet the needs of the residents. There is no regard that many of the houses will be second homes or people coming from larger cities, commuting and taking the town away from residents. It is about pushing out the people that already live in Porthcawl. It about turning visitors away that by tradition have been coming here from the valleys for many years. Its about making money out of porthcawl and spending it in other area's of the borough Its about disregard and disrespect Its about shutting bridle ways and down grading to footpaths for future building Its about forcing people out of Porthcawl to get jobs. People will always want to be independent and the though that you can replace cars with busses and trains and turn back time is ridiculous it will just send people to other seaside towns with more considerate councillors ie Port Talbot or Barry Island. Its about creating short term jobs whilst construction work is ongoing. Its about destroying our sea side town</p>

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	

998	<p>In relation to Sandy bay evidence has shown that it should never be built on due to conditions set down in 1946 which were that the land was purchased for £39,000 by the rate payers for public walks, leisure exercise and camping. Evidence available .</p> <p>The infrastructure and parking requirements cannot sustain larger populations alongside the influx of tourists. Park and ride is not a feasible option as there are too many complexities of family life to make this a realistic option for a family day out at the beach for example. It will impact negatively on the use of other facilities within Porthcawl such as shopping, use of fairground etc. The natural places that exist, ie Sandy bay contain rare plants and creatures (Photographic evidence can be provided). Building on this area would not meet SOBJ4. Neither would building north of Newton Nottage Road, and although a logical place to build it would impact on the feeding grounds of over wintering Egrets and Curlews at high tides. Again I reiterate that the infrastructure would not sustain extra housing, being built in Porthcawl at all, as it would result in more traffic and more pollution. The projected works at Sandy Bay are purely to contain the sand and not defence from the sea . This is environmental vandalism no better than the dumping of concrete rubble post war. It is my understanding that this has been grant funded. In my opinion such work is not necessary as a sea defence but has been manipulated within the grant application because there is a need of sand control to allow development of the area. It is evidenced within a video of 1965, (available upon request), an interview with a councillor stated that the sand was reaching the top of the caravans, but in written statement in 2004 by an ecological expert, it said that there was insufficient sand to sustain the dunes which was a contradiction. I can provide factual information about the removal regularly of sand off the road way , for example in one instant during 2020 of 600 tonnes which was higher than three metres higher than the original foreshore.</p>
-----	--

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
<p>ID</p> <p>998</p>	<p>The LDP does not consider people's health and well being unless you and stupid enough to believe that park and ride will work and reduce emissions through less cars. People will use cars. I would love to see the plan for cycle routes because the current one is a shambles. I would like to see the plan for bridle ways to allow horse riders to ride safely but the plan seems to be to shut these down to make way for more future housing. I suspect that the way the houses will be build will be ecologically sound to promote the health and well being of the community. This would meet the criteria but there is not consideration to leisure and active lifestyle that is meaningful and well thought through. There has been no consultation up to now. Plans are being cemented without reading what people have to say. CPO's have already gone out and the consultation process has not been completed. Even Charles Smith is campaigning against his own development plan because he does not want housing in his ward. This is just a money making exercise that is not in the best interest of the community that exists today. This is not about future generations because if it was you would invest in the young and not take all their open space away from them. You are creating a nightmare to support big cities. This plan is about destruction and manipulation of words to gain grants and funding.</p>

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
<p>ID</p>	

998	<p>The infrastructure will not cope with the plans There are not enough GP's The roads would not cope with more traffic coming in to the household you plan to create. Our hospitals would not cope There is no enough police There are not enough social workers to cope with the mental health issues, child protection etc that this plan is likely to create. This plan is about destruction not construction. This is about urbanisation not regeneration This is about ignoring Sandy Bay is for Recreation and Leisure only. We do not have have adequate infrastructure You are not providing homes for homeless although you emphasise the amount of homeless in the borough You may consider some houses as affordable but that will be relative and most houses will go to people earning lots of money in the cities and commuting back and for to work. You do not care about the future of Porthcawl as a tourist industry. Most Importantly the consultation is meaningless as decisions have been made and the vision really has not been properly shared .</p>
-----	---

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	It about housing and commuting to cities - this plan does not consider may local jobs and supporting tourism.
998	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Retail shops in Porthcawl will close. People will not come to Porthcawl it will only be residents using the shops. The staff from co-op are likely to move to aldi as co-op will not be able to complete. The people coming in on buses will not be able to leave their equipment to go shopping. Its is not at all well thought through
998	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
998	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	
998	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
998	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	BCBC need to improve their methods of consultation - this form is not at all user friendly We do not want more houses in Porthcawl We do not want you taking away our tourism. You need to give the land of Sandy bay back to the people you manipulated access to The only plans that i have see have no real bones to them other than the plan to build 912 houses in Coney beach and sandy bay alone
998	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID

998

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

998

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

998

This has not been a user friendly consultation This is manipulation of words to gain funding to meet agreements made with larger cities. We do not want more housing. Hospitals surgeries, social services and police are not coping at the moment don't bring more people into our town.

LDP Rep: 999

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable): N/A

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	N/A
999	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	N/A
999	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	N/A
999	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	N/A
999	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	N/A
999	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	N/A
999	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	N/A
999	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	N/A
999	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	N/A

999	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
999	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
999	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
999	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
999	<p>I strongly object to any development of the Island Farm area and raise concerns around your Key issues of SOBJ4: To protect and enhance distinctive and natural places . The prospect of approximately 1000 new houses in such an area is scandalous. Without thought of local ammenaties such as Schools, Medical Services Social Services etc, The loss of wild life clearly is of no concern. If the area of Merthyr Mawr is the jewel in the Borough's crown why build on to it unless purely for revenue purposes. The Island Farm Sports Academy development was clearly always a red herring with no intention of such a development being completed. Housing was always the plan and now we see the true plan. If needed why not build housing together with the necessary increase in schools, Doctor's / Dentist Surgeries etc in more appropriate although less profitable locations Why not build around the disused Ford Factory site? This development will not be welcome by residents of the borough. On a personal note what consideration has been given to change of traffic flow conditions from the A48 in to Merthyr Mawr Rd? This is a residential road which despite signage for children crossing and Pedestrians already suffers with excess speed issues whilst now used as a cross town link. This road is directly linked to Old Castle and Brynteg Schools and has considerable usage by children to and from school.. As a rate payer i strongly object to the excess congestion we can expect to suffer with such a development. Nobody can think construction encroaching onto Merthyr Mawr is desirable.</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	N/A
999	

LDP Rep: 1000

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable): none

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	THE EASTERN PROM IS UNSUITABLE FOR RESIDENTIAL HOUSING -THIS PLAN MUST BE HALTED -RESIDENTS HAVE NEVER BEEN PROPERLY CONSULTED ON DETAILS/-HENCE OMBUDSMAN OR SUCH ARBITRATION ESSENTIAL.
1000	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	FURTHER FULL CONSULTATION WITH PORTHCAWL CITIZENS IS ESSENTIAL
1000	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	USE OF SPACE REMAINS TO BE ADEQUATELY DISCUSSED
1000	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	NO
1000	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	NO
1000	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	NO
1000	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1000	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1000	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	
1000	

ID	
1000	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1000	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1000	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
1000	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
1000	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1000	

LDP Rep: 1001

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1001	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1001	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Island Farm Development The current adopted LDP identifies Island Farm as a Strategic Employment Site and I understand that there is a valid planning permission on the site to deliver such development. Given that this site is good quality agricultural land (Grades 2 and 3a), the adopted LDP presumably had to demonstrate over-riding need for employment land in this location. What has changed to demonstrate that the site is no longer needed for Strategic Employment? If the site is not needed for Strategic Employment it should be released to safeguard the agricultural land. Why is Island Farm now suitable for a Sustainable Growth Area (PLA2) - which is largely residential rather than employment? The evidence demonstrating over-riding need for such residential development in this area - which could be delivered elsewhere - is very limited. Good quality agricultural land will be lost to development without sufficient justification. There is very little detail - and potentially contradictory policy - between PLA2 and interactions with Bridgend town centre. E.g. Transport policies PLA8 and PLA9 to improve the A48 for vehicles are very likely to worsen the poor access for pedestrians and cyclists and will not result in the expressed green lung between Merthyr Mawr and Newbridge Fields. PLA2 along with the other housing proposals in this area of Bridgend will lead to an unacceptable increase in traffic volumes on the main roads and the minor road network in the area.
1001	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1001	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1001	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
---	--

ID	<p>Island Farm Development The current adopted LDP identifies Island Farm as a Strategic Employment Site and I understand that there is a valid planning permission on the site to deliver such development. Given that this site is good quality agricultural land (Grades 2 and 3a), the adopted LDP presumably had to demonstrate over-riding need for employment land in this location. What has changed to demonstrate that the site is no longer needed for Strategic Employment? If the site is not needed for Strategic Employment it should be released to safeguard the agricultural land. Why is Island Farm now suitable for a Sustainable Growth Area (PLA2) - which is largely residential rather than employment? The evidence demonstrating over-riding need for such residential development in this area - which could be delivered elsewhere - is very limited. Good quality agricultural land will be lost to development without sufficient justification. There is very little detail - and potentially contradictory policy - between PLA2 and interactions with Bridgend town centre. E.g. Transport policies PLA8 and PLA9 to improve the A48 for vehicles are very likely to worsen the poor access for pedestrians and cyclists and will not result in the expressed green lung between Merthyr Mawr and Newbridge Fields. PLA2 along with the other housing proposals in this area of Bridgend will lead to an unacceptable increase in traffic volumes on the main roads and the minor road network in the area.</p>
1001	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
1001	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1001	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?
--

ID	
1001	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley
--

ID	
1001	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill
--

ID	
1001	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys
--

ID	
1001	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
1001	<p>Island Farm Development The current adopted LDP identifies Island Farm as a Strategic Employment Site and I understand that there is a valid planning permission on the site to deliver such development. Given that this site is good quality agricultural land (Grades 2 and 3a), the adopted LDP presumably had to demonstrate over-riding need for employment land in this location. What has changed to demonstrate that the site is no longer needed for Strategic Employment? If the site is not needed for Strategic Employment it should be released to safeguard the agricultural land. Why is Island Farm now suitable for a Sustainable Growth Area (PLA2) - which is largely residential rather than employment? The evidence demonstrating over-riding need for such residential development in this area - which could be delivered elsewhere - is very limited. Good quality agricultural land will be lost to development without sufficient justification. There is very little detail - and potentially contradictory policy - between PLA2 and interactions with Bridgend town centre. E.g. Transport policies PLA8 and PLA9 to improve the A48 for vehicles are very likely to worsen the poor access for pedestrians and cyclists and will not result in the expressed green lung between Merthyr Mawr and Newbridge Fields. PLA2 along with the other housing proposals in this area of Bridgend will lead to an unacceptable increase in traffic volumes on the main roads and the minor road network in the area.</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1001	

LDP Rep: 1002

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	The Proposal to build housing on Salt lake car park does not fit in to a plan to attract tourism, this would be unsuitable for the area with little travel links , little parking facilities and does nothing to improve the town what so ever. My wife and I have grave concerns with this proposal and ask that it be looked at again and reviews to make sure Porthcawl benefits from something more suitable for a tourist destination.
1002	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1002	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	The key words here are benefit to the community. I feel that building housing on Salt Lake car park will not benefit the community. It will merely put pressures on infrastructure and other car parks during very busy days in Porthcawl. There is no benefit from extra housing in this area.
1002	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Salt lake car park proposal would only benefit those who reside there it will not have any other benefit to the people of Porthcawl or tourists. It will only be of benefit to BcBC coffers.
1002	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	I recognise the need for affordable housing for generations to come in Porthcawl, however the salt lake proposal is not suitable for the benefits of Porthcawl. The fear is that infrastructure, leisure facilities will not be a priority one the housing is in place. Over many years Porthcawl has been neglected in this area and has failed to listen to the concerns of the towns folk. There are many area that can be allocated for affordable housing Salt Lake should not be one of them it will detract and spoil the reasons why so many visit this beautiful town.
1002	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	The more support BCBC can give to local businesses the better. Having a good business plan for the area and develop Porthcawl asa major tourist destination will have huge economic benefits for all. Building housing to make a quick buck is not the answer a forward thinking and sustainable business plan to lead Porthcawl in to the next 10 - 20 years will require imagination and a realisation from some that Porthcawl is the jewel of the Bridgend county and must be developed accordingly.
1002	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	Again a sustainable business plan that is flexible to be able to deal with the challenges the pandemic brings. You have recognised health and leisure are key. This is what Porthcawl will need to focus on and develop to benefit the community and also attract tourism. Porthcawl must complete with other tourist destinations in Wales such as Tenby where the health and leisure infrastructure has been developed.
1002	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	Waste management is an issue in Porthcawl. On very busy days the infrastructure does not meet the demands that the holiday seasons bring. Better management in this area will require foresight and not a reactive response.
1002	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
1002	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1002	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	The Salt Lake proposal to build housing will not benefit the community of Porthcawl and will not benefit the local tourism industry. There are better things to use the land for and housing should not be one of them. The lack of travel links , infrastructure and little economic benefit to the community this proposal should be reconsidered and a new plan put in its place.
1002	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
1002	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
1002	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	Please Reconsider the proposal to build housing on Salt Lake car park.
1002	

LDP Rep: 1003

Representor Name: ████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Yes.
1003	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1003	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Yes.
1003	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1003	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Yes.
1003	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1003	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Yes.
1003	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1003	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Yes.

1003	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1003	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Yes. Why is the supermarket not located at the donkey field on Newton Nottage
1003	Perfect location. Salt Lake car park is the centre of Porthcawl - it should be a park - landscaped with trees/shrubs/flowers and picnic areas and maybe an interactive water feature. Plaques showing local info - Triassic period - mammoth footprint at Newton. Speak to Porthcawl Museum for info re Roman and viking data. Show Porthcawl is more than the fair, caravan site and empty gravel car park as its central feature.

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1003	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1003	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Yes. Where is the imagination and sensitivity that is requisite when reimagining our
1003	towns?

LDP Rep: 1004

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1004	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Good high level aspirations
1004	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1004	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	This is essential to provide great surroundings that do not damage the environment and people want to stay
1004	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Unless this is done in line with infrastructure such as sewer and water development and provision it won't happen
1004	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1004	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1004	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1004	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1004	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1004	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Must ensure the sewage network can cope with the extra housing pressure. It's already in difficulty at beech road sps.
1004	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1004	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1004	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1004	

LDP Rep: 1005

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1005	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Use the empty properties for housing and if new homes are required ensure that there are new facilities in place i.e. doctors,schools etc. Ensure that nature and woodland is protected and playing fields remain for recreation.
1005	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1005	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1005	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1005	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1005	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1005	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1005	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
--	--

ID	Protect nature don't build on it!
1005	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1005	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1005	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
1005	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	Don't merge Bryntirion and Laleston communities! Protect green space and nature!
1005	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	Don't build on Pandy Park Aberkenfig- fields that have been enjoyed for walking and football and rugby for both young and old alike! Protect our green spaces and trees and environment for birds and other inhabitants.
1005	

LDP Rep: 1006

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable): The Llynfi Woodland Group

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	By protecting and enhancing distinctive and natural places SOBJ4, SOBJ1-3 should also benefit. The plan needs to take into account the Nature Emergency declared by the Senedd on 1 July 2021 as well as the Climate emergency and prioritise protecting biodiversity.
1006	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	This would ideally be balanced with maintaining and improving the natural spaces to make the area a more attractive place to live and work and to avoid housing developments where there are obvious transport constraints.
1006	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	The proposed plans do not take account of the huge recent investment by WG/NRW in the Llynfi Valley of the Spirit of Llynfi Woodland site. From what the group can see of the plans, the area is incorporated into plans for housing/other at both the Coegnant end and at the washery site. The woodland should be shown as major Green/tourism infrastructure for protection/expansion map 32/33 Com1 (r3), com 11(9). Additionally, national cycle route 885 and the disused railway line from Maesteg to Caerau should also be prominently featured but appear to be absent.
1006	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Land at Maesteg Washery and Coegnant site has been the subject of a feasibility study SD70 which shows many contraindications to the development of these areas for development, including lack of access, mine voids, contamination, methane and floodrisk.
1006	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	The Spirit of Llynfi Woodland site was developed as part of the Llynfi 20 initiative to improve the lives of residents of the valley who have significantly higher health conditions compared to south of the M4. Any further development should enhance rather detract from this.
1006	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1006	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
---	--

ID	
1006	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	The conditions in SP13 are of paramount importance so it can be demonstrated that there will be no unacceptable impacts on the natural and historic environment or local communities (such as noise and air pollution) and that no other unacceptable cumulative impacts will arise; b) Satisfactory mitigation can be put in place to minimise the impacts of renewable and low carbon proposals and its associated infrastructure; and c) Proposals make provision for the appropriate restoration and aftercare of the land for its beneficial future re-use.
1006	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	in order for the policies to be applied, it is important that all assets, including biodiversity as well as natural/smi natural assets such as the new woodland and cycle track are identified on the plan.
1006	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	As noted previously, the plan for the Coegnant and Maesteg Washery site are home to the Spirit of Llynfi Woodland site which is not recognised in the draft LDP. It has been chosen as a pilot project for WG National Forest of Wales. Previous feasibility studies indicate it is not suitable for housing/light industrial development, The plan does not show current cycle route provision, which again is part of a national network. Improved walking and cycle routes linking areas are generally to be welcomed but insufficient details published.
1006	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1006	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
1006	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
1006	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1006	

LDP Rep: 1007

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	None
1007	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Right sort of growth to benefit Porthcawl
1007	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Porthcawl needs to continue to attract visitors but allow parking not by park and ride which will deter many peoe including young families.
1007	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Salt Lake at Porthcawl needs to be community atea to attract visitors to our beautiful town. Supermarket should be slightly out of town not prime location.
1007	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Excessive housing planned at Sandy Bay will require much infrastructure support and must not loose our sea front attractions for private use.
1007	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	A mix of permanent and seasonal jobs always required if Porthcawl to retain a holiday, visitor reputation
1007	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Large retail development is not in keeping with community of Porthcawl. Change of use of Salt Lake will force visitors to try to find other locsl parking and will negatively impact local residents.
1007	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Never forget Porthcawl is a holidays visitor destination
1007	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
--	--

ID	
1007	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1007	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	Park and Ride to Porthcawl will kill the town. Parking is essential to local residents so visitors have designated parking. People always try to park in town for convenience.
1007	We should not take that away or risk reduced visitors.

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
1007	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
1007	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	Community and visitor attractions essential for Porthcawl.
1007	

LDP Rep: 1008

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1008	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1008	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Areas of Porthcawl for example Sandy Bay are not, as far as I am aware, owned by Bridgend County Borough Council and I do not understand how planning for a large number of houses in this area is possible. Redevelopment of the Sandy Bay site is needed but NOT with 1115 houses.
1008	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	I believe that any development which sits within other well established buildings should conform to the same appearance. However, from what I have seen of some local home refurbishments along the promenade in Porthcawl this does not seem to be the case. How can we be sure that design of any new developments will be in keeping with the area.
1008	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	I do not believe that building a large number of houses in Porthcawl will be of benefit to the area. The town is struggling to cope with the number of residents at the moment. Porthcawl Medical Centre is, in my opinion, overrun with patients, the schools cannot possibly take more students especially since Porthcawl Comprehensive School already has pupils who are bussed in from Bridgend and beyond. More houses, more people, more cars does not create an active or healthy lifestyle, nor will they create a more cohesive community. What happens if the houses are built but no further action is taken to improve the transport links or create extra leisure facilities, just a grid locked town with local residents unable to get a doctors appointment or enrol their children in their local schools. Also building houses on what are currently car park facilities, where exactly are visitors to Porthcawl going to park when they come here. Please don't suggest they will come down by train or bus because they will not.
1008	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	

1008	Try lowering the rates local businesses already have to pay for their shops and rental units, maybe then they would have the financial resources to grow their business rather than close down.
------	---

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Stop agreeing to more out of town shopping centres full stop. Many people can travel to these places by car. Someone who doesn't have a car, cannot . Concentrate on the town centres and as I said previously, lower the rents business owners have to pay, maybe this would encourage businesses to remain in town centres or take up residency in the first place.
1008	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	I think we are all doing our bit for waste reduction and recycling. Renewable energy generation is a significantly important measure that we do need to address
1008	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Continuing to protect our historic and natural environments are very important, we must continue to conserve these so that we can still connect with our past. The natural environment needs to be protected and not built on.
1008	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	No comment
1008	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Leisure and tourism facilities should be improved since Porthcawl is a seaside resort which attracts many visitors in the summer months. Regeneration of the waterfront has been discussed many, many times and is still no further forward. Residential, that is new houses should not be part of the key proposals. Salt Lake Car Park is not exactly photogenic but at least it provides car parking space, take that away and there is very little car parking facilities left.
1008	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	No Comment
1008	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	No Comment
1008	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	

1008	<p>My only comments are as said before. Porthcawl, in my opinion, cannot sustain a large number of houses being built on Sandy Bay or anywhere else for that matter. Leisure facilities and complete regeneration of the waterfront is more beneficial, Cosy corner needs to be completed, not left to rot behind large metal sheeting. The harbour and Jennings buildings has been redeveloped exceptionally well and this should continue.</p>
------	--

LDP Rep: 1009

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	no
1009	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	no
1009	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	There is insufficient planning for access to services within the planned developments for the Pencoed area - for example health care services and public transport.
1009	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	no
1009	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	No planning for bolstering and ensuring new residents have access to health services in the Pencoed area development. The local GPs are already oversubscribed and have waiting lists weeks long for an appointment, without an additional 700 new homes in the area. Dentists within 20 miles of Pencoed are not taking on new NHS patients. The council needs to ensure that before any building work is started that the unpinning healthcare services are available. The local public transport system is in a state of chaos. In Pencoed, there is one bus an hour in either direction (towards Bridgend or towards Talbot Green) which is not suitable for commuting, and the local railway is (pre-Covid) incredibly packed at rush hour. The council has proposed no measures to address either of these ahead of building 700 houses - instead proposing to improve the A473, so forcing more people into private cars rather than public transport.
1009	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	There are no "strategic employment sites" in Pencoed yet the council propose to build 700 homes here. The town will become a true commuter village, taking all the money into neighbouring cities/larger towns, rather than allowing businesses to develop within the town.
1009	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
---	--

ID	no
1009	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	no
1009	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	The council is proposing to build a significant number of homes (PLA2) on/near the Island Farm Prisoner of War camp, a site of specific historic value to the county and wider Wales. This is abominable. The men and women who gave their lives in the second world war from the Bridgend County would not welcome the Council's attempt to knock down historic buildings that once held (and was the scene of a famous escape of) German Prisoners of War.
1009	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	no
1009	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	no
1009	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	no
1009	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	The proposals for the Pencoed area are not suitable - as previously mentioned, there is insufficient public transport in the area already, healthcare services (GPs and Dentists) are already oversubscribed and not able to take on more patients, and the local road network is already straining. It is noted that the Council propose to improve the A473, however this is not stated within the plan that the improvements will be made before the first houses area occupied, and given the Council's current financial status it is difficult as a resident to be optimistic that the Council would actually undertake the improvements. It also does not confirm to current green ideals that the council would force residents into private cars to commute to work given the current poor provision of public transport. The council has already breached PLA7 by allowing a stand to be built on Woodland Fields. This will have a significant impact on traffic on weekends, and previous match days have seen residents of Woodland Avenue unable to get their cars off drives due to the number of cars being parked along the street and transiting the street. PLA2 does not conform to the historic significance of
1009	

	the Island Farm Prisoner of War Camp. The council seem intent to trample all over the historic value that it has.
--	---

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1009	Page 23 of the maps available online shows the inlay of 23a on it. Unfortunately, the council has deliberately chosen to overlay 23a onto the PLA4 area, to prevent residents to understand the complete bounds of the proposed development area. For this reason alone, PLA4 should be thrown out until local residents can see a clear map of the boundaries of PLA4. I strongly believe this to be a deliberate act by the council to subvert the will of the taxpaying residents of the county.

LDP Rep: 1010

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1010	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1010	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	This is in conflict with SOBJ4. Our natural areas and historical landmarks should be protected
1010	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1010	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Our natural areas and historical landmarks should be protected
1010	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1010	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1010	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1010	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1010	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1010	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1010	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1010	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	No more new housing estates should be built. The infrastructures are not in place.
1010	Our natural areas and historical landmarks must be protected

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1010	

LDP Rep: 1011

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Too much concentration on housing in an area of Porthcawl which should focus on leisure only. The local and only surgery is already unable to cope with resident numbers currently.
1011	
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Porthcawl will continue to be isolated from Cardiff Capital region or Swansea Bay. Transport offering is dreadful, this will not attract skilled, younger households.
1011	
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Spaces such as Salt Lake and Sandy Bay, Porthcawl, require leisure facilities, not more housing
1011	
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Bridgend Council will only focus on building as many houses as possible on a given space e.g. Salt Lake plans
1011	
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Where is the Olympics 2012 legacy for Porthcawl? There is NO leisure centre or swimming pool for local residents. Increased housing supply in Porthcawl will increase health problems - only one surgery, which is unable to cope currently.
1011	
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Porthcawl is a seaside town which offers little in the way of high quality employment. Transport provision does nothing for the town currently - no train station and no buses going west to Port Talbot or Swansea.
1011	
7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	The siting of new supermarket, Aldi, is in wrong location. It should be on a site away from the more attractive coastline. It will not be regarded as attractive to visitors to Porthcawl.
1011	
8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Move all responsibility for waste management back in house. Kier should be removed.
1011	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	BCBC is paying lip service to natural and built environment policies. Their only policy is build, build, build!
1011	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1011	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	People are not going to leave their cars at Pyle P&R - they would simply drive straight to Porthcawl, where there will be a shortage of car parks after BCBC put housing on them.
1011	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
1011	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
1011	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	Each area needs local councillors who live in the area to work with residents on plans. In regeneration plans for Porthcawl, the councillor is Charles Smith from Laleston!! Porthcawl n
1011	

LDP Rep: 1012

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1012	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	I have to put an objection in about the Gypsy and traveller site proposal for bryncethin the main objections are the are proposed has been for many years been been put on the ldps for recreational purposes and nothing has ever materialized from the local authority .the local rugby has a proposal in for developing that area for much needed sports fields as they have many youth sides with also senior sides they have lost the use of the old ogmore school fields as they have been sold off for more development within the village they have also among the plans put in for a car park that can be used in the daytime's for car sharing and this would also help as would reduce the traffic flow through the already gridlocked at some points during the day yours Shaun Morgan
1012	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Yes
1012	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	No
1012	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	No
1012	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	No
1012	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	No
1012	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	No
1012	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	No
1012	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1012	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1012	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	Yes as previously stated
1012	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	No
1012	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	No all previously complete
1012	

LDP Rep: 1013

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	The current plan completely fails to take into account that there is insufficient local resources available to support this development ie lack of local school places, not enough GP'S and hospital services to support this plan and the local road network would be totally overwhelm. Also the it greatly impact on the ancient road way of Llangewydd road and have deviation impact on local wild life and plant habitat and our already decreasing green belt. I totally object to this proposal and request that this proposal is withdrawn.
1013	
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	This proposal will have the totally opposite effect of CALM turning Bridgend in to a dormitory town for Cardiff and Swansea with increased traffic for travelling to out of the area for work adding to more and more pollution
1013	
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	This proposal totally fails to achieve sustainable growth, only adding to the already poor infrastructure
1013	
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Yes this fails to your own basic concept of sustainable policies.
1013	
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Yes we need to maintain our already green belt and wildlife habitat and increase them and not build over them as stated in this plan
1013	
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Attract more industry to our already abundant brown area site not impose them on our already limited green areas.
1013	
7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Yes improve the town center
1013	
8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	

ID	n/a
1013	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	We need to protect and increase our limited and green site not build over them.
1013	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1013	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1013	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
1013	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	The current plan completely fails to take into account that there is insufficient local resources available to support this development ie lack of local school places, not enough GP'S and hospital services to support this plan and the local road network would be totally overwhelm. Also the it greatly impact on the ancient road way of Llangewydd road and have devation impavt on local wild life and plant habitat and our already decreasing green belt. I totally object to this proposal and request that this proposal is withdrawn
1013	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	I totally object to the plan as it seems to total money making scheme for the national house builder and do not reflect the any local needs.
1013	

LDP Rep: 1014

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable): ██████████

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	yes I believe that the ultimate test of the feasibility of the LDP rests with the visions and objectives , Porthcawl civic trust society is of the opinion that BCBC intends to builds up to 1,115 new homes , where these new homes are to be built is of great concern, not on salt lake as this would deter any future visitor's as there would be nowhere for these people tp park , already we have had problems with on street parking , with the existence of salt lake, if this facility disappears under a large supermarket and housing estate , these visitor's will disappear down the m4 to abaeravon or swasea therefore killing of the town with the loss of employment and shops .
1014	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	yes the the key to the growth strategy would be to realize the potential of Porthcawl as a premier seaside resort and tourist destination which capitalizes on the regeneration of the water front, and introduce extra leisure facilities to accommodate all weathers as the main tourist accommodation is currently open 10 months of the year and is a source of employment for the younger generation , we need to enhance this to meet the needs of all age groups ,
1014	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1014	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	adding extra houses and taking away the salt lake will not be helping to improve the environment or peoples health or well being , but will be adding extra burdens and stress .
1014	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	how may I ask if by taking away a perfect site for development, on the salt lake area by building a supermarket , and a residential housing estate , will be providing the scale of growth needed to secure the growth and infrastructure , facilities, and additional benefit, for the local community, the supermarket will probably employ around 100 plus if we are lucky .
1014	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	

1014	yes the purposed plan for building 1,115 new homes will not enhance the employment strategy if the tourism, industry is killed off by lack of faculties to meet the needs of the tourists and locals , indeed this will detrimental .
------	---

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	this i have already outlined
1014	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	none to date
1014	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	to promote tourism there is a need to include the infrastructure to accommodate this industry, not to encourage people to travel elsewhere, with better faculties
1014	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1014	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1014	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1014	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1014	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1014	

LDP Rep: 1015

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	1800 houses from Laleston to Eweny Roundabout will do the opposite of SOBJ4 as it will completely spoil the distinctive and natural place of Merthyr Mawr. The amount of traffic at rush hour on that stretch of the A48 is already significant and this development will result in increased pollution and standing traffic.
1015	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	No issues with the growth strategy, it is just the location of the proposed development
1015	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	There are plenty of appropriate sites throughout the borough that would benefit from this strategy - Island Farm is NOT one of these areas
1015	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1015	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1015	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1015	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1015	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1015	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	There are very few sites in BCBC that have a cultural and historical significance compared with Island Farm. The countryside around this area is home to protected species (dormice and lesser horseshoe bats) as well as birds such as lapwings and barn owls which have had their numbers dramatically reduced nationwide over the past 50 years. It is these sort of schemes that have contributed towards this and our borough will be significantly harmed as a result of this development
1015	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	no
1015	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	no
1015	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	no
1015	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	The land south of Bridgend which includes a proposed 847 houses on Island Farm plus Craig y Parcau, south of the Broadlands roundabout will be a disaster for the local area that already struggles with the amount of traffic that is generated from Broadlands. There are traffic pinch points including the roundabout itself, which at busy times is log jammed. All of those houses that are close to road will suffer from the pollution that the extra cars will undoubtedly create. The area will not be able to cope with this extra traffic. The lanes going towards Merthyr Mawr and the 'dipping bridge' are such lovely areas to walk and spend time, but they will be completely ruined by a new housing estate built. This area is one of the jewels of Bridgend and has been enjoyed by the residents of the borough for such a long time that if BCBC decide that this should now be a built up area it will leave heartache that will ensure that the current leaders in BCBC will never be forgiven. This will be your legacy, so please do the right thing and do not allow this development at Island Farm and south of the Broadlands roundabout go ahead. The damage to the people and the wildlife in this area cannot be undone if this goes ahead.
1015	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1015	

LDP Rep: 1016

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1016	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Areas of growth have been identified to connect to Cardiff and Swansea but there are no plans to improve the routes to the cities. The motorway slip roads are already at a stand still with the volume of houses that already exist as is the a48 in the mornings especially near broadlands. Improvements in roads and other transport should be made before any additional building is considered. Traffic queuing for hours every morning is adding to pollution. Covid has resulted in less people using public transport and more people will be driving. The current road infrastructure is not adequate for the housing that already exists.
1016	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Sustainable growth areas identified between Laleston and Bridgend is going to cause even more traffic and pollution. Bryntirion comprehensive school is a good size and what attracted me to the area. The plan that has been proposed concerns me that the school will become over subscribed or the local primary schools will be replaced at some by super schools which are not in the interest of children.
1016	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1016	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Building of properties all over the remaining green spaces does not create a healthy environment. One of the positives of Laleston area is the rural feel plus the historic interest. There is a real risk that this will be lost by building such a large development on the circus field. Large areas are already covered by solar panels and the remaining fields are being put forward for development. Bridgend is going to lose its rural feel if it's over developed and there appears to be no mention as to how the rural feel will be protected as that is what attracts families to the area
1016	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1016	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID

1016

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID

1016

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

1016

Building on the circus field puts the historic village of Laleston at risk of losing its charm. There will be extra traffic going through the village to get to the site. The a48 is already too busy and cannot cope with the current housing. People will start using the local lanes to bypass traffic and the historic environment is at risk

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

1016

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

1016

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID

1016

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

1016

Land west of Bridgend I think this should be revisited. Building houses in an area where the road infrastructure is already under pressure with no plan to ease this is a significant risk.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1016

LDP Rep: 1017

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1017	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1017	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1017	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1017	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1017	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1017	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1017	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1017	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1017	I fail to see how you can protect the natural environment by building over 800 new houses on an area of land rich in wildlife and history. Our roads are already shoddy, badly maintained and over congested and you propose to cram more and more houses and people into the area. Our wildlife are already on a massive decline, hit by cars and having their habitats destroyed. And building houses on a historical landmark?? Not that I'm surprised as landowners are just greedy and think of nothing but money. I think these plans are awful and definitely should not go ahead.
------	---

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1017	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1017	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1017	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1017	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1017	

LDP Rep: 1018

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	No
1018	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	No
1018	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	I oppose to the development proposed at Craig y parcu and island farm. The infrastructure is not in place to support so many houses with pressure on access to Broadlands off the A48 roundabout, Ewenny Roundabout and the stretch of road between the two. This has had a number of fatal accidents on. The welsh government grant money to improve road safety might have claw back conditions as a result? The pressure on this road at peak times would be awful. Also there would be a loss of green spaces and woodland which is an area of specific interest
1018	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	No
1018	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Comments on house building being inappropriate at island farm already been mentioned
1018	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Has the need for business units been examined since the covid 19 pandemic? Are the plans been adjusted for more businesses working from home going forward? What is the risk of too much vacant office spaces in the borough?
1018	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Does this mean the death of the town centre if less retail?
1018	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
---	--

ID	No
1018	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Totally agree with conserving the natural and historic site - Merthyr Mawr will be affected adversely by a housing development. How will these two stands of the LDP marry up?
1018	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	No
1018	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	No
1018	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	No
1018	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Strongly objective to housing at island farm
1018	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Would be interested to know what the council plans to do with its office accommodation in Bridgend town centre as a result of covid? Will it continue to have staff work from home thereby not having office workers to support businesses with the town centre? Will this effect the viability of the Bridgend heat network?
1018	

LDP Rep: 1019

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	I object on two objectives as present constructions are clearly not producing SOBJ2 so a thorough investigation why the current strategy isn't working should be looked into before any future developments and SOBJ4 is clearly not being achieved in the proposed development of Sandy Bay area
1019	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	CARM is clearly all wrong by the large empty commercial areas, surely it would be money well spent on attracting employers first which will then attract employees moving to the area
1019	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	I object to the development of the foreshore area of Porthcawl due to it not forfilling 226 of The Town & Country Planning Act 1990
1019	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	I object to there being no public infrastructure to cope with the present developments as is, let alone any future developments
1019	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	I object due to none of the above ie; Active and Healthy conditions being met on the Porthcawl developments
1019	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	Why are we developing new sites when old sites are lying empty, beggars belief
1019	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	Why isnt the Aldi site not positioned closer to town as pulling the public away from the high street has a detrimental effect, already down in Bridgend town centre
1019	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1019	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	None
1019	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	None
1019	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	It should be restricted to just leisure, tourism and public open space only as it doesn't contravene The Town & Country Planning Act 1990
1019	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	None
1019	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	None
1019	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1019	

LDP Rep: 1021

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	I cannot see how destroying natural habitats fits in with other biodiversity requirements.
1021	
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	It's speculative on who will live here and unfortunately employers may not necessarily pay a wage to make purchasing possible.
1021	
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Why are we expanding when there are already a considerable number of empty residential properties and premises within the borough..... do we know how many empty properties there actually are?
1021	
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Hmmmm..... cavity wall insulation? Marketed as the best thing since sliced bread and then we had to pay to have it removed as it was not functional.
1021	
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	No comment..... utilise what we already have sitting vacant
1021	
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Fords was a big employer who moved on..... you can't sell a property to someone who does not have purchasing power. I doubt many on minimum wage get on the property ladder.
1021	
7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Retail in Bridgend has not evolved
1021	
8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Most places are planting trees to reduce carbon omissions..... and this proposal is to reduce those trees 😞
1021	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	Best way to preserve is to not destroy it in the first place
1021	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	No
1021	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	Put the proposals in place first and measure
1021	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	No
1021	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	Unnecessary development
1021	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	Make use of the buildings we have that are currently dormant.
1021	

LDP Rep: 1022

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1022	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1022	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Infrastructure has been historically very poorly thought through when creating housing estates locally.
1022	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1022	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1022	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1022	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1022	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1022	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1022	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1022	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1022	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1022	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1022	There is insufficient infrastructure such as medical practices and roads to support such developments, particularly to the south of Bridgend. Building on such areas of natural beauty when other areas are already built on but have been abandoned, seems a waste. Areas and buildings should be regenerated and land which has ceased to be 'green field' should be used, rather than taking more 'green' sites.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1022	

LDP Rep: 1023

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	I think the damage to the local fauna flora, wildlife and natural resources in this beautiful area would be devastating. The increase in traffic, traffic noise and pollution would be very very disruptive it would spoil the local environment. The infrastructure would not be able cope with this new traffic overload and Bridgend would become a series of traffic queues with cars emitting fumes constantly
1023	
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Housing may be required but not on these beautiful fields that should be treasured for future generations
1023	
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	The plans provided don't allay my fears for the future generation of Bridgend.
1023	
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Not enough information given to local residents. The details I know from the Bcbc website information, I most definately say NO. I do not think these plans should be approved
1023	
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	You are considering building on the main fields where people excercise.....doesn't make sense
1023	
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Most of the development is planned around housing.....employment opportunities are small.... Do not agree with these plans
1023	
7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Reduce town rents and encourage more businesses to start up and grow. Reduce parking fees to encourage people to visit and spend in the area.....supporting entrepreneurs
1023	
8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Kier seems to have settled down with collections....

1023	
------	--

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Keep the natural.....stop the build
1023	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	Do we need so many new houses
1023	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Porthcawl front needs new investment. It is looking shabby and needs smart and modern development. Not like the bottle bank apartments which sadly do not enhance the area
1023	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1023	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Far too many houses.....who wants to cycle on a small area do close to the cars. It is more dangerous
1023	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Please do not let Bridgend grow so big.....it is not a city....it is a town with its residents at its heart
1023	

LDP Rep: 455

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	More congestion on the roads
455	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Over population to the are , more strain on schools , doctors and the NHS
455	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
455	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
455	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	No other than the area will be grossly over populated
455	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
455	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Building more houses does not mean that there will be more retail in the town centre, where as there will be employment while these house are built (if they get the go ahead) after they've been built the jobs finished , the town centre is a ghost town and is overpriced with rents and rates , that's why there's more empty than trading , housing won't make a difference just put more pressure on Bridgend
455	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
455	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

455

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

455

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

455

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID

455

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

455

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

455

LDP Rep: 1024

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1024	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	The growth strategy does not appear to take any account of the pandemic(and post pandemic) nor Brexit. This is a fundamental flaw in the LDP - the growth strategy seems to be based on old assumptions and solutions. Would expect BCBC to reflect on both Brexit and pandemic & what this means to the growth strategy & LDP. BCBC should postpone the current LDP & start again.
1024	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	The sustainable growth areas are a misnomer - they are primarily greenfield sites - therefore clearly not sustainable. Also in terms of proposed housing numbers there is too much placed in sustainable growth areas. Some of the areas are not even "logical expansion".
1024	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Does "good design" have any real meaning. Have the lessons of Broadlands been learnt & applied to the LDP? Will we have the same mess of badly designed new estates? How are words on the paper to be translated into reality. It may tick the boxes in a document - but???
1024	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	The assumption that housing supply will act as key driver to economic growth across Bridgend is flawed. The likelihood of some sites being commuter housing for Cardiff is very high & is not explored in the LDP. As stated earlier the housing growth assumption is probably too high as Brexit & pandemic not factored into growth strategy & LDP.
1024	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Employment sites unbalanced across BCBC - too weighted towards south west Bridgend. Sites should be developed closer to population rather than aiming for increased commuting to already congested sites & infrastructure.
1024	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	

1024	
------	--

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1024	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	The LDP is contrary to these natural & environment policies - too much emphasis on building on greenfield sites. The policies are the right approach - unfortunately LDP not aligned to this.
1024	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1024	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1024	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
1024	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	Building south of A48 not sustainable & appropriate. The LDP already identifies that the infrastructure cannot cope at present. Dualling the A48 will reinforce that these sites are not expansion of existing communities - they are new Cardiff commuter communities - with consequential environmental & carbon damage.
1024	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	Given Brexit & pandemic the LDP reads as if written 5 years ago. Is the LDP relevant & appropriate? It reads as a a housing led plan - this will not necessarily benefit the county. Have the lessons of Broadlands & Bracla expansion been learnt? The economic, industrial, training & employment strategy should drive the LDP - not housing.
1024	

LDP Rep: 1025

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable): N/A

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	No
1025	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	No
1025	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Improvements to the infrastructure are essential as there are existing concerns in relation to transport networks, health, education and social facilities that will likely be exacerbated by additional housing developments.
1025	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	No
1025	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	The increase in housing supply needs to be carefully considered as the potential improvements in terms of wider economic growth and local infrastructure are rarely realised. Healthcare facilities have been under significant pressure for years and transport links are also poor. More housing does not necessarily create cohesive communities. There needs to be greater focus on reasons to bring people together, create a common sense of purpose and re-inject a sense of community pride. If this doesn't happen, Bridgend will lose it's identity and simply end up a more affordable commuter belt for Cardiff and Swansea.
1025	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Where is the evidence for spacial alignment between housing and local employment growth? I'd be interested to know what proportion of the residents of Brackla, Broadlands or the Court housing estates actually work in Bridgend County Borough. Anecdotal evidence suggests, not very many.
1025	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	I agree that town centres need to incorporate a wider range of uses than just retail. However, unless the council reconsiders parking in the town centres the long term viability will be severely compromised. With McArthur Glen designer outlet and
1025	

	numerous out of town shopping centres, people will opt for convenience and free parking.
--	--

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	No
1025	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment is an essential part of valuing the heritage of Bridgend. I would like to see commitment from the council to protect the locally distinctive, valued and important buildings and features of the site of the former POW camp at Island farm. The demolition of all but one of the buildings was a lost opportunity to provide valuable cultural experiences and enhance tourism. To further denigrate this area with new housing would create an imbalance between the built environment and the natural environment that so desperately needs to be protected.
1025	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	No
1025	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	No
1025	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	There are far more opportunities for tourism in the Ogmore and Garw valleys, especially in terms of leisure and outdoor pursuits.
1025	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	More consideration needs to be given to locations for new housing. There needs to be a balance between the need for affordable housing, sufficient green spaces and protecting key sites of historical and cultural interest that form a unique part of our heritage and local identity.
1025	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	The Deposit Replacement LDP does not provide sufficient detail about how it will achieve what are in essence, long term aspirations. Within the local community there is an enduring sense that the council are out of step with the views of the residents. I work in the public sector and regularly participate in a range of consultation processes, but even I found this survey a challenge. I find it very worrying that fundamental decisions are being made about the future of our county, with such limited, accessible engagement.
1025	

LDP Rep: 1026

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	No
1026	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1026	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1026	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	No thought is given to the road congestion that will occur
1026	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	The plan I'd destroying the concept of village life. It links small villages like Laleston to become greater Bridgend town. No thought is given to the road congestion that will occur And subsequent pollution
1026	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1026	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1026	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1026	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	
1026	

ID	The plan I'd destroying the concept of village life. It links small villages like Laleston to become greater Bridgend town. No thought is given to the road congestion that will occur And subsequent pollution
1026	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1026	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1026	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1026	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	The plan I'd destroying the concept of village life. It links small villages like Laleston to become greater Bridgend town. No thought is given to the road congestion that will occur And subsequent pollution
1026	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1026	

LDP Rep: 1027

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1027	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1027	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1027	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1027	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1027	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1027	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1027	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1027	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1027	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1027	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1027	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1027	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Yes the plans got housing And development at the bottom of broadlands and the top of broadlands towards lalestin will both have a huge effect on the current infrastructure, the roads are already blocked with traffic and the schools unable to take pupils the area is not able to cope with the planned proposals it will have a detrimental impact on the climate and increase pollution in the area
1027	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1027	

LDP Rep: 1028

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1028	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1028	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1028	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1028	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1028	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1028	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1028	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1028	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1028	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1028	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1028	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1028	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1028	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	I disagree with the current proposal to use the land for housing. As a local resident I consider this area already very busy with traffic congestion, let alone how surgeries and other local facilities will cope with increased housing.
1028	

LDP Rep: 1029

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1029	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	No more houses needed
1029	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1029	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1029	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Bridgend does not need anymore houses
1029	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1029	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1029	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1029	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Just stop building houses

1029	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1029	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1029	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1029	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1029	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1029	

LDP Rep: 1030

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
1030	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	The Cardiff Capitol Region plan is a wastes of resources. Much better to fund more local communittees
1030	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
1030	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
1030	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	We don't need any more new builds, it's always at the cost of green spaces. What we do have is a pricing crises on existing property.
1030	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
1030	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	As long as McArthur Glen exists Bridgend town cannot improve. How many visitors to MG think to visit the town centre? Not many.
1030	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1030	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
-----------	--

1030	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1030	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1030	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1030	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1030	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1030	

LDP Rep: 1031

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1031	<p>Draft Local Development plan Proposed site: SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I/We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds; Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area.</p>

Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 - The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedance on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk.

Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmore Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmore) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation. YOU ARE DEVELOPING AROUND AN AREA THAT IS ALREADY OVER DEVELOPED OBJECTIONS. THERE IS NO RATIONALE FOR THIS. PLEASE PURSUE LAND THAT IS ALREADY DISUSED - INDUSTRIAL ESTATES etc. Elizabeth Johnson

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	Not good enough reason, Bridgend is a commuter town.
1031	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	Not sure how Bridgend developmental plans will benefit in context of the valleys, they also need their own infrastructure of better roads/walks and tourist spots for access to Rhondda tunnel and zip development
1031	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	No - other than. No plans on your part for adequate road infrastructure and protection of wildlife
1031	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
1031	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	I don't think this is realistic
1031	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	No evidence to back the housing plan with town development
1031	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	More housing more waste !!!!!
1031	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	No development- enough has been done
1031	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1031	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1031	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1031	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1031	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	NO DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSING- tourism activities Yes!!!!
1031	

LDP Rep: 1032

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	No consideration has been made for the infrastructure to support this new development. School places are oversubscribed, doctors appointments are hard to get and the volumes of traffic that this development will generate will gridlock an already struggling road network in the area
1032	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Yes, whilst the houses will be economically active, it's most likely that these jobs will not be in the local area and will be commutators to Cardiff/Swansea
1032	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1032	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1032	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1032	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1032	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1032	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1032	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

1032

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

1032

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

1032

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID

1032

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

1032

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1032

LDP Rep: 1033

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID 1033	SOBJ2: it would be nice to see the word inclusive somewhere, for wheelchair, pram users, dog walkers, cyclists, runners, inclusive playgrounds with accessible equipment for people with additional needs etc.
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID 1033	Can some thought be given to the placement of social housing on executive sites i.e. Parc Derwen, whilst the sites are attractive and nice to live on, the council banding is too high as a result, no consideration seems to have been given to this
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID 1033	There seems to be a lot of expenditure on Welsh Language Schools, whilst Heronsbridge is bursting at the seams, with children having to wait until they are 5 years old to get a place, that is hardly early intervention, and designating a few classrooms in existing schools as 'units' is not acceptable or sufficient
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID 1033	We need more accessible public toilets, how is smart technology going to be incorporated, and hog weed is out of control in many green spaces
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID 1033	Consider the council tax implication of siting affordable housing on executive developments
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID 1033	The key has to be delivering the metro, transport links from rural areas to employment areas remain very poor and unreliable, also the availability of electric vehicle charging ports is sparse
7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID 1033	The retail hierarchy hasn't worked for some years so why protect it, town councils and dominant voices within communities need to be challenged in their prohibitive decisions regarding businesses that can and can't open particularly in Maesteg Town, Aberkenfig, and Porthcawl Town

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	We live in an energy efficient home, run by a Tesla battery, we have solar panels and a heat exchange ventilation system. What are the Council doing to support developers to build more homes like ours.
1033	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID
1033

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	Improved transport links are vital in this area such as a transport hub, also increased scrutiny, test and challenge of Town Council decisions
1033	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID
1033

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID
1033

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID
1033

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID
1033

LDP Rep: 1034

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	There seems to be no key issue related to traffic levels / traffic flow, ECO friendly zones for traffic or means of travel without car.
1034	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Sounds good, except that this means in reality that Bridgend becomes a satellite Cardiff and all real skilled people will find employment there first.
1034	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1034	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1034	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	It all sounds lovely. I do question whether the same thinking process was used when Broadlands was created? No additional leisure facilities were made, apart from McArthur Glen. So its bound to create untrust when you see settlements just as large as broadlands being developed and no changes. It has to be visible that houses are only as important as the infrastructure
1034	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	retaining economically active households is easy when the commute to Cardiff is so easy. That doesnt mean that people actually work in Bridgend.
1034	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1034	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1034	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

1034

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

1034

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

1034

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID

1034

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

1034

The extra houses drives fear into my heart. The levels of traffic at certain times of the day is unbearable now. I cannot visualise how much these developments will affect traffic. I have to pick the times of day to go out now so as to avoid that traffic. The small roads are now being used to bypass the traffic jams, they were never made for that. The car parks at the coast are over run. The retail centres are packed and access is challenging (getting into my own street is actually dangerous) . Getting off Broadlands at rush hour is a farce. I would put more houses as the very last thing to do and get the infrastructure in first to show how its going to be in the future.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1034

No more comments - please read the local comments I have already typed in

LDP Rep: 1035

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	No
1035	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	I do object to the new housing developments at Craig y Parcau and Island Farm
1035	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Regeneration is important especially for what was once a great market town (Bridgend)
1035	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Make better use of the empty buildings in Bridgend before considering building new houses
1035	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	The development of the new flats near The Rhiw is a good example of integrating low-cost housing, more of this could be achieved by making use of brown-field sites rather than building new properties on greenfield-sites
1035	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	No
1035	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	It's important to try to regenerate teh town centres rather than have new developments.
1035	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	No
1035	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
--	--

ID	Already made
1035	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	No
1035	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	Great to see developments for these areas.
1035	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	Like the idea of the co-operative approach to self-build
1035	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	No further development needed to the south of Bridgend, make better use of empty buildings in the town centre
1035	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	No
1035	

LDP Rep: 1036

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	Will create more stress on the already stressed traffic system, frequent queueing as it is
1036	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	This is a good idea however the traffic system and shops cannot handle the volume of traffic and people as it is at the moment so how is it supposed to cope when you double the people living in the area
1036	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	The area is stressed enough. Doubling the amount of people would change the homely feel of the area into a loud city setting
1036	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
1036	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
1036	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
1036	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	The town centre needs updating and re-thinking. It cannot handle the volume of people and traffic in the area at present so needs developing greatly to accommodate the current population before increasing it
1036	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1036	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	Adding developments of housing will take the town feel out of the area and it will become more of a city. Emissions will increase as people will be sitting in traffic for longer. Shops and schools will not be able to handle the new addition. Rural countryside areas will become overrun with new shopping centres, roads, infrastructure.
1036	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1036	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1036	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
1036	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	Local highway network is overly stressed as it is with the current volume of traffic. Often queuing up to 20 mins just to travel to Tesco's 5 mins down the road. Traffic systems should be updated to handle the current volume of traffic before consideration can be taken to add more housing
1036	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1036	

LDP Rep: 1037

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1037	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable</p>

	<p>sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.</p>
--	---

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	See first box
1037	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	See first box
1037	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	See first box
1037	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	See first box
1037	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	See first box
1037	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	See first box comments
1037	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	See first box comments
1037	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	See first box comments
1037	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its
1037	

	<p>residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.</p>
--	---

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1037	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1037	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1037	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1037	

LDP Rep: 1039

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1039	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1039	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1039	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1039	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1039	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1039	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1039	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1039	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1039	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1039	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1039	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1039	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1039	<p>I'm very concerned about the lack of infrastructure support with regard to the developments proposed in Bridgend near the Island Farm site. As a Broadlands resident who commutes past this area to Bridgend Industrial Estate, the traffic links throughout the journey are currently extremely bad during peak travel times and I'm deeply concerned about the addition of further traffic (from the new housing and construction traffic) causing significant further degradation in this area. This ultimately resulting in a loss of value for my house and the area in general. The Bridgend area is being used as "overflow" for Swansea and Cardiff to the detriment of the residents living here. Adding a train link or other public transport from the new area will help to remedy this but not enough in my opinion.</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1039	

LDP Rep: 866

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	Too many new housing developments being proposed.
866	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	No
866	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	No
866	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	No
866	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	I don't see the need for the planned increase in housing supply to meet local needs. Building new houses is attracting buyers from outside the local area. Building some new houses on brownfield sites is acceptable but I see no need to build on greenfield sites.
866	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	No
866	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	I see no need for more out-of-centre retail developments. Money should be allocated to improve existing town centres. Housing should be directed towards town centres to replace unviable shops.
866	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	No
866	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	No
866	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	No
866	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	No
866	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	No
866	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	Too much housing has been allowed for. I don't see the demand locally for the increase in housing proposed. Housing should not be built on greenfield sites.
866	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	No
866	

LDP Rep: 1041

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	None
1041	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	None
1041	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
1041	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
1041	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	This is a key priority for government at all levels. As a member of the local community with a young family having space and facilities to allow children and families to stay active and promote good health is vital as we see the longer term impact of the pandemic. Whilst i understand the need for Gypsy traveller provision I am concerned that the site highlighted for this in Bryncethin is one that has been previously given permission for extension of much needed leisure facilities on the area. This would take away the only remaining space to develop facilities and give the young people of Bryncethin space for sports.
1041	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
1041	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
1041	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1041	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	
1041	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1041	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1041	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1041	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1041	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	As stated earlier I am concerned about the loss of land for leisure facilities should the bryncethin site be allocated for Gypsy traveller accomodation. I also believe proposals for a bigger development on this site have been rejected on the basis of unsafe and inadequate vehicle access. I therefore have safety concerns about the use of the site for travellers given these access issues.
1041	

LDP Rep: 1042

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	these are worthy objectives.
1042	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	growth in housing must be preceded by growth in effective infrastructure. We have already outgrown the existing infrastructure capacity. Make investments there FIRST before building more homes that the current infrastructure level is not able to support!
1042	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	all fine as long as infrastructure expansion COMES FIRST. We can't support the homes we have now, we need more schools, surgeries, etc, to cope with the expansion already done before now!!!
1042	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	again, sounds great as long as the infrastructure improvements are not left until later. They MUST COME FIRST.
1042	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	STOP BUILDING MORE HOUSES until after investing in infrastructure!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
1042	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	invest in the jobs and infrastructure BEFORE you build any more houses!!
1042	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	give people more local access to services through improved infrastructure so they travel less and keep their spending within the borough!!
1042	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	local infrastructure investments in sustainability will bring more local jobs and help keep funds invested in the borough within the borough, while also improving quality of life
1042	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	preserve the existing environment by radially reducing housing investments until you make significant sustainability and infrastructure improvements!!!
1042	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	infrastructure improvement is a must BEFORE YOU BUILD ANY MORE HOUSES
1042	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	infrastructure improvement is a must BEFORE YOU BUILD ANY MORE HOUSES
1042	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	infrastructure improvement is a must BEFORE YOU BUILD ANY MORE HOUSES
1042	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	infrastructure improvement is a must BEFORE YOU BUILD ANY MORE HOUSES
1042	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	sustainability investment and infrastructure improvement is a must BEFORE YOU BUILD ANY MORE HOUSES
1042	

LDP Rep: 1043

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1043	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1043	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1043	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1043	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1043	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1043	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1043	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1043	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1043	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1043	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Cycle path between Bridgend and Porthcawl is greatly needed.
1043	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1043	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	The idea of over 1800 houses from Laleston to Ewenny roundabout is shocking! The infrastructure would never cope with already long traffic queues at busy times of the day. It can already be a nightmare getting out of Broadlands!! Safety of pedestrians along this busy A48 is already of great concern.
1043	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1043	

LDP Rep: 1044

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable): N/A

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	Yes - I do not agree that the LDP for Porthcawl will improve the environmental quality or the quality of life for Porthcawl residents.
1044	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	Porthcawl is a SEASIDE RESORT and should be established and improved with younger generations in mind! All of the facilities that younger residents desire are not provided for and there is no mention of any amenities being provided!
1044	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	Necessary infrastructure for Porthcawl should not be solely by providing accommodation, this will be a detrimental factor for residents and there are little or no guidelines as to what leisure facilities will be included
1044	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	Good design is fundamental when creating places where people want to live, residents should also be accommodated for, our youngsters have no leisure facilities, our teenagers have no amenities, these should be factored into the redevelopment of Porthcawl!
1044	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	Building approx 1,200 houses and apartments on Salt Lake Car Park and more on Sandy Bay is extremely undesirable and is not benefitting anybody's Health. Residents will be fighting to enter Porthcawl and parking will be impossible, the past week has seen thousands of extra cars coming into Porthcawl how is this going to be managed when Salt Lake Car Park is no longer available, they will park outside mine and everybody else's houses, blocking driveways and will cause major traffic jams, which again will be totally unacceptable for Porthcawl Residents.
1044	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	I believe creating employment and providing houses is necessary just not on frontline of our beautiful coastline! Please make Porthcawl more of a tourist resort which will still encourage employment, build a supermarket opposite Newton Nottage Road, there are so many fields there which will not cause congestion to our beaches and town centre!
1044	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	I believe a supermarket is necessary but please point out which other seaside resort has one placed on prime land on the Seafront? Why cannot it not be placed in the fields opposite Newton Nottage Road and beyond, there are so many other areas that could be considered!
1044	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	Porthcawl has gone out of its way for many years to improve waste management and renewable energy, we have three windmills place in full view. Many residents including myself go out clearing beaches voluntarily, after tourists leave, because we love the place where we live and are proud of it being kept clean!
1044	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	The diversity of landscape - promote the county as a tourist location - please do not build a supermarket and accommodation in a place of such beauty, use the area to promote a healthier lifestyle and facilitate leisure facilities and enhance our wonderful coastline!
1044	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	Porthcawl does not need accommodation and supermarkets built on the seafront, look around and you will see there are so many other areas that could be built up to provide the necessary infrastructure you have outlined!
1044	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	Providing a transport hub at Pyle will not accommodate the thousands of cars and tourists that travel to Porthcawl on a regular basis, by taking away Salt Lake Car Park you will cause severe congestion to the area and to the detriment of Porthcawl residents. There are so many other areas that could be built up, why take away from our natural and beautiful heritage!
1044	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	N/A
1044	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	N/A
1044	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	Please be sympathetic to our Sea Front. Please provide amenities that will benefit residents and visitors alike, there are many fields that can be developed on the outskirts of Porthcawl, accommodation should be built in other areas as this would not have such a detrimental effect on Porthcawl as building on Salt Lake Car Park. Please be considerate to our younger residents who have no leisure facilities that they
1044	

	<p>can use, 2 splash pools have been filled in, why can these not be replaced? Along with a marine centre and crazy golf facilities along our seafront. There are no amenities for teenagers and certainly none for those a little older, every night club has been discarded. PLEASE BRING PORTHCAWL INTO THE 21st CENTURY AND MAKE IT A SEASIDE RESORT TO BE PROUD OF AND TOURISTS WISH TO COME TO!!</p>
--	--

LDP Rep: 1045

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	There is far too much housing in this plan.
1045	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
1045	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	The bias seems to be towards more housing with only a small allowance for leisure and commercial development.
1045	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	As usual it will probably be cram in as many housing units as you can within regulations.
1045	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
1045	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
1045	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	All we seem to get are charity shops, coffee shops and tattoo parlours with one or two speciality shops. There is not very much too discourage out of town shopping which can be very difficult if not impossible for those without personal transport.
1045	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1045	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	It looks as if you want to develop a lot of wide open, green spaces. Hardly conservation minded.
1045	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1045	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	Mixed use at Porthcawl Waterfront, most of which will be housing, what a farce.
1045	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
1045	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
1045	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1045	

LDP Rep: 1047

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1047	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1047	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Schools surgeries hospitals will be unable to cope
1047	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Structure layout not appropriate to conditions
1047	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Schools hospitals roads will be unable to cope ...pollution will increase
1047	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	What about movement of goods when road system unable to cope with increase on already crowded highways
1047	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Retail centres destroy town centre Bridgend is dying
1047	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Tremendous strain on existing facilities
1047	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Will destroy natural environments and ecological system

1047	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	No
1047	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	No
1047	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	No
1047	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	No
1047	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	The environment is being ruined for future generations....habitats for wildlife and plants destroyed
1047	

LDP Rep: 1048

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
1048	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	Growth seems to be overly driven by short term metrics, particularly housing growth, and not in economic growth from leisure and tourism. This is particularly significant in Porthcawl, where housing and retail are taking priority over leisure and tourism on sites that could transform the town into a real destination that'd boost the entire region
1048	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	Again, growth is being focused on the wrong areas and in the wrong form. Larger scale individual projects on essential land for leisure and tourism, such as Salt Lake and Sandy Bay in Porthcawl or Island Farm in Bridgend, fish long term failure of the LDP in favour of short term wins around housing growth
1048	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	Placemaking is great, when being applied in the right locations. No design concept will work for a large retail outlet on prime tourism land, for example
1048	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	This is again really great, but only in the right places, and only when coupled with viable development. Any housing, affordable or otherwise, in the wrong location, is damaging. However BCBC needs to make a significant statement in ensuring allocation of genuinely affordable housing goes above and beyond the minimum expected of developers
1048	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	Leisure and tourism could potentially be one of the largest employers in Bridgend, particularly in Porthcawl, but the Council needs to rethink its approach to L&T in the LDP, particularly looking at Sandy Bay and Salt Lake. Make a statement that L&T, not housing or retail, will drive Porthcawls economy forward, and commit to using these essential waterfront plots for tourism, not housing or retail. They will be lost forever otherwise
1048	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
-----------	--

1048	Salt Lake is a prime example where the LDP is being badly applied. Whilst retail is important, it's the wrong location for Porthcawl, for Porthcawls economy, and for the retail already established in the town. Retail shouldn't be a LDP tick box for communities at their detriment
------	---

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Sustainable development is essential, pleased to see this in the LDP, but the Council could go further
1048	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	
1048	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1048	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	The Porthcawl Waterfront plan is a disaster. The mix use overly favours housing and retail at the detriment of the other uses. Of all the plans within the LDP, this one needs to go back to the drawing board or risk derailing Porthcawls growth in the future. Both Sandy Bay and Salt Lake should be reserved for leisure and tourism only, to enhance the offer of Porthcawl and position it as the seaside destination for South Wales. There are a number of potential options for both sites, including restoring Porthcawl's historic miniature railway on Salt Lake, that could drive firmware the economic growth of the town with cascading impact across the county borough. I urge BCBC to plshelve Porthcawl Waterfront and come back to the table with the community to make something that'll revolutionise the town
1048	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1048	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	The interconnectivity of Bridgend communities, particularly Brackla - Coychurch, is holding back green travel. Equally the development of Island Farm is a real risk to the future growth of leisure and tourism in Bridgend town
1048	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Re-consider individual sites, particularly Island Farm and Porthcawl Waterfront, and work with communities on a longer term strategy for growth that plays to the advantages of these sites
1048	

LDP Rep: 1050

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	No
1050	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	No
1050	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1050	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1050	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1050	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1050	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1050	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1050	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1050	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1050	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1050	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1050	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1050	<p>The proposed developments at Island Farm, Craig y Parcau and between Cefn Glas and Laleston will have a detrimental effects for a number of reasons: Traffic: the volume of traffic will increase significantly especially on the A48. It is likely that New InnRoad and the Dipping Bridge will become more dangerous than they already are. Crossing the A48 is already a lottery for walkers e.g. crossing from Gipsy Lane towards Merthyr Mawr. Nature: the SINC will be adversely affected by the proposed spine road. Merthyr Mawr: the rural nature of this area will be adversely affected by 847 houses at Island Farm Services: there do not cooer to be any proposals regarding infrastructure such as doctors, hospital and schools which are already under severe pressure. Safe routes: Has the Council included sustainable transport in the proposals by consulting with Sustrans for example?</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1050	<p>As the overall population of Wales remains fairly static, why are so many new houses needed. Building is still continuing at Parc Derwen parts of which still resemble a building site years after some residents have moved in.</p>

LDP Rep: 1052

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	I believe the proposal to site 847 houses on Island Farm is in clear contravention of SOBJ4, to protect and enhance distinctive and natural places. At present, there is a clear distinction between the lands north of the A48, with mainly urban development, and those south of the A48, with farmland, dunes and the historically significant Merthyr Mawr village. This plan will have a serious adverse effect on the countryside between the A48 and the coast. It will result in massively increased traffic on quiet country roads, reduced wildlife and biodiversity, and destroy the unique nature of Merthyr Mawr village. The jewel in the crown of Bridgend County will become and traffic bottleneck. Traffic jams will increase both on the A48 and the road between Ewenny Roundabout and Ogmere. The Council needs to understand that there are not enough facilities in the town for the current population. Schools, doctors surgeries and the hospital are all overcrowded and struggling to cope. This plan will provide short term gain, in the sale of the land, for long term pain, with further pressure on amenities. The Council needs to focus on improving the amenities for the existing residents, not simply increasing the number of residents.
1052	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	The Council needs to understand that there are not enough facilities in the town for the current population. Schools, doctors surgeries and the hospital are all overcrowded and struggling to cope. This plan will provide short term gain, in the sale of the land, for long term pain, with further pressure on amenities. The Council needs to focus on improving the amenities for the existing residents, not simply increasing the number of residents.
1052	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	No
1052	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	No
1052	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	No
1052	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
---	--

ID	No
1052	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	No
1052	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	No
1052	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	No
1052	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1052	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1052	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
1052	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
1052	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1052	

LDP Rep: 1053

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1053	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that</p>

creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough. Furthermore, much argument has been given to the ecological considerations around the south of the fields and the SINC area. The north east fields of Island Farm have an abundance of wildlife too. We have a thriving hedgehog population that enjoy feeding and hibernation stations in the gardens adjacent to the field. We have seen Hedgehogs this week using the fields to hunt for food. By the number of raptors seen in the field there is clearly a good small mammal population. The variety of bird species that can be seen is extensive, I have recorded Lapwings, Redwings and yellow wagtails that are all classified in the UK as Red under the Birds of Conservation Concern 4: the Red List for Birds (2015). Priority Species under the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework. We have also had a resident Polecat that was living in the area for over for four months, I contacted the Wildlife trust to confirm that it was a polecat and I have evidence of it frequenting our garden. The Polecat is a protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981. Priority Species under the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework. The bats from hut no9 in the area of PLA2 named Bridgend SINC, need an area of up to 2.6km to feed, they are regular visitors to our garden which is situated in the North of Island Farm Road. If the PLA2 land was to become residential then noise and light pollution may significantly affect their feeding grounds. I do not understand how SOBJ4 can adequately be met in the LDP if this area was to become a residential site. The impact on the ecological system as a result of placing so many houses close to a SINC will be disastrous.

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
1053	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
1053	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
1053	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
1053	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
1053	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
1053	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1053	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
1053	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1053	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1053	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
1053	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	Please see my first comments
1053	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1053	

LDP Rep: 1054

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Whilst supporting regeneration of Porthcawl, especially the Eastern Promenade, Sandy Bay & Rych Point Sea defences and the improvements to the historic breakwater I am very concerned about the nature of proposed development on the area known as salt lake car park and the wholesale unknown development of said open space, leisure area.
1054	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	I support the initial proposals for the development and improvement of the fair ground site. The extension and improvement of Griffin Park, the extension to Newton School and the rejuvenation of Hillsborough Place car park I do not see why an area of open space on the salt lake an area of potential consummate beauty and multi leisure use to residents and visitors needs to be filled in with highrise housing, hotels, hard core parking and retail areas that will distract from business already ailing on the high Street. There are other spaces in Porthcawl where destination park and single purchase venues could be placed.
1054	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	The improvements to the sea defences and open areas are necessary and laudable the improvements to Hillsborough Place car park are long, long over due but to build anything but open leisure facilities on the salt lake is ridiculous if not criminal. This area should be developed as a low impact wet weather multifunctional leisure area for swimming (when the tide is out) travelling stadium site for circuses fairs markets and interactive sports area for the enhancement of the visitor experience.
1054	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	We need to see design and restrictions for the proposed development before this is sold off and timescales with penalties need to be factored in along with sustainable proposals.
1054	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Surely with the proposed increase in housing Pirthcawl can finally receive its swimming pool.
1054	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Apart from building I see no increase in employment apart from the jobs created at a badly sited supermarket that will be filled with jobs lost on the high Street.
1054	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID 1054	The proposed development of the salt lake will only detract from the footfall on the high Street as the removal of the general practice to Newton away from town has already proved.

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID 1054	This is essential. Bridgend has a magnificent record for recycling both domestic and at the recycling features. This has to be improved and extended and the improvement in public facilities and road clearing has to be built upon and improved in a seasonal town that has to be seen to have pride in its appearance and sustainability.

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID 1054	Building housing and retail on an open leisure site right on the sea front is ludicrous.

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID 1054	No

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID 1054	See above. Do not build on the salt lake site anything other than leisure.

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID 1054	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID 1054	See above

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID 1054	This is a crucial life changing opportunity to enhance and promote Bridgend Borough. Consultation within local areas and strict regulation on timescales and sustainability is paramount.

LDP Rep: 1055

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable): Nottage

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	I object to the proposal to build 847 houses on the Island Farm site and also 110 houses South of the Broadlands roundabout. This development would ruin significant nature habitat and put at further risk wildlife (protected species- dormice, horseshoe bats) as well as cause the felling of mature trees. This will harm the local SNIC area, and deplete the beautiful natural environment of this area as well as adding to the pollution of the area with cars etc. It will also put further strain on the infrastructure of the area- roads, schools etc. New Inn Road and the Dipping Bridge is already a dangerous rat run for cars avoiding the traffic queues on the A48. This area to Merthyr Mawr is a well known beauty spot that attracts walkers and cyclists to the area. Please think again. There are other areas such as the already used and no longer used area of the Ford plant. Why not spend money on making Bridgend town centre a more attractive place for local people and visitors?
1055	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Where exactly are these skilled people going to work? where are the employers????
1055	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1055	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	see previous comments.
1055	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Large developments of houses will put pressure on the green areas where people take exercise. there is already litter problems in the local area. There are is no local expansion in employers, most will just commute from Bridgend to Cardiff and beyond and spend their money elsewhere and not in the town which needs major regeneration.
1055	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	see previous comments.
1055	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	there should be no more out of town retail development. Bridgend town could be a beautiful place to live and work if it could attract different types of independant shops. No more Mcdonalds, KFC, Burgerking that just produce masses of litter that ends up all over the countryside.
1055	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1055	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	see previous. Large scale development puts the rich historic landscape at risk.
1055	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1055	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	see previous. more independant shops for Porthcawl not chains.
1055	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
1055	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	see previous
1055	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1055	

LDP Rep: 1056

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	I particularly refer to SOBJ4 and the plans to build 1150 houses on the land at Sandy Bay, Porthcawl PLA3(8). Since the demise of the caravan park many years ago nature has reclaimed this land and it is now a haven for wildlife, with flora and fauna which have not been seen for some time. This open piece of land is vital to the health and wellbeing of residents and visitors alike and if development takes place it should not be used for housing, but should enhance the natural beauty that already exists in this area. This particular piece of land is a walk through for visitors to the Parkdean holiday park. Housing will not attract visitors to Porthcawl and I believe they will go elsewhere. With reference to development at Pwll y Waun, Porthcawl - PLA3(9) your plans refer to creating public open space. With plans to build 40 dwellings on this area you are already building on the existing open space, so how can you create more? You have no vision at all. None of your proposed plans benefit the wellbeing of future generations.
1056	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	With large concerns such as Fords leaving the area the skilled, economically active households will not be attracted to the county borough due to the inflated house prices.
1056	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	I refer to PLA3(8) the Porthcawl Waterfront regeneration. People visit Porthcawl for it's natural beauty and open space. The building of houses on the waterfront will NOT attract visitors, they will go to other resorts. Parking is already an issue in Porthcawl, especially on fine weekends and bank holidays. When people visit the beach with the equipment and leisure items they need for the day they need to be able to park their vehicles relatively close to the beach. Park and ride is NOT the answer! Visitors will NOT come here if they have to use park and ride. This has not been thought through.
1056	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Good design is NOT erecting as many houses as you can fit into an area. Open spaces must be retained and enhanced. Ancient trees must be left in place and incorporated into the design to encourage wildlife to remain and flourish.
1056	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	The proposed plans to build housing in the borough do not seem to include adequate open spaces, leisure facilities, educational facilities or health facilities
1056	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID

1056

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID

1056

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID

1056

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

1056

Building houses on a waterfront location will most definitely NOT conserve or enhance the seascape at Porthcawl

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

1056

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

1056

Less housing and retain more public open space if Porthcawl is to remain a desirable tourist destination. Park and ride will NOT work for the thousands of visitors to Porthcawl who bring beach equipment, etc.

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID

1056

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

1056

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1056

It needs a total rethink. Not fit for purpose.

LDP Rep: 1057

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	No
1057	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1057	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1057	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1057	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	I believe there are too many units to be sited at Sandy Bay, PORTHCAWL and Coney Beach. I am also concerned that housing will be sited right up to the seafront of that area, which in my opinion should be designated for other social uses. The esplanade should be extended from the harbour to Rhych point with the front-line buildings consisting of leisure / social use as seen at Aberavon seafront (gym, play park, splash park, coffee shop, cinema or other). I don't object to houses per se on the site, but object to the quantity and also that front-line land should be designated for social/community use.
1057	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1057	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1057	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	

ID	
1057	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
1057	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1057	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	I believe there are too many units to be sited at Sandy Bay, PORTHCAWL and Coney Beach. I am also concerned that housing will be sited right up to the seafront of that area, which in my opinion should be designated for other social uses. The esplanade should be extended from the harbour to Rhych point with the front-line buildings consisting of leisure / social use as seen at Aberavon seafront (gym, play park, splash park, coffee shop, cinema or other). I don't object to houses per se on the site, but object to the quantity and also that front-line land should be designated for social/community use.
1057	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
1057	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
1057	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1057	

LDP Rep: 1058

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Lack of consultation
1058	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	1100 houses in one area does not benefit Porthcawl and believe this is being pushed through to provide BCBC with no thought of the impact this number of houses/flats on the town and surrounding protected areas
1058	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Again there is no benefit on the people of Porthcawl on this development just lining BCBC pockets on extra council tax. We pay more than people in Windsor.
1058	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Young people of Porthcawl are Being priced out of the town.
1058	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	This development will not benefit Porthcawl town. There is no recreation facilities that the people of Porthcawl will benefit from.
1058	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Again this is beneficial to BCBC to gain more money from council tax.
1058	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	If this development goes ahead it will be interesting what shops will be available as the town centre has lost so many businesses recently
1058	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	I find this a joke as you are willing to put 1100 houses, shops and other facilities but not taken the impact on the extra track. The bus service in the town would need to be expanded causing extra pollution. Again will be interesting to see if this is a viable argument for this development to go ahead.
1058	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	You will be building right by the coast. I would not contemplate buying a house/flat without the confirmation of protection from erosion from the sea.
1058	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID
1058

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID
1058

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID
1058

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID
1058

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	Consultation with the Porthcawl people would be beneficial. We have been fighting for some sort of swimming pool/ recreational facilities before my sister was born in 1965. If affordable housing is available for the young people of Porthcawl would be beneficial.
1058	

LDP Rep: 1059

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	SOBJ4 - The proposed development of the land in bridgend i.e proposed private developer housing site of 850 houses west of Bridgend town, locally known as the "Circus Field" and the proposed development of the land near island farm will damage and not protect distinctive and natural places.
1059	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1059	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Sustainable growth areas - The areas proposed for expansion of housing in Bridgend are not under utilised there has been a surge of people using the land around the proposed development west of bridgend for walking cycling and enjoying the natural environment. This has been so beneficial for mental well-being.
1059	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	By taking away the natural environment and creating an artificial environment west of bridgend and around island farm, would in no way improve the environment or contribute to people's health and well being.
1059	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Development in the last two decades has seen an increase in traffic throughout Bridgend Town, with long queues all around the town and the surrounding areas. There has also been a huge increase in housing within bridgend and the local area with no discernible development of the necessary and adequate infrastructure to support those developments. The infrastructure and public services, including schools, NHS services and access roads are already stretched and this would put unbearable strain on them.
1059	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1059	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1059	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID

1059

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

1059

Conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment is therefore a key function of the Replacement LDP.. The Deposit Replacement LDP seeks to conserve and enhance the natural and historic environment of the county borough, recognising that the unique characteristics help attract investment, promote tourism, provide cultural experiences and encourage healthy lifestyles for communities. - the development of housing west of bridgend and by the island farm site

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

1059

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

1059

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID

1059

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

1059

Land west of Bridgend: including residential, education, community facilities and public open space. I strongly object to this proposal: This area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years (Bryntirion and Broadlands). This is already a disproportionate amount. A further 850 houses would merge the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles and the statements made within the LDP to safeguard local/natural communities. The infrastructure is not in place and would be unable to cope. The local Comprehensive School, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. Just down the road, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the County. Increased road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. The site forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council's objective of maintaining and

	<p>enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the County Borough. This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with a historical heritage. The proposed site is crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. Improved walking and cycling routes. Improved public transport and improvements to the local highway network. This has been promised with all developments over the last twenty years and has failed to be delivered in a quite spectacular fashion. There is absolutely no evidence or assurance that it would be different this time!</p>
--	---

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1059	

LDP Rep: 1060

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment against the LDP. My comment relates to the Coity conservation area and in particular the land adjoining the Coity Bypass. I feel that this land contains some important wildlife and woodland and should be preserved to ensure a green wedge between Coity and Brackla (Taylor Wimpy Estate). The woodland in the field adjacent to the roundabout (Heol Simonstone end) and the bypass bund are important parts of this green wedge. The map 21 is unclear on the extent of the conservation area and the potential intentions for the land adjoining the bypass. Many Thanks
1060	
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	None
1060	
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	None
1060	
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	None
1060	
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	None
1060	
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	None
1060	
7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	None
1060	
8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	

ID	None
1060	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	None
1060	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1060	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1060	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1060	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1060	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
1060	

LDP Rep: 1061

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1061	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1061	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1061	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1061	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1061	The proposal for more housing in the area of island farm and close to the Broadlands A48 round about will result in unacceptable levels of traffic. At peak times the A48 is chaotic and dangerous now. Ewenny roundabout is not fit for purpose, with traffic often stuck on the roundabout blocking other traffic routes. Also at peak times traffic backs up Al the way into minor cul de sacs on Broadlands.

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1061	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1061	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1061	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

1061

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

1061

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

1061

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID

1061

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

1061

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1061

LDP Rep: 1062

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	I think there should be a mention of culturally rich or creative spaces celebrating living heritage
1062	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	I think there has to be a careful balance in Porthcawl when determining the number of houses that will be built and their location. Too many in the wrong area could have a detrimental impact, making the place less attractive to tourists and residents. I think that Salt Lake and Sandy Bay should have residential development but it needs to be secondary to other types of development in Salt Lake in particular. We don't want to spoil the very thing that attracts people to the town in the first place. Also, any over-development of residential will lead to congestion and parking issues which will be further exacerbated if parking spaces decline to make way for residential
1062	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	No mention of development of cultural facilities i.e. The Grand Pavilion....investment here can help drive economic regeneration - more jobs, better visitor attractor, more secondary spend in the town/borough/region Any housing development needs to be proportionate in Porthcawl and not spoil its natural resources i.e. seafrontage, views, open space. Balance of social, affordable and private housing should be appropriate to ensure that the council yield from development in prime locations is maximised. Housing should be about quality not quantity, have to be really careful about not over developing the seafront locations. Look at alternative areas west of Nottage or East of Danygraig.
1062	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	This is critical and council should be ensuring it is working with the best creatives to make this happen. Porthcawl's whole identity is built around the sea so don't over develop those prime seafront locations with housing or you will destroy the very thing that drives people to the town. Also, don't forget the role of The Pavilion and cultural events in this.
1062	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	Housing development in Porthcawl is needed but don't overdevelop the prime seafront locations. They should have some housing but not so much that it spoils the very thing people find attractive about the town. Look east of Danygraig or west of Nottage for large-scale housing development. Also, where you do develop in prime
1062	

	seafront locations - go high end to maximise return - quality not quantity will reap better long-term rewards for the town.
--	---

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Investment in The Pavilion will create more jobs locally. It currently contributes circa £10Million to local economy in terms of secondary spend and supports many supply chain businesses
1062	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Personally, I don't think a new supermarket is the right thing to do in Porthcawl. There is already a supermarket in the town centre and a good selection of independent food retailers. That ecology works well at the moment and there has been a significant increase in people using these local retailers and more have them have developed in recent years...Home & Colonial, Fishmongers Cat, Fruit Bowl, several excellent butchers. If we could resist the urge to put a supermarket there, this growth could continue and Porthcawl could be like Crickhowell - but I understand that ship may have sailed!!! I know the argument is that people need a more affordable supermarket option in the town but since the pandemic, so many people now shop online if they require a cheaper supermarket option. I think Aldi combined with continued growth of online shopping will just result in the death of the co-op in town which will lead to a closed, boarded up large shop in the centre of town. People in Porthcawl are very aware of sustainability, short supply chains and circular economy stuff and BCBC have an opportunity to hold the town up as an exemplar for this type of place like Crickhowell did. Also, the location of the proposed Aldi is unfortunate! make co-op an offer and put it there instead!!!!!! It already has parking!! The you can save some of Salt Lake for visitor parking. Also think about other council owned assets in the area - Pavilion, Awel Y Mor and Porthcawl Library.....and also other public sector owned buildings / areas - Police station, Ambulance/Fire station - these are all under utilised areas of land/buildings that are within your gift to develop.
1062	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	No
1062	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Development of Sandy bay and Salt Lake has to be carefully balanced - don;'t over deveop it, think about what makes it unique and celebrate that natural heritage. Similarly the most iconic building in Porthcawl is The Pavilion - it is regionally significant both in terms of its cultural offer and its heritage - invest in it to ensure its maximising its potential
1062	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	No
1062	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	I'm not convinced that Park & Ride will work for Porthcawl on busy summer days.
1062	Think Tenby!!! Two massive car parks on the seafront. Put Aldi somewhere else and retain some car parking on Salt Lake and Sandy Bay. Do not over develop Salt Lake with too much housing, keep it low level developments so as not spoil the Vista. Maximise returns by going for quality not quantity in terms of housing in the prime locations - Look East of Danygraig and West of Nottage for other options. Sandy bay could make for a beautiful place to live but don't lose opportunity to extend coastal path/promenade right through that area to Newton. Don;t over develop it

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
1062	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
1062	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1062	

LDP Rep: 1063

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1063	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1063	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1063	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1063	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1063	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1063	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1063	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1063	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1063	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	Ensure horseriders can use the improved walking and cycling routes. Other counties have included the needs of horseriders in their development plans
1063	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Ensure horseriders can use the improved walking and cycling routes. Other counties have included the needs of horseriders in their development plans
1063	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	Ensure horseriders can use the improved walking and cycling routes. Other counties have included the needs of horseriders in their development plans
1063	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Ensure horseriders can use the improved walking and cycling routes. Other counties have included the needs of horseriders in their development plans
1063	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	This plan wouldn't win any awards for plain English. Too much jargon.
1063	

LDP Rep: 1064

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable): [REDACTED]

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID 1064	<p>I strongly oppose the Local Development Plan (LDP) for the Pyle/Cornelly area (PLA5: Land East of Pyle, Kenfig Hill & North Cornelly) on the following grounds: the lands are of prime agricultural status which are needed for the growing of crops for sustainable human and animal needs; the area in question is of vital importance to the heritage of Kenfig and surrounding areas. I've briefly listed the following that fall within my objections to this proposed plan. STORMY DOWN (a) Prime Agricultural Land (b) Heritage - Stormy Castle, Sturmistown (c) Heritage - Roman Road, Julia Martitima (d) Heritage - Military, RAF Stormy Down (Airfield) WWII (e) Heritage - Military, Air Crash Sites (Controlled sites under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986) (f) Heritage - Stormy Down Settlement (deserted rural settlement) (g) Heritage - Stormy Farmhouse (h) SSSI - Site of Special Scientific Interest (located under Laleston on BCBC "Designation of Special Landscape Areas", March 2010 - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf) SSSI includes the quarry's at this location in addition to the geology/mineral wealth and prehistoric value of the area in general. All this would be lost forever if the proposed LDP for this area was to take effect. As I'm responsible for the Kenfig Heritage website project (documenting the heritage of the Kenfig & surrounding areas) - an online educational resource which has been formerly recognised by the National Library of Wales as "an important part of Wales' documentary heritage" which includes this particular area in question, I'm opposing the proposed LDP as outlined as it would decimate the heritage of the area in its entirety - additionally, the new Welsh government schools curriculum now includes local Welsh history; destroying areas of both natural beauty and of which is steeped in Welsh heritage would detract school visits to places of historic Welsh importance and of which goes completely against the proposals of the new Welsh schools curriculum in the main.</p> <p>Rob Bowen Owner/Author Kenfig - The Complete History (e-Resource) www.kenfig.org.uk Further Reading 1. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (Wikipedia) - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protection_of_Military_Remains_Act_1986 2. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (The National Archives) - https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/35/contents 3. Designation of Special Landscape Areas, March 2010 (BCBC) - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf 4. Stormy Down (RCAHMW, Coflein) - https://coflein.gov.uk/en/search/?term=stormy%20down</p>

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID 1064	<p>I strongly oppose the Local Development Plan (LDP) for the Pyle/Cornelly area (PLA5: Land East of Pyle, Kenfig Hill & North Cornelly) on the following grounds: the lands are of prime agricultural status which are needed for the growing of crops for sustainable human and animal needs; the area in question is of vital importance to the heritage of Kenfig and surrounding areas. I've briefly listed the following that fall</p>

within my objections to this proposed plan. STORMY DOWN (a) Prime Agricultural Land (b) Heritage - Stormy Castle, Sturmistown (c) Heritage - Roman Road, Julia Martitima (d) Heritage - Military, RAF Stormy Down (Airfield) WWII (e) Heritage - Military, Air Crash Sites (Controlled sites under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986) (f) Heritage - Stormy Down Settlement (deserted rural settlement) (g) Heritage - Stormy Farmhouse (h) SSSI - Site of Special Scientific Interest (located under Laleston on BCBC "Designation of Special Landscape Areas", March 2010 - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf) SSSI includes the quarry's at this location in addition to the geology/mineral wealth and prehistoric value of the area in general. All this would be lost forever if the proposed LDP for this area was to take effect. As I'm responsible for the Kenfig Heritage website project (documenting the heritage of the Kenfig & surrounding areas) - an online educational resource which has been formerly recognised by the National Library of Wales as "an important part of Wales' documentary heritage" which includes this particular area in question, I'm opposing the proposed LDP as outlined as it would decimate the heritage of the area in its entirety - additionally, the new Welsh government schools curriculum now includes local Welsh history; destroying areas of both natural beauty and of which is steeped in Welsh heritage would detract school visits to places of historic Welsh importance and of which goes completely against the proposals of the new Welsh schools curriculum in the main.

Rob Bowen Owner/Author Kenfig - The Complete History (e-Resource) www.kenfig.org.uk Further Reading 1. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (Wikipedia) - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protection_of_Military_Remains_Act_1986 2. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (The National Archives) - <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/35/contents> 3. Designation of Special Landscape Areas, March 2010 (BCBC) - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf 4. Stormy Down (RCAHMW, Coflein) - <https://coflein.gov.uk/en/search/?term=stormy%20down>

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1064	I strongly oppose the Local Development Plan (LDP) for the Pyle/Cornelly area (PLA5: Land East of Pyle, Kenfig Hill & North Cornelly) on the following grounds: the lands are of prime agricultural status which are needed for the growing of crops for sustainable human and animal needs; the area in question is of vital importance to the heritage of Kenfig and surrounding areas. I've briefly listed the following that fall within my objections to this proposed plan. STORMY DOWN (a) Prime Agricultural Land (b) Heritage - Stormy Castle, Sturmistown (c) Heritage - Roman Road, Julia Martitima (d) Heritage - Military, RAF Stormy Down (Airfield) WWII (e) Heritage - Military, Air Crash Sites (Controlled sites under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986) (f) Heritage - Stormy Down Settlement (deserted rural settlement) (g) Heritage - Stormy Farmhouse (h) SSSI - Site of Special Scientific Interest (located under Laleston on BCBC "Designation of Special Landscape Areas", March 2010 - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf) SSSI includes the quarry's at this location in addition to the geology/mineral wealth and prehistoric value of the area in general. All this would be lost forever if the proposed LDP for this area was to take effect. As I'm responsible for the Kenfig Heritage website project (documenting the heritage of the Kenfig & surrounding areas) - an online educational resource which has been formerly recognised by the

	<p>National Library of Wales as "an important part of Wales' documentary heritage" which includes this particular area in question, I'm opposing the proposed LDP as outlined as it would decimate the heritage of the area in its entirety - additionally, the new Welsh government schools curriculum now includes local Welsh history; destroying areas of both natural beauty and of which is steeped in Welsh heritage would detract school visits to places of historic Welsh importance and of which goes completely against the proposals of the new Welsh schools curriculum in the main.</p> <p>Rob Bowen Owner/Author Kenfig - The Complete History (e-Resource) www.kenfig.org.uk Further Reading 1. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (Wikipedia) - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protection_of_Military_Remains_Act_1986 2. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (The National Archives) - https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/35/contents 3. Designation of Special Landscape Areas, March 2010 (BCBC) - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf 4. Stormy Down (RCAHMW, Coflein) - https://coflein.gov.uk/en/search/?term=stormy%20down</p>
--	--

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1064	<p>I strongly oppose the Local Development Plan (LDP) for the Pyle/Cornelly area (PLA5: Land East of Pyle, Kenfig Hill & North Cornelly) on the following grounds: the lands are of prime agricultural status which are needed for the growing of crops for sustainable human and animal needs; the area in question is of vital importance to the heritage of Kenfig and surrounding areas. I've briefly listed the following that fall within my objections to this proposed plan. STORMY DOWN (a) Prime Agricultural Land (b) Heritage - Stormy Castle, Sturmistown (c) Heritage - Roman Road, Julia Martitima (d) Heritage - Military, RAF Stormy Down (Airfield) WWII (e) Heritage - Military, Air Crash Sites (Controlled sites under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986) (f) Heritage - Stormy Down Settlement (deserted rural settlement) (g) Heritage - Stormy Farmhouse (h) SSSI - Site of Special Scientific Interest (located under Laleston on BCBC "Designation of Special Landscape Areas", March 2010 - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf) SSSI includes the quarry's at this location in addition to the geology/mineral wealth and prehistoric value of the area in general. All this would be lost forever if the proposed LDP for this area was to take effect. As I'm responsible for the Kenfig Heritage website project (documenting the heritage of the Kenfig & surrounding areas) - an online educational resource which has been formerly recognised by the National Library of Wales as "an important part of Wales' documentary heritage" which includes this particular area in question, I'm opposing the proposed LDP as outlined as it would decimate the heritage of the area in its entirety - additionally, the new Welsh government schools curriculum now includes local Welsh history; destroying areas of both natural beauty and of which is steeped in Welsh heritage would detract school visits to places of historic Welsh importance and of which goes completely against the proposals of the new Welsh schools curriculum in the main.</p> <p>Rob Bowen Owner/Author Kenfig - The Complete History (e-Resource) www.kenfig.org.uk Further Reading 1. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (Wikipedia) - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protection_of_Military_Remains_Act_1986 2. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (The National Archives) - https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/35/contents 3. Designation of Special Landscape Areas, March 2010 (BCBC) -</p>

	https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf 4. Stormy Down (RCAHMW, Coflein) - https://coflein.gov.uk/en/search/?term=stormy%20down
--	---

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
1064	<p>I strongly oppose the Local Development Plan (LDP) for the Pyle/Cornelly area (PLA5: Land East of Pyle, Kenfig Hill & North Cornelly) on the following grounds: the lands are of prime agricultural status which are needed for the growing of crops for sustainable human and animal needs; the area in question is of vital importance to the heritage of Kenfig and surrounding areas. I've briefly listed the following that fall within my objections to this proposed plan. STORMY DOWN (a) Prime Agricultural Land (b) Heritage - Stormy Castle, Sturmistown (c) Heritage - Roman Road, Julia Martitima (d) Heritage - Military, RAF Stormy Down (Airfield) WWII (e) Heritage - Military, Air Crash Sites (Controlled sites under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986) (f) Heritage - Stormy Down Settlement (deserted rural settlement) (g) Heritage - Stormy Farmhouse (h) SSSI - Site of Special Scientific Interest (located under Laleston on BCBC "Designation of Special Landscape Areas", March 2010 - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf) SSSI includes the quarry's at this location in addition to the geology/mineral wealth and prehistoric value of the area in general. All this would be lost forever if the proposed LDP for this area was to take effect. As I'm responsible for the Kenfig Heritage website project (documenting the heritage of the Kenfig & surrounding areas) - an online educational resource which has been formerly recognised by the National Library of Wales as "an important part of Wales' documentary heritage" which includes this particular area in question, I'm opposing the proposed LDP as outlined as it would decimate the heritage of the area in its entirety - additionally, the new Welsh government schools curriculum now includes local Welsh history; destroying areas of both natural beauty and of which is steeped in Welsh heritage would detract school visits to places of historic Welsh importance and of which goes completely against the proposals of the new Welsh schools curriculum in the main.</p> <p>Rob Bowen Owner/Author Kenfig - The Complete History (e-Resource) www.kenfig.org.uk Further Reading 1. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (Wikipedia) - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protection_of_Military_Remains_Act_1986 2. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (The National Archives) - https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/35/contents 3. Designation of Special Landscape Areas, March 2010 (BCBC) - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf 4. Stormy Down (RCAHMW, Coflein) - https://coflein.gov.uk/en/search/?term=stormy%20down</p>

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
1064	<p>I strongly oppose the Local Development Plan (LDP) for the Pyle/Cornelly area (PLA5: Land East of Pyle, Kenfig Hill & North Cornelly) on the following grounds: the lands are of prime agricultural status which are needed for the growing of crops for sustainable human and animal needs; the area in question is of vital importance to the heritage of Kenfig and surrounding areas. I've briefly listed the following that fall within my objections to this proposed plan. STORMY DOWN (a) Prime Agricultural Land (b) Heritage - Stormy Castle, Sturmistown (c) Heritage - Roman Road, Julia</p>

	<p>Martitima (d) Heritage - Military, RAF Stormy Down (Airfield) WWII (e) Heritage - Military, Air Crash Sites (Controlled sites under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986) (f) Heritage - Stormy Down Settlement (deserted rural settlement) (g) Heritage - Stormy Farmhouse (h) SSSI - Site of Special Scientific Interest (located under Laleston on BCBC "Designation of Special Landscape Areas", March 2010 - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf) SSSI includes the quarry's at this location in addition to the geology/mineral wealth and prehistoric value of the area in general. All this would be lost forever if the proposed LDP for this area was to take effect. As I'm responsible for the Kenfig Heritage website project (documenting the heritage of the Kenfig & surrounding areas) - an online educational resource which has been formerly recognised by the National Library of Wales as "an important part of Wales' documentary heritage" which includes this particular area in question, I'm opposing the proposed LDP as outlined as it would decimate the heritage of the area in its entirety - additionally, the new Welsh government schools curriculum now includes local Welsh history; destroying areas of both natural beauty and of which is steeped in Welsh heritage would detract school visits to places of historic Welsh importance and of which goes completely against the proposals of the new Welsh schools curriculum in the main.</p> <p>Rob Bowen Owner/Author Kenfig - The Complete History (e-Resource) www.kenfig.org.uk Further Reading 1. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (Wikipedia) - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protection_of_Military_Remains_Act_1986 2. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (The National Archives) - https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/35/contents 3. Designation of Special Landscape Areas, March 2010 (BCBC) - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf 4. Stormy Down (RCAHMW, Coflein) - https://coflein.gov.uk/en/search/?term=stormy%20down</p>
--	--

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1064	<p>I strongly oppose the Local Development Plan (LDP) for the Pyle/Cornelly area (PLA5: Land East of Pyle, Kenfig Hill & North Cornelly) on the following grounds: the lands are of prime agricultural status which are needed for the growing of crops for sustainable human and animal needs; the area in question is of vital importance to the heritage of Kenfig and surrounding areas. I've briefly listed the following that fall within my objections to this proposed plan. STORMY DOWN (a) Prime Agricultural Land (b) Heritage - Stormy Castle, Sturmistown (c) Heritage - Roman Road, Julia Martitima (d) Heritage - Military, RAF Stormy Down (Airfield) WWII (e) Heritage - Military, Air Crash Sites (Controlled sites under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986) (f) Heritage - Stormy Down Settlement (deserted rural settlement) (g) Heritage - Stormy Farmhouse (h) SSSI - Site of Special Scientific Interest (located under Laleston on BCBC "Designation of Special Landscape Areas", March 2010 - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf) SSSI includes the quarry's at this location in addition to the geology/mineral wealth and prehistoric value of the area in general. All this would be lost forever if the proposed LDP for this area was to take effect. As I'm responsible for the Kenfig Heritage website project (documenting the heritage of the Kenfig & surrounding areas) - an online educational resource which has been formerly recognised by the National Library of Wales as "an important part of Wales' documentary heritage" which includes this particular area in question, I'm opposing the proposed LDP as</p>

	<p>outlined as it would decimate the heritage of the area in its entirety - additionally, the new Welsh government schools curriculum now includes local Welsh history; destroying areas of both natural beauty and of which is steeped in Welsh heritage would detract school visits to places of historic Welsh importance and of which goes completely against the proposals of the new Welsh schools curriculum in the main.</p> <p>Rob Bowen Owner/Author Kenfig - The Complete History (e-Resource) www.kenfig.org.uk Further Reading 1. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (Wikipedia) - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protection_of_Military_Remains_Act_1986</p> <p>2. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (The National Archives) - https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/35/contents 3. Designation of Special Landscape Areas, March 2010 (BCBC) - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf 4. Stormy Down (RCAHMW, Coflein) - https://coflein.gov.uk/en/search/?term=stormy%20down</p>
--	---

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1064	<p>I strongly oppose the Local Development Plan (LDP) for the Pyle/Cornelly area (PLA5: Land East of Pyle, Kenfig Hill & North Cornelly) on the following grounds: the lands are of prime agricultural status which are needed for the growing of crops for sustainable human and animal needs; the area in question is of vital importance to the heritage of Kenfig and surrounding areas. I've briefly listed the following that fall within my objections to this proposed plan. STORMY DOWN (a) Prime Agricultural Land (b) Heritage - Stormy Castle, Sturmistown (c) Heritage - Roman Road, Julia Martitima (d) Heritage - Military, RAF Stormy Down (Airfield) WWII (e) Heritage - Military, Air Crash Sites (Controlled sites under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986) (f) Heritage - Stormy Down Settlement (deserted rural settlement) (g) Heritage - Stormy Farmhouse (h) SSSI - Site of Special Scientific Interest (located under Laleston on BCBC "Designation of Special Landscape Areas", March 2010 - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf) SSSI includes the quarry's at this location in addition to the geology/mineral wealth and prehistoric value of the area in general. All this would be lost forever if the proposed LDP for this area was to take effect. As I'm responsible for the Kenfig Heritage website project (documenting the heritage of the Kenfig & surrounding areas) - an online educational resource which has been formerly recognised by the National Library of Wales as "an important part of Wales' documentary heritage" which includes this particular area in question, I'm opposing the proposed LDP as outlined as it would decimate the heritage of the area in its entirety - additionally, the new Welsh government schools curriculum now includes local Welsh history; destroying areas of both natural beauty and of which is steeped in Welsh heritage would detract school visits to places of historic Welsh importance and of which goes completely against the proposals of the new Welsh schools curriculum in the main.</p> <p>Rob Bowen Owner/Author Kenfig - The Complete History (e-Resource) www.kenfig.org.uk Further Reading 1. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (Wikipedia) - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protection_of_Military_Remains_Act_1986</p> <p>2. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (The National Archives) - https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/35/contents 3. Designation of Special Landscape Areas, March 2010 (BCBC) - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf</p>

df 4. Stormy Down (RCAHMW, Coflein) - https://coflein.gov.uk/en/search/?term=stormy%20down
--

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
---	--

ID	
1064	<p>I strongly oppose the Local Development Plan (LDP) for the Pyle/Cornelly area (PLA5: Land East of Pyle, Kenfig Hill & North Cornelly) on the following grounds: the lands are of prime agricultural status which are needed for the growing of crops for sustainable human and animal needs; the area in question is of vital importance to the heritage of Kenfig and surrounding areas. I've briefly listed the following that fall within my objections to this proposed plan. STORMY DOWN (a) Prime Agricultural Land (b) Heritage - Stormy Castle, Sturmistown (c) Heritage - Roman Road, Julia Martitima (d) Heritage - Military, RAF Stormy Down (Airfield) WWII (e) Heritage - Military, Air Crash Sites (Controlled sites under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986) (f) Heritage - Stormy Down Settlement (deserted rural settlement) (g) Heritage - Stormy Farmhouse (h) SSSI - Site of Special Scientific Interest (located under Laleston on BCBC "Designation of Special Landscape Areas", March 2010 - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf) SSSI includes the quarry's at this location in addition to the geology/mineral wealth and prehistoric value of the area in general. All this would be lost forever if the proposed LDP for this area was to take effect. As I'm responsible for the Kenfig Heritage website project (documenting the heritage of the Kenfig & surrounding areas) - an online educational resource which has been formerly recognised by the National Library of Wales as "an important part of Wales' documentary heritage" which includes this particular area in question, I'm opposing the proposed LDP as outlined as it would decimate the heritage of the area in its entirety - additionally, the new Welsh government schools curriculum now includes local Welsh history; destroying areas of both natural beauty and of which is steeped in Welsh heritage would detract school visits to places of historic Welsh importance and of which goes completely against the proposals of the new Welsh schools curriculum in the main.</p> <p>Rob Bowen Owner/Author Kenfig - The Complete History (e-Resource) www.kenfig.org.uk Further Reading 1. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (Wikipedia) - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protection_of_Military_Remains_Act_1986 2. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (The National Archives) - https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/35/contents 3. Designation of Special Landscape Areas, March 2010 (BCBC) - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf 4. Stormy Down (RCAHMW, Coflein) - https://coflein.gov.uk/en/search/?term=stormy%20down</p>

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
---	--

ID	
1064	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
---	--

ID	
1064	<p>I strongly oppose the Local Development Plan (LDP) for the Pyle/Cornelly area (PLA5: Land East of Pyle, Kenfig Hill & North Cornelly) on the following grounds: the lands are of prime agricultural status which are needed for the growing of crops for</p>

	<p>sustainable human and animal needs; the area in question is of vital importance to the heritage of Kenfig and surrounding areas. I've briefly listed the following that fall within my objections to this proposed plan. STORMY DOWN (a) Prime Agricultural Land (b) Heritage - Stormy Castle, Sturmistown (c) Heritage - Roman Road, Julia Martitima (d) Heritage - Military, RAF Stormy Down (Airfield) WWII (e) Heritage - Military, Air Crash Sites (Controlled sites under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986) (f) Heritage - Stormy Down Settlement (deserted rural settlement) (g) Heritage - Stormy Farmhouse (h) SSSI - Site of Special Scientific Interest (located under Laleston on BCBC "Designation of Special Landscape Areas", March 2010 - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf) SSSI includes the quarry's at this location in addition to the geology/mineral wealth and prehistoric value of the area in general. All this would be lost forever if the proposed LDP for this area was to take effect. As I'm responsible for the Kenfig Heritage website project (documenting the heritage of the Kenfig & surrounding areas) - an online educational resource which has been formerly recognised by the National Library of Wales as "an important part of Wales' documentary heritage" which includes this particular area in question, I'm opposing the proposed LDP as outlined as it would decimate the heritage of the area in its entirety - additionally, the new Welsh government schools curriculum now includes local Welsh history; destroying areas of both natural beauty and of which is steeped in Welsh heritage would detract school visits to places of historic Welsh importance and of which goes completely against the proposals of the new Welsh schools curriculum in the main.</p> <p>Rob Bowen Owner/Author Kenfig - The Complete History (e-Resource) www.kenfig.org.uk Further Reading 1. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (Wikipedia) - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protection_of_Military_Remains_Act_1986 2. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (The National Archives) - https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/35/contents 3. Designation of Special Landscape Areas, March 2010 (BCBC) - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf 4. Stormy Down (RCAHMW, Coflein) - https://coflein.gov.uk/en/search/?term=stormy%20down</p>
--	--

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1064	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1064	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1064	<p>I strongly oppose the Local Development Plan (LDP) for the Pyle/Cornelly area (PLA5: Land East of Pyle, Kenfig Hill & North Cornelly) on the following grounds: the lands are of prime agricultural status which are needed for the growing of crops for sustainable human and animal needs; the area in question is of vital importance to the heritage of Kenfig and surrounding areas. I've briefly listed the following that fall within my objections to this proposed plan. STORMY DOWN (a) Prime Agricultural Land (b) Heritage - Stormy Castle, Sturmistown (c) Heritage - Roman Road, Julia</p>

Martitima (d) Heritage - Military, RAF Stormy Down (Airfield) WWII (e) Heritage - Military, Air Crash Sites (Controlled sites under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986) (f) Heritage - Stormy Down Settlement (deserted rural settlement) (g) Heritage - Stormy Farmhouse (h) SSSI - Site of Special Scientific Interest (located under Laleston on BCBC "Designation of Special Landscape Areas", March 2010 - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf) SSSI includes the quarry's at this location in addition to the geology/mineral wealth and prehistoric value of the area in general. All this would be lost forever if the proposed LDP for this area was to take effect. As I'm responsible for the Kenfig Heritage website project (documenting the heritage of the Kenfig & surrounding areas) - an online educational resource which has been formerly recognised by the National Library of Wales as "an important part of Wales' documentary heritage" which includes this particular area in question, I'm opposing the proposed LDP as outlined as it would decimate the heritage of the area in its entirety - additionally, the new Welsh government schools curriculum now includes local Welsh history; destroying areas of both natural beauty and of which is steeped in Welsh heritage would detract school visits to places of historic Welsh importance and of which goes completely against the proposals of the new Welsh schools curriculum in the main.

Rob Bowen Owner/Author Kenfig - The Complete History (e-Resource) www.kenfig.org.uk Further Reading 1. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (Wikipedia) - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protection_of_Military_Remains_Act_1986 2. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (The National Archives) - <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/35/contents> 3. Designation of Special Landscape Areas, March 2010 (BCBC) - https://www.bridgend.gov.uk/media/1796/designation_of_special_landscape_areas.pdf 4. Stormy Down (RCAHMW, Coflein) - <https://coflein.gov.uk/en/search/?term=stormy%20down>

LDP Rep: 1065

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Getting the infrastructure in place needs to be the main focus before any other plans should be put in place.
1065	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1065	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Infrastructure to be done first before ANY other contracts awarded
1065	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1065	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1065	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1065	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1065	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1065	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1065	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1065	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1065	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1065	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	ReSP2(2)Island Farm and COM1(2) Craig-y-Parcau especially are areas where new build homes are simply not viable. Living in Newbridge Gardens I regularly walk over to the dipping bridge and through the lanes to Merthyr Mawr, all this natural habitat will be disrupted, the roads are already dangerous, for all road users and very poorly maintained. The roundabout at Ewenny Road is already horrific during busy periods, one of the worst roundabout layouts anywhere. There are already numerous vehicles using the rat run from Ewenny through to the A48 on New Inn Road, many people ignore road signs advising left or right turns only and this will get worse. The turning from the A48 onto Merthyr Mawr road, coming from the Broadlands, is already a busy and tight junction again will only get worse with increased traffic. The roundabout by Tesco by McDonalds is already exceptionally busy and dangerous, this needs to be resolved now, again will get worse.
1065	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	There are so many empty properties in Bridgend county why build so many new homes when there are empty properties or poor quality existing housing stock, that should be brought into use first, before any other building projects are started. There are insufficient local bus services, which means more cars on the road. The houses will be mainly for those working outside Bridgend County so the town centre will not benefit to the same level as Cardiff or Swansea, I normally work in Cardiff, my job doesn't exist in Bridgend, shops are open late so people will go to the city centre after work or in their lunch hour and not spend money in the town centre. I am not against development where it is actually needed but some of these plans are ill considered and will further damage an already fragile infrastructure, which in many areas simply will not cope. Schools, healthcare services, etc will all be impacted.
1065	

LDP Rep: 1066

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1066	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1066	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1066	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1066	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1066	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1066	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1066	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1066	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1066	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1066	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1066	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1066	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Ref SP2(2) and COM1(2) I object to the proposed housing due to impact on environment in Broadlands and A48 corridor from traffic causing air quality deterioration, noise increases, hazards to pedestrians and cyclists in an area already saturated with traffic and well known for significant existing traffic congestion. On a personal note, air quality is poor and traffic noise intrusive in Broadlands and the additional traffic generated will only make things much worse.
1066	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	The replacement LDP needs to do more to address Climate Emergency and support Well-being of Future Generations.
1066	

LDP Rep: 546

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	I don't have an issue with the objectives but I do have an issue with the lack of infrastructure in place to support a lot of what is being proposed which will have a devastating impact on green spaces and will increase carbon emissions and impact on air quality
546	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	Balanced is the key word here and the plans aren't balanced they are seeking to deliver housing at all costs
546	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	Growth is only sustainable where the infrastructure Supports it and there's an absence if infrastructural improvements in any of the documents
546	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	Good design isn't needed for green spaces just management of natural space. This plan requires design due to the destruction of that natural space
546	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	This talks to new households improving infrastructure, leisure facilities and education. We are already seeing leisure facilities suffering through inflated costs and a drive to sell off facilities to local groups - how will more houses reverse that trend? Schools are overcrowded with children having to travel. Furthermore there have been endemic failures on previous developments to secure infrastructural commitments by those developers and a lack of onward financial commitment to maintenance of those developments. There needs to be contractual and statutory obligations placed on developers and a public presence in the tendering process from community groups directly impacted by new sites
546	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	Yes the developments will bring in employment but not lasting employment and many of those companies will be from wider afield meaning limited benefit to the shops and communities of Bridgend
546	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	Retail in Bridgend is all but dead. The town centre is full of charity shops, take aways and vape shops. With the planned movement of the college into the centre and
546	

	antisocial behavior that Isn't being addressed will further dilute the relevance of the centre.
--	---

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	No comment
546	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	What inward investments have been generated by this to date? Its not clear, however the plan talks to biodiversity at a time when it's talking about digging up huge swathes of green belt areas to accommodate housing. The plan seems to be houses over the environment
546	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
546	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Potential development of a transport hub isn't enough. The current station in the centre of Bridgend and the infrastructure cannot support the additional housing and an alternative station with park and ride must be factored into any planning model
546	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
546	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
546	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	The whole plan is poorly conceived and reads as a plan to build at all costs. The current council tax rates in the Borough are among the highest in the UK yet services are being cut. Adding significant houses will increase the council funding but will result in far higher resident support needs and place further strain on services and infrastructure. With many roads incapable of widening to support the increased traffic created. Plans need to be revised and a more balanced, green and wellbeing perspective adopted over build, build and build
546	

LDP Rep: 1067

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	The issues and drivers are fair
1067	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	I disagree with the plans for more housing in my area. I don't believe the plans fully reflect the growth strategy above. The plans will have a detrimental effect on the infrastructure of the area as well as the environment. There are simply not enough roads, school places, GP places or other resources to support the plans and i am against taking even more countryside land away from the wildlife.
1067	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	I totally agree with the plans for more housing within the strategy and see no evidence that the above infrastructure issues have really been addressed.
1067	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	I do not believe that any of these plans should be at the expense of the countryside environment around us, which needs to be preserved.
1067	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	I don't believe that the plans focus on meeting housing need and ensuring that new developments are supported by the necessary infrastructure. I am absolutely unconvinced that the infrastructure has been given enough thought and I would hate to see these proposals come to fruition.
1067	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
1067	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	I feel the plans for the town centre are interesting and could be helpful.
1067	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
-----------	--

1067	It is ironic that BCBC suggests it cares about its environmental impact here when the plans for the large increase in housing will wipe out a large area of wildlife and countryside.
------	---

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	
1067	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1067	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1067	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1067	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I object to the proposals to increase housing in this area.
1067	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1067	

LDP Rep: 1068

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	How is this to be achieved with the building of 1800 houses between Llaliston and Ewenny roundabout when already the infrastructure is bursting at the seams ie education - Brynteg is already one of the biggest secondary schools in South Wales, Health - it is extremely difficult to obtain a drs appointment (even prior to Covid) after 9.30 on a Monday morning for the week ahead as all appointment are already taken by then. The lack of success rate of getting inward investment is illustrated by the closing of Ford, the failure to obtain the battery development and the withdrawal of the land rover replacement inward investment. awal
1068	
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Closing of Ford factory; loss of the inward investment of replacement land rover to be on old Ford site; loss of the battery plant. Where else is the economic growth to come from to attract a skilled population - and indeed where are these skills to be produced.
1068	
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	See previous comments re Schools, Drs.Inward investment
1068	
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	How can 1800 houses on the area from Llaleston to Ewenny roundabout which will increase school population, demand on the NHS (downgraded Bridgend hospital) Higher education facilities which have no industrial strategy. Also traffic on B roads that are already grossly over crowded and do not allow easy movement of traffic. Not to mention Merthyr Mawr and the Dipping Bridge - how will they fare with such an increase in the populus
1068	
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Where will the jobs come from to ensure this economic growth?
1068	
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Unfortunately, this does not seem to have happened to date - how to expand?
1068	
7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	

1068	
------	--

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1068	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	Methyr Mawr and the Dipping Bridge are places of natural beauty - will these be enhanced in any way by having 1800 houses and approx 4500 more people living in the area between Llaleston and Ewenny roundabout
1068	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1068	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1068	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
1068	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	With regard to the land south of Bridgend -would need more information regarding proposal for the development of education, health and economic growth facilities to accommodate the increased population that this development will result in. The lack of success of the Pencoed Technology Park illustrates the difficulties Bridgend will have in fulfilling this part to the strategy.
1068	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	I believe the technical facilities that Bridgend college has in no way relate to a advanced technology inward investment strategy. A lot more clarity is needed to support the inward investment necessary to substantiate the need for increased employment opportunities. The roads and the infrastructure of Bridgend will not support an increase of 4500 people. The position of the housing development will blight the beautiful surroundings of Merthyr Mawr - surely the crown in Bridgend Town.
1068	

LDP Rep: 1069

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	They all appear to have a sound basis
1069	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	None of this appears to encourage said growth in the Garw valley, why?
1069	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	How will you assess which settlements and parts of the county borough will benefit the most etc. This suggests it would be areas of high population and that potentially excludes the Garw valley
1069	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Does this mean new builds as opposed to regeneration of existing infrastructure?
1069	New builds have very little character

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	None of this would support development of Garw valley as there are no areas that can have new builds
1069	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	How will they be encouraged to come to the area? Will this result in higher council tax?
1069	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	This talks about 'traditional town centres' will there be a consultation with residents around what they see this as?
1069	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	This is something that needs further explanation, especially to those who may live near such sites
1069	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
--	--

ID	I'm glad to see you mention the historic environment as this is something that is really important, should never lose site of the fact that Bridgend was a market town
1069	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1069	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1069	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	Who has made the determination that this will not accommodate significant growth.
1069	Growth in tourism and leisure is an option and must be considered a positive

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1069	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Disappointed that the focus is not considered in relation to diversity in growth areas.
1069	Not everything revolves around housing, especially when the roads are not able to take increase in traffic and the prices are too high for locals

LDP Rep: 1070

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1070	<p>I would like there to be more consideration of ecosystems and biodiversity than there are in existence currently and I did not see anything of significance in the Proposed Local Development Plan to take us to 2033. I do not think that biodiversity should be reserved to specific wildlife locations. I believe we have a duty to incorporate the enhancement of nature and build protections into all aspects of planning strategies. I am concerned how low down this matter appears on the plan and the wording of it as a key strategy. I want to know if it will be given equal consideration to other human activities? We are facing habitat and species loss at an alarming rate and I do not see this crisis reflected in the local development plan, especially if it will take us to the next decade 2033. I have seen large oak trees cut down in the name of development in the locality. An oak tree can support up to 2300 species. Insect species are in decline by 75%. If we do not have insect pollinators we do not have a future. The insect decline is largely down to habitat loss and pesticide use. If we are to call this kind of destruction to a halt and really commit to the wellbeing of Future Generations then we need a much bolder, robust plan to protect our delicate habitats. I propose a Guardianship of the earth citizens assembly to be involved in decision making in Bridgend so that there is a voice for the voiceless at the table. I am going to write to the Welsh Assembly in relation to this matter also.</p>

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1070	<p>More clarity on the meaning of sustainability and if climate change and the environment is considered.</p>

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1070	<p>I am concerned about "on previously developed (brownfield) sites in the first instance" This seems to give Bridgend council room to build on Green sites. I am in complete opposition to this. There has already been mass building and habitat loss in the Bridgend Area and there has been large areas of habitat loss. This is unsustainable and incompatible with the Future Generations Wellbeing Act. The houses that have been built in the last 5-10 years in Bridgend do not appear to have sustainable energy as a requisite.</p>

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1070	<p>I feel that any new building should automatically have renewable energy as a requisite of planning. Environmentally friendly as possible building materials. Design that reuses water. I think that there should be a restriction on people purchasing property and not living it or renting out, i.e. holiday home. There is too much concentration on leisure facilities in certain areas. Llangeinor has very little in terms of community space and facilities.</p>

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	I am concerned that there is the postential to be open to oversized house developments which ultimately cater for the wealthier person rather than a needs based situation. If our finite green land is being used as a very last resort it should at least seek to accomodate as many affordable houses as possible, that way it is based on a real housing need rather than a lifestyle choice. I would like to reiterate that I object strongly to the use of green land unless there is a real crisis or need proven.
1070	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	I accept economic growth in the right and appropriate locations such as industrial estates which have been earmarked for certain industries.
1070	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	No more retail centres are needed in Bridgend.
1070	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	There needs to be discussions around community benefit, in terms of discounts on energy if people have to live with renewable energy developments.
1070	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	There is no mention of protecting the natural habitat in its own right. It is not all about how things benefit us, as people, although it does, when we do not protect our fragile ecosystems, then we and future generations will inevitably suffer the consequence. If you place everything else above the natural world which we have done for far too long then there is no way back. "These goals need to be balanced alongside the need to facilitate sustainable economic growth". You talk about the historic environment as being finite, which I agree with, however, the natural world is too, this has not been mentioned and I find this highly concerning in a 10 year plan. It seems to me like it is business as usual and ignoring the factual scientific basis. I recognise there needs to be economic growth but we need to be more innovative in how we achieve this so we are not using up our FINITE, irreplaceable ecosystems.
1070	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1070	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1070	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	Meaningful consultations needed about public transport to get people out of their cars. I like the sound of cooperative housing, I am concerned about self build, so far, it has meant large executive homes on green land which takes too much from the natural habitat. I think it would be good to have improved walking and cycling - clearing invasive species and encouraging and planting native species. To designate unused 'council' owned land for wildflower spaces as they have done in Swansea along Fabian Way.
1070	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1070	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	As I have outlined throughout the survey my concern is about the priority and order of importance in relation to Biodiversity in this Deposit Replacement LDP. There appears to be no mention of Biodiversity in this plan where as there was in the last Local Development Plan for Bridgend. Can it be explained why this is? It would appear to have regressed in its priorities if this vital, essential consideration is removed. I find the wording around natural and historic environment to be too nuanced to provide any real protection for biodiversity when it is pitted against economic growth or even lifestyle choices. I am highly concerned by the lack of vision and strategy when we are faced with an extinction of species crisis on such a scale as well as climate change. Habitat loss is a significant factor in fighting carbon emissions, especially in the case of peat areas. I am including some poignant articles which I would like Bridgend Council to consider in their Replacement LDP;- https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/jul/25/the-insect-apocalypse-our-world-will-grind-to-a-halt-without-them?platform=hootsuite https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2020/sep/14/lost-decade-for-nature-as-uk-fails-on-17-of-20-un-biodiversity-targets-aoe https://www.nhm.ac.uk/discover/news/2020/september/uk-has-led-the-world-in-destroying-the-natural-environment.html
1070	

LDP Rep: 1071

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
1071	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
1071	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
1071	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
1071	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
1071	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
1071	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
1071	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1071	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
-----------	--

1071	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1071	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1071	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1071	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I object strongly to any further housing developments in Bridgend as the roads cannot cope with the extra traffic & there arent enough schools, hospitals, doctors & dentists surgeries
1071	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Bridgend has been overdeveloped as it stands. The roads are chaotic. There isnt enough provision within schools, doctors surgeries, dentists or schools.
1071	

LDP Rep: 1073

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	Yes
1073	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	No
1073	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	No
1073	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	No
1073	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	No
1073	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	No
1073	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	No
1073	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	No
1073	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	Yes
-----------	-----

1073	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	Yes
1073	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Yes
1073	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	Yes
1073	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Yes
1073	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Yes
1073	

LDP Rep: 1074

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1074	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1074	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1074	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1074	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1074	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1074	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1074	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1074	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1074	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1074	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1074	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1074	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Re the Bridgend developments. How will the biodiversity of the area and the famous area of Merthyr Mawr be affected by this development. The wildlife (endangered and protected - dormice and bats) and environment cannot be anything but adversely affected by this development. The development will be isolated from the surrounding area - cut off from Bridgend by the busy A48. The lanes and roads around the development will become busy and dangerous without adaptation. I cannot understand how this is being agreed when the clear drive of the Welsh government is towards sustainability and safeguarding the environment. New houses must be built but not at the expense of the environment which will only exacerbate the current climate crisis.
1074	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	I feel that the initial goals set out by the LDP have not been followed. I am hugely disappointed by the plans which seem completely at odds with the sense of determination of the Welsh government to address the current environmental crisis. This plan needs to think outside the box - build on brown field land NOT green land
1074	

LDP Rep: 1075

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1075	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1075	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1075	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1075	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1075	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1075	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1075	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1075	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1075	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1075	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1075	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1075	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1075	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	This will destroy areas natural habitat for animals and plant life. It will completely destroy the natural green corridors that we so need to preserve. It is completely at odds with the primary aims of the development plan and at odds with the aims of the Welsh government towards promoting a green, sustainable future
1075	

LDP Rep: 1077

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	#1and#2 are not supported by the Island Farm development
1077	
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Concentrate on economic regeneration rather than building houses for people who have to travel elsewhere to work otherwise you have barren estates which are empty during the day and congested at peak times
1077	
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	The proposed development alongside the A48 to the south will be cut off from the rest of the town by the A48 and the gridlock we sometimes see at 5 pm will be a daily occurrence
1077	
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	To build houses along the A48 by pass road is neither sustainable nor desirable. Merthyr Mawr and the dipping bridge are a significant asset and they will be irrevocably harmed by this imposition
1077	
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	There are no apparent proposals to improve the infrastructure or to build sustainable communities only the imposition of large housing estates away from local facilities and which impact on existing settlements adversely
1077	
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Building housing estates doesn't attract jobs, healthy, accessible vibrant places generate jobs
1077	
7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	By and large I agree with them
1077	
8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	The first and second sentence of para 5 don't make any sense at all. What are you trying to say?
1077	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Again, you cannot hope to capitalise on the attraction to visitors of Merthyr Mawr and the Ogmore river if you create a sterile suburb cut off from the town, overshadowing one of Bridgend's best attractions
1077	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	None
1077	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	None
1077	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	None
1077	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Points 1 & 2 are anathema to me. Point 3 makes sense as this is brownfield land and I welcome points 5 & 6 . I have no comment on point 5 as it's not somewhere I know
1077	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	As you will have gathered, I agree with the town centre proposals but am totally opposed to building houses for commuters to Cardiff at Island farm as it will negatively impact the environment and the road struvpcure of an area which you have already allowed to become a rat-run for impatient commuters
1077	

LDP Rep: 1078

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1078	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1078	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1078	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1078	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1078	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1078	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1078	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1078	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1078	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1078	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1078	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1078	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Island farm development is a big mistake. They will flood badly.
1078	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1078	

LDP Rep: 1079

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID 1079	SOBJ2 The siting of a Gypsy, travellers and showmans site at Bryncethin. We object as we feel that this is an ill considered location in a residential and established community between Blackmill Road and Dennis Place, it will inevitably result negatively in the well being of our community. Also this land was promised to the residents of Bryncethin as recreational land at the time that the clay hole was filled in. In summary, we believe that BCBC have a duty of care to protect the health and welfare of the residents in Bryncethin, establishing this site will undoubtedly cause unnecessary stress and anxiety.

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID 1079	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID 1079	SOBJ2 The siting of a Gypsy, travellers and showmans site at Bryncethin. We object as we feel that this is an ill considered location in a residential and established community between Blackmill Road and Dennis Place, it will inevitably result negatively in the well being of our community. Also this land was promised to the residents of Bryncethin as recreational land at the time that the clay hole was filled in. In summary, we believe that BCBC have a duty of care to protect the health and welfare of the residents in Bryncethin, establishing this site will undoubtedly cause unnecessary stress and anxiety.

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID 1079	SOBJ2 The siting of a Gypsy, travellers and showmans site at Bryncethin. We object as we feel that this is an ill considered location in a residential and established community between Blackmill Road and Dennis Place, it will inevitably result negatively in the well being of our community. Also this land was promised to the residents of Bryncethin as recreational land at the time that the clay hole was filled in. In summary, we believe that BCBC have a duty of care to protect the health and welfare of the residents in Bryncethin, establishing this site will undoubtedly cause unnecessary stress and anxiety.

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID 1079	SOBJ2 The siting of a Gypsy, travellers and showmans site at Bryncethin. We object as we feel that this is an ill considered location in a residential and established community between Blackmill Road and Dennis Place, it will inevitably result

	negatively in the well being of our community. Also this land was promised to the residents of Bryncethin as recreational land at the time that the clay hole was filled in. In summary, we believe that BCBC have a duty of care to protect the health and welfare of the residents in Bryncethin, establishing this site will undoubtedly cause unnecessary stress and anxiety.
--	---

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1079	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1079	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1079	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	SOBJ2 The siting of a Gypsy, travellers and showmans site at Bryncethin. We object as we feel that this is an ill considered location in a residential and established community between Blackmill Road and Dennis Place, it will inevitably result negatively in the well being of our community. Also this land was promised to the residents of Bryncethin as recreational land at the time that the clay hole was filled in. In summary, we believe that BCBC have a duty of care to protect the health and welfare of the residents in Bryncethin, establishing this site will undoubtedly cause unnecessary stress and anxiety.
1079	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1079	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1079	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1079	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	

1079	
------	--

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	SOBJ2 The siting of a Gypsy, travellers and showmans site at Bryncethin. We object as we feel that this is an ill considered location in a residential and established community between Blackmill Road and Dennis Place, it will inevitably result negatively in the well being of our community. Also this land was promised to the residents of Bryncethin as recreational land at the time that the clay hole was filled in.
1079	In summary, we believe that BCBC have a duty of care to protect the health and welfare of the residents in Bryncethin, establishing this site will undoubtedly cause unnecessary stress and anxiety.

LDP Rep: 1080

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1080	<p>Proposed site: SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds;</p> <p>Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area. Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from</p>

the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 - The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedance on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk. Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmore Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmore) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation. Mark Emery 2 marine drive, CF32 0pj

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
1080	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
1080	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
1080	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
1080	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
1080	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
1080	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID

1080

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

1080

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

1080

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

1080

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID

1080

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

1080

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1080

LDP Rep: 1081

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1081	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1081	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1081	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1081	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1081	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1081	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1081	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1081	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1081	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1081	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1081	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1081	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Education needs to be a welsh school now. There are plenty of other schools
1081	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1081	

LDP Rep: 1082

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1082	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1082	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1082	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1082	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1082	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1082	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1082	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1082	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1082	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1082	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1082	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1082	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	The proposed island farm site will cause a significant uplift in the traffic into this area. With narrow roads and already over congested roads leading into the area it appear unimaginable as to how this will not become a major issue. As a resident of the local area, during high season for tourism the roads are already backed up into bridgend heading towards Ogmere and Southerndown. Congestion right back and beyond the Merthyr Mawr junction is often so bad that it would be impossible for an emergency vehicle to pass into this area. Adding more cars to an already busy road would be a danger.
1082	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	The proposed island farm site will cause a significant uplift in the traffic into this area. With narrow roads and already over congested roads leading into the area it appear unimaginable as to how this will not become a major issue. As a resident of the local area, during high season for tourism the roads are already backed up into bridgend heading towards Ogmere and Southerndown. Congestion right back and beyond the Merthyr Mawr junction is often so bad that it would be impossible for an emergency vehicle to pass into this area. Adding more cars to an already over busy road would be a danger.
1082	

LDP Rep: 1083

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1083	SOBJ1 and 2 are not in line with your proposals to build large numbers of houses at Island Farm and Broadlands roundabout - these will become commuter housing for Cardiff and there is no way that these will be social communities as the Bridgend infrastructure does not support more housing. This is not going to be a healthy community if these houses are built in an area with extremely poor vehicle access. Park Derwen has already manifested itself as a sterile housing estate devoid of greenery.

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1083	Concentrate on economic regeneration not building houses for people to commute to work elsewhere. Bridgend has a poor reputation in retaining well paid jobs. Sony, Fords, now igneos have all gone and the authority has done nothing to attract new business. The only reason people will move into the Borough is that housing is cheaper than Cardiff. They will be commuting out of Bridgend. That in itself will be a problem with the traffic problems that already exist on Ewenny Road from Ewenny to Ewenny roundabout on the A48. How does the council think that building 1000 houses south of the A48 will help the traffic problems.

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1083	The housing built south of the A48 will be cut off from the rest of Bridgend. It will not be integrated. How does the council propose to deal with the transport issues which will be created by this housing? There is no public transport from Island Farm, cars will increase by perhaps up to 1500 in the area in a place where New Inn Road is already a rat run off the A48 and can barely cope with the existing traffic. The impact of these houses on the infrastructure of the area will be huge - GP surgeries already full, roads exceptionally busy, schools will not be able to cope and the green land on the edge of Bridgend used for exercise is being swallowed up by housing. I do not see any to quote your words 'positive impacts and benefits of growth' of building 1000 houses on green fields swallowing up countryside. Who exactly is this benefiting? We do not have a town centre that is fit for anyone, it is rundown and depressing.

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1083	Building 1000 houses south of the A48 is not appropriate to the local context and will not support a sustainable community. These estates isolated from the rest of Bridgend will not have services to make them sustainable. Building 1000 houses is not going to improve the environment in the Island Farm area as it will inevitably destroy some of the natural habitat and biodiversity of this area. We should be protecting this green lung between Bridgend town and Merthyr Mawr and ensure that it is there to be enjoyed by future generations to help their health and well being.

	During lockdowns these areas were used extensively by walkers and others taking exercise. We will be left with a car fumed area and the tranquility and peace destroyed by another housing estate.
--	--

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	Building 1000 houses south of the A48 will not bring opportunities for new infrastructure, education, leisure and transport as there is simply not room on that site. You state that the quality of life of all the county boroughs residents is sustained - you are already taking away an area of beauty where I walk so that my quality of life will not be catered for in this development. You state that the increase in housing supply will act as a key driver of economic growth - I'm not sure how you work this out? In my experience developers will bring their own labour and disappear once finished. Your logic is seriously flawed if you think building houses brings economic growth!
1083	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	As I have already stated, building houses alone does not bring economic growth. In building these huge estates across the borough you are simply providing more housing stock for Cardiff and Swansea. We have already seen the loss of employment on a grand scale in the Borough - Sony, Fords, Igneos and more. I fail to see how by creating more key strategic employment sites you are actually going to attract new business. There are many empty units already and the town centre itself is a disgrace. I think your views of creating growth by building houses and designating employment locations as rather naive. Perhaps you should consider giving more thought to tourism by retaining the countryside and beauty of the Borough rather than building houses all over it.
1083	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	This is a very vague policy on retail development. The town needs some high class and niche retailers to make the town centre a place worth visiting. Bridgend needs to deal with the problem of drug addicts in the town.
1083	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	Paragraph 5 does not make any sense whatsoever. I suggest you rewrite this into English and explain what you mean.
1083	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	Bridgend has some beautiful green areas that the Borough should preserve and it's economic focus should be on promoting tourism, maintaining these landscapes, biodiversity rather than destroying it by building as many houses as possible. Perhaps you should consider how much housing is already in the Borough before building more. There are already huge housing estates - Brackla, Broadlands, Penyfai, Parc Derwen, and more. These are being built with no thought to the environment each one getting more depressing than the last. Parc Derwen for example has barely any greenery outside of the houses. The new estates are built without proper
1083	

	consideration to the number of cars per household because too many houses are crammed in. You say that appropriate development will need to conserve valued countryside but by building 1000 houses you are doing the exact opposite.
--	---

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	No comment
1083	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Land East of Pyle - if this is green sites it should not be built on
1083	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	No comment
1083	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Land south of Bridgend should not be built on. 1000 houses will create a major traffic problem, destroy the biodiversity and green areas.
1083	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	None
1083	

LDP Rep: 1084

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Support the overall vision. Be good to see climate and nature emergencies given greater prominence.. maybe they integrated green infrastructure approach rather than a separate policy for green infrastructure
1084	
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Surely an aging population which has disposable income is also an opportunity for growth. Besides continuous drive for economic growth could displace existing communities?
1084	
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	It's pretty sensible. Must ensure communities are created not the generic major housebuilding sterile developments.. placemaking is key, access to alternative transport (not cars) is key
1084	
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	No. Good job. Let's make them mean something
1084	
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1084	
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Protection of employment is important and not viability arguments and key strategy lost to more residential
1084	
7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1084	
8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Ensuring new developments use renewable energy and don't have to transition later at home owner expense is key. This was all in the last ldp? What happened
1084	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Why is the environment balanced against economic growth? It's a three way balance with society?? That way you incorporate ecosystem services into decision making.. will help us prevent societal collapse from degraded ecosystems and it's symptoms such as climate change
1084	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1084	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Need to prioritise walking and cycling route..
1084	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	Need to prioritise walking and cycling route..
1084	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Need to prioritise walking and cycling route.. Land West of Bridgend and South of Bridgend must not be car dominated but provide alternatives. A48 should stay single lane and will be overwhelmed by these developments
1084	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1084	

LDP Rep: 475

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable): █

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	I think this format is difficult to use and over complicated, which will limit the number of responses.
475	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
475	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	I think regeneration, particularly of the Porthcawl seafront, should not include so many residential properties. That area should be used for the purpose of health and well being for locals and visitors alike, as it was supposed to be.
475	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	A supermarket is not the ideal use of the Salt Lake carpark. Detrimental to the highstreet and depriving tourists of car parking. Not good.
475	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Totally agree with the idea of active travel routes.
475	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	Support local tourism businesses.
475	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Promote small local shops rather than large scale shopping centres. Macarther Glen seems to struggle filling all its stores.
475	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
475	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
--	--

ID	Don't spoil Merthyr Mawr, by building developments too close to the surrounding area.
475	Leave a space between Laleston and Pen y Fai, and don't loose the ancient by-way at Laleston or the circus field.

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
475	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Too many houses on the waterfront. Build for the holiday destination, as once you have built houses, thats it gone forever. Make the seafront somewhere people want to visit, not somewhere for rich people to commute into Cardiff from, or buy as holiday homes.
475	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	Agree. Growth should be encouraged in all the ways mentioned.
475	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Tread carefully around Dipping Bridge, Merthyr Mawr and Laleston. Don't over crowd, and ensure road infrastructure is up to the job.
475	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Over all I am impressed and approve with the majority of the LDP, just concerned with loss of tourism facilities and outdoor leisure facilities in Porthcawl. I visit beaches frequently and find it difficult to park as it is. I can only see it getting worse with the current regeneration plans. Build more housing, schools and retail on the outskirts, add active travel routes to the beaches, but leave room for visitors to park. A pump track would be nice too.
475	

LDP Rep: 1086

Representor Name: ■

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1086	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1086	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1086	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1086	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1086	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1086	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1086	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1086	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1086	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1086	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1086	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1086	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Please protect green spaces on Island farm in Ewenny. The roads in close proximity to Ewenny roundabout are already at a constant standstill most hours of the day. 800 new builds on green land will dramatically worsen this problem. How will local services cope in the near future with all the new housing being built all over Bridgend on green land?
1086	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1086	

LDP Rep: 1087

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Obj1 - you are taking agricultural land instead of brownfield sites, how is this sustainable? Obj1 - how can you claim to protect natural spaces when you're taking them away?
1087	
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	More youthful and skilled? What about us older folks who can't find jobs but are still expected to have to work until they're 67? How is that looking after your aging population?
1087	
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	More pressure on Pencoed? Building on even more grade 2 agricultural land? Houses before infrastructure? Sony in Pencoed is empty - we have to lose jobs before we can "gain" them? Ask yourselves these questions and be truthful.
1087	
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	How are you improving the environment by covering it in concrete?
1087	
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	The proposed development in Pencoed near the cemetery is completely cut off from the village by the dual carriageway. How is that cohesive? You propose new schools and infrastructure. Please don't take money of the developers for these schemes and sit on it so it becomes worthless. Infrastructure first, houses (if they must) second.
1087	
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	What employment exactly? Do you mean the builders? So temporary jobs only? Any big companies coming our way?
1087	
7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	This seems sensible.
1087	
8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Seems sensible.

1087	
------	--

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Not possible. We need to preserve quality agricultural land.
1087	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1087	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1087	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1087	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Taking grade 2 agricultural land is shameful. Future generations will not thank us for it.
1087	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	It's good to see that some things are improving, but unfortunately the permanent and large scale destruction of land we need to feed ourselves is just crazy. There are plenty of brownfield sites to use first. Most of Bridgend town centre could be redeveloped for housing.
1087	

LDP Rep: 1088

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1088	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1088	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1088	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1088	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1088	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1088	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1088	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1088	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1088	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1088	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Building so close to the coast is a bad idea if you believe the predictions of higher tides and flooding There is not enough parking in Porthcawl as it is. People will not be using public transport to get to the beach.
1088	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1088	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Nobody is using the cycle paths on the roundabouts. Stop wasting money. Stinky oppose building around the area south of Broadlands and the A48 and the lasland Farm area. The scenery and wildlife in this area should not be disturbed. Plenty of brownfield sites left to build on...closer to the motorway because everybody has to travel out of Bridgend to work. The A48 south of Broadlands is already too busy and dangerous. The traffic coming off these large estates in the mornings cause massive tailbacks and pollution. It is all the wrong side of the A48 for schools,shops and services
1088	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1088	

LDP Rep: 1089

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1089	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1089	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1089	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1089	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1089	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1089	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1089	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1089	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1089	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1089	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1089	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1089	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Land south of bridgend. Schools overpopulated, more housing, requires more primary and secondary schools or funding to existing schools to manage this demand. Children often turned away, even siblings from Maes y haul due to overcrowding.
1089	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1089	

LDP Rep: 1090

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1090	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1090	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Need to consider the local environmental and transport issue of developing specific area in strategy
1090	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1090	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1090	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1090	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1090	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1090	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1090	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1090	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1090	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1090	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	The situation with saturation of transportation links into Bridgend particularly park Street bottleneck needs to be addressed in any development
1090	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1090	

LDP Rep: 1091

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	There is far too many houses being built in Pencoed. With all the building, no matter how many road improvements Pencoed will become gridlocked. The 'country' atmosphere is being ruined and taken away. Also no matter how much drainage put in place, flooding will still exist.
1091	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	There are plenty of empty units and space on the Waterston and Bridgend Industrial Estate to be used NOT built on surrounding countryside.
1091	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	Again, housing not required
1091	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	Designs are far too modern today and the old designs and culture were far better
1091	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	As previously stated housing is not required. The countryside is being turned into concrete jungles. The council at one point say 'look after the bees, save the bees' then when it suits, sell valuable land for building. Also extra housing etc means more usage of water. We get threatened with water cuts as soon as the sun shines now.
1091	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	As stated enough space and empty units on the Industrial Estates. Make them go there
1091	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	Attention should be on Bridgend Town Centre not out of town retail. Stop online ordering and make car parking free at all times.
1091	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	Give all households wheelie bins and not the pathetic system in place now.
1091	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	With the building of houses etc the countryside and heritage etc will be extinct
1091	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1091	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1091	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
1091	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	Cyclists do not use the cycle routes in Pencoed, and the odd one that does, expect pedestrians to move out of their way. They definitely have an attitude.
1091	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	Sadly the Council looks at easy ways of making money. Council tax is far too high.
1091	

LDP Rep: 1092

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1092	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1092	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1092	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1092	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1092	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1092	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1092	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1092	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1092	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1092	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1092	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1092	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1092	<p>I write to object about the proposed developments in the above areas. The present road infrastructure is incapable of coping with the demands of the volume of traffic that uses the A48, both east and west of Ewenny Roundabout and also Ewenny Road, southbound towards Ewenny and St Brides and the villages of the Vale. With regards to the A48, at times of peak traffic use, vehicles are regularly queuing from Watertown Roundabout to Ewenny Roundabout, when travelling west, and from Broadlands Roundabout to Ewenny Roundabout if travelling in an easterly direction. In addition, at weekends, it is not unusual if travelling from Ewenny Roundabout towards Waterton with the intention of going to the Waterton Retail areas, Tesco etc, to be unable to exit the McDonalds Roundabout from the A48, because of vehicles blocking the nearside lane while they queue to go to the McDonalds Drive Through. Similarly it is not unusual if travelling from Ewenny towards Ewenny Roundabout on the A48 to have to queue from the top of Pottery Hill to the roundabout. It would appear the the reason for this is the timing of the myriad of traffic lights at Ewenny Roundabout which appear to give precedence to the traffic flow on the A48. The additional vehicles that would be added to the roads as result of the construction of almost 1000 houses in the proposed development areas would only add to the congestion that already exists. In addition, New Inn Road has become a "rat run" for drivers attempting to avoid the congested A48 and the imposition of even more vehicles which would become an inevitable consequence of the proposed development would only make the situation worse. New Inn Road has no pavements and is quite narrow with limited visibility but due to its proximity to Merthyr Mawr Village and the Heritage Coast sand dunes it is used by numerous walkers intent on enjoying the benefits of the local beauty spots. The Dipping Bridge, as well as having great historical significance, is used by locals as an informal recreation area. The environs of Merthyr Mawr village stretch from the A48 to the sea and draws in local visitors and tourists alike and is seen by many as the jewel the crown of Bridgend. and an increase in traffic usage will surely affect the enjoyment of walkers and cyclists. Island Farm and the surrounding area is a site of importance for nature conservation and the development in the area will disturb the the environment for protected species such as dormice, which require continuous hedgerows and</p>

	horseshoe bats which will be adversely affected by increased light pollution. On a wider view the addition of more houses and their occupants will impose even more stresses on the local services such as health, education and the responsibilities of BCBC, i.e social services, refuse collection, road and lighting maintenance and if the intention of the proposed development is to make Bridgend the go-to area for business and developers, constraints on the services provided will sure have an adverse affect on that aim. For the above reasons I object to the proposed developments,
--	---

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1092	

LDP Rep: 1093

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1093	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1093	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1093	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1093	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1093	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1093	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1093	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1093	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1093	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1093	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1093	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1093	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1093	<p>Reference the above plans for the two areas I would like to state that I am in total disagreement with the council issuing permission for housing developments for these areas. Both the places are areas of natural beauty and valuable wildlife habitats. Both my wife and I walk these areas at least five times per week and any building work being planned would devastate the area. Furthermore the A48 is highly congested at the present time and to allow further traffic to support more new builds is fundamentally wrong. Thus I/we would like to object in the strongest terms on any planning permission being awarded.</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1093	

LDP Rep: 1094

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1094	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1094	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1094	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1094	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1094	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1094	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1094	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1094	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1094	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1094	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1094	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1094	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1094	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Replacement Local Development Plan. I am a retired Chartered Civil Engineer and have lived in Laleston since 1986, having moved to Bridgend originally in 1979 to supervise construction of the M4 between J35 and J36. My comments are based on the 'Consultation Document' published on the BCBC web site. Although I appreciate the extensive work undertaken to produce this document, I am disappointed that there appear to some fundamental flaws in the basic premises. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is inadequate reason or justification given for the required number of housing units proposed for construction between 2022 and 2033. • The need for additional housing appears to be based on an ambition to create substantial additional local employment that would require this extra housing provision. However, although the document details the existing local employment sites, there is no detail on how the council intends to secure the target quoted of an additional 500 jobs per year. That ambitious figure is, apparently, insufficient to justify the proposed number of new housing units proposed per year. <p>Furthermore, the workforce released from the closure of the Ford plant, who are already resident in the area, will require new employment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document proposes that the target for additional employment is monitored. However, if the target is missed, there is no proposal that the reduction in anticipated employment will result in a corresponding reduction in planning consent for the additional housing proposed in the LDP. Indeed, surprisingly, despite the designated monitoring of numerous 'targets' there is no indication in this draft LDP of a mechanism for reviewing and modifying the rate of new housing required during the period of the plan; either up or – more realistically – down. • The draft LDP refers extensively to local transport links and an ambition to encourage reduction of motor vehicle use but ignores the existing congested bottlenecks on most routes in and around the town centre, particularly in rush hours. The existing congestion is almost certain to cause pollution that exceeds national targets. Adding the substantial additional traffic generated by the proposed additional housing will not only exacerbate the problem but is also contrary to policies stated in the draft LDP. • Anticipated requirements for additional school places are given in the draft LDP for PLA1 – 5 but the derivation of these numbers is not clear. Although proposals for construction of additional Primary School provision are given

for each of these five proposed developments, the only proposals for provision of Secondary Schooling are Section 106 agreements. There is no evidence in the draft LDP of where or how the required additional secondary schooling could be provided, let alone how much this might cost. It appears necessary to resolve these issues in order to determine the values of developer contributions for provision of additional secondary schooling.

- In most developments the numbers of Secondary school places appear inconsistent with the quoted requirement of Primary places. For example, the figures for PLA3 are 251 Primary but only 152 Secondary. I do not understand how 251 Primary children will not, subsequently, require 251 Secondary school places!
- I am not convinced by the bland assurances given in the draft LDP that all the necessary Utilities will be readily available for each development. In particular, I note that the draft LDP confirms that DCWW has already been required to improve sewerage facilities [pg 338, para 5.5.83]. This infers not only failures to comply with regulations but also a potential inability to accommodate the substantial increase in sewerage from the additional housing proposed in the draft LDP. As I live in Laleston, I am most concerned about and object to the proposed development PLA3. I understand that local councillors and others have submitted objections to this development. I have seen some of these objections and endorse and support the points made in them. However, I wish to add the following comments:
 1. Further to the 6th point above, I note that Bryntirion Comprehensive School is not large enough for increased housing requirements for additional secondary school places over the last 10 years. It is difficult to see how it could be expanded to accommodate existing demand; let alone the increased demand for a further 850 housing units. The alternative of providing secondary school places elsewhere is inconsistent with the 'Local Policies' proposed in the draft LDP.
 2. At school start and end times the road past Bryntirion Comprehensive School is congested, which is exacerbated by the existing traffic calming measures. Should the school be expanded to accommodate pupils from an additional 850 housing units, the congestion on the access road would cause pollution far in excess of permitted levels, contrary to the stated aims in the draft LDP. Given the recent coroners ruling in London on the cause of death of a child [air pollution], inappropriate actions by the council – to cause excessive air pollution – could render it liable to financial sanction.
 3. The density of proposed housing in PLA3 appears greater than other proposed developments. PLA4 only appears to contain approximately 15 housing units per ha but PLA3 appears to have 23. Although PLA3 is described as having green space, it appears to be more crowded than other developments, even though it is a green field development.
 4. None of the proposed sites providing employment are close to the proposed development site. Accordingly, provision of housing at this location appears to contravene 'local' policies in the draft LDP.
 5. PLA5 is described as allocated for a comprehensive mixed-use scheme, with a local commercial centre and appropriate supporting infrastructure, including 3 new access points. This appears to be a more viable development site than PLA3 and has a quoted capacity of 2,000 housing units. However, in the draft LDP, only 1,057 are scheduled for construction by 2033. I note that the balance of 973 exceeds the 850 proposed for PLA3. Therefore, I strongly suggest that PLA3 is removed from the current draft LDP, which is modified so that PLA4 accommodates these 850 houses, if required.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1094	
------	--

LDP Rep: 1095

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	No
1095	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	No
1095	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	No
1095	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	No
1095	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	When developing housing it needs to be future proofed in relation to schools, nurseries and play facilities. Coety is an example where this hasn't been done
1095	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	No
1095	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	No
1095	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	No
1095	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Appropriate consultations will need to take place

1095	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	No
1095	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	No
1095	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	No
1095	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	No
1095	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Contracts given out should be done fairly and appropriately scrutinised so that no elected member or paid officer has links to any of those companies
1095	

LDP Rep: 1096

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	I am concerned that the local infrastructure, particularly the road network, will not be able to support the development. The A48 gets very congested at peak periods and adding a significant number of additional vehicles will only further exacerbate the problem.
1096	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	No
1096	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	No
1096	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	No
1096	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	Only to reinforce my comments on the two housing developments.
1096	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	Keeping incoming companies, sponsored by WG or local government, seems to be an issue.
1096	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	Bridgend town centre is an absolute disgrace shopping wise, far too many empty premises.
1096	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	No
1096	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	No
1096	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	No
1096	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	No
1096	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	No
1096	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	No
1096	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	No
1096	

LDP Rep: 1099

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	The LDP clearly does not meet the strategic objectives by nearly offering an abundance of cheaply constructed, poorly maintained and badly designed housing estates. Priority to this seaside town must surely be the provision of leisure facilities and the refurbishment of the existing town's facilities.
1099	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	Nice words no substance. "Build it and they will come" springs to mind. In what specific areas will the growth of 500 jobs per year be attained and what then is the sustainability of these alleged skilled jobs.
1099	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	The apparent abundance of housing development will consume many of the prime seaside locations in Porthcawl. These prime located sites would benefit the community by being utilised for leisure facilities and not mass housing developments.
1099	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	The lack of green spaces shown in your LDP indicates that you have paid scant regard to health and well-being of the residents of Porthcawl. With regards to building design, the developers will only be interested in maximising houses upon the available land to attain maximum profit. The latest housing Bellway housing development in Newton is a prime example of this.
1099	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	When planning was approved for the housing development in Newton the lack of educational and health facilities were discussed by local residents as being an issue for such a large development. The local residents were assured that the health and educational facilities were currently sufficient. Shortly after the development was completed a new health centre was built to allow for the extra population and educational facilities were not extended and are under great pressure. Should new housing facilities go ahead infrastructure should be in place before any additional housing
1099	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	There is no evidence to support the suggestion that new houses would bring new jobs to Porthcawl. Qualified tradesmen would be needed and in all probability these would live elsewhere
1099	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	The last but one paragraph is appropriate to Porthcawl however the LDP for this area does not support this statement
1099	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID
1099

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	The LDP does not support any of the above statements, in fact the planned changes to Porthcawl is in total opposition to the natural and built policies
1099	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID
1099

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	Key proposals for Porthcawl would be welcomed, however they have either been designated to inappropriate areas (housing on salt lake), or minimised and are an omission (public open spaces, leisure, tourism, community facilities and a bus terminal, how ever much needed should not be placed on prime leisure facility areas.
1099	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID
1099

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID
1099

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	I believe that Porthcawl areas should be revisited and professional architects should visit areas such Barry, Tenby and other successful seaside resorts that people would wish to visit and enjoy their facilities. This is an opportunity that has been missed.
1099	

LDP Rep: 1100

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1100	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1100	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1100	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1100	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1100	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1100	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1100	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1100	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1100	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1100	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1100	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1100	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1100	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1100	

LDP Rep: 1101

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1101	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1101	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1101	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1101	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1101	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1101	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1101	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1101	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1101	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1101	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1101	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1101	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1101	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1101	

LDP Rep: 1102

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1102	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1102	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1102	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1102	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1102	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1102	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1102	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1102	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1102	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1102	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1102	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1102	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1102	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1102	

LDP Rep: 1103

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1103	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1103	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1103	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1103	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1103	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1103	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1103	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1103	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1103	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1103	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1103	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1103	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1103	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1103

LDP Rep: 1104

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1104	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1104	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1104	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1104	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1104	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1104	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1104	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1104	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1104	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1104	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1104	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1104	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1104	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1104

LDP Rep: 1105

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1105	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1105	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1105	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1105	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1105	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1105	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1105	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1105	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1105	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1105	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1105	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1105	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1105	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1105

LDP Rep: 1106

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1106	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1106	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1106	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1106	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1106	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1106	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1106	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1106	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1106	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1106	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1106	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1106	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1106	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1106	

LDP Rep: 1107

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Outraged at the planned development at Island Farm because this directly affects my family's quality of life. Living in Priory Ave for over 35 years we have witnessed a real decline which will become unbearable if this and the other large developments in Broadlands and Laleston go ahead. We have witnessed the volume of traffic escalate to saturation point at certain times of the day. There is no way that this area can absorb any increase in traffic numbers!!!!!!!!!! The positioning of MacDonalds, K.F.C. a huge Home Bargains Tesco, etc etc etc in such a confined area where was the forward planning there??????? The litter that this all generates is another matter!!!!!! The volume of traffic from the other direction .. Ewenny Ogmere -by Sea ... is another major issue it is only by the courtesy of some drivers that we manage to drive out of our road. We could easily be stuck there for a considerable while!!!!!!!!!! But who is bothered about quality of life when there are profits to be made!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! There is not the infrastructure schools, doctors etc to support this proposed massive influx of people. Island Farm is a truly glorious area of natural beauty one of our rapidly disappearing green spaces to be enjoyed by all. I could go on and on listing our objections to these proposals because quite simply I can not comprehend how anyone of even average intelligence could think these plans are workable and more importantly are improving this area or the quality of life of its present or proposed residents.
1107	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	Please refer to my previous list of objections.
1107	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Attempting to totally over develop and ruin these areas for everyone.
1107	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	NO ONE COULD SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED THE IMPACT OF TOTALLY OVER WHELMING VOLUMES OF TRAFFIC IN AN ALREADY CONGESTED AREA.
1107	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	OBVIOUSLY NO CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNERS.
1107	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
---	--

ID	THE PROPOSED PLANS ARE OBVIOUSLY FOR PEOPLE WORKING OUTSIDE BRIDGEND. CHEAPER HOUSING THAN CARDIFF BRISTOL ETC
1107	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	LOOK AT THE CONGESTION AT MACDONALD'S ROUNDABOUT TOO LATE WHEN THERE ARE SERIOUS ACCIDENTS.
1107	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1107	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	WHY IS THERE NO PLAN TO SAFEGUARD AREAS SUCH AS ISLAND FARM????????????????????????????
1107	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1107	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1107	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
1107	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	REFER TO PREVIOUS COMMENTS
1107	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	PLEASE FOR ALL OUR SAKES JUST RECONSIDER TO PROTECT THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR US ALL.
1107	

LDP Rep: 1108

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1108	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1108	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1108	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1108	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1108	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1108	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1108	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1108	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1108	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1108	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1108	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1108	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1108	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP. If I wanted to live in an urban area I would have bought a house in Cardiff. No more houses are needed in this area and there is not infrastructure to support it. Those lanes and fields are an escape for people to exercise and retain a sense of mindfulness. Not to mention the plantation and wildlife that live in and around the area. The area belongs to wildlife and not a housing development.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1108	

LDP Rep: 1109

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1109	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1109	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1109	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1109	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1109	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1109	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1109	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1109	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1109	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1109	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1109	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1109	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1109	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1109

LDP Rep: 1110

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1110	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1110	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1110	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1110	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1110	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1110	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1110	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1110	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1110	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1110	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1110	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1110	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1110	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1110

LDP Rep: 1111

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1111	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1111	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1111	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1111	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1111	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1111	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1111	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1111	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1111	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1111	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1111	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1111	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1111	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP. Absolutely ridiculous

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1111	

LDP Rep: 1112

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1112	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1112	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1112	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1112	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1112	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1112	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1112	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1112	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1112	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1112	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1112	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1112	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1112	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1112

LDP Rep: 1113

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1113	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1113	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1113	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1113	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1113	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1113	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1113	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1113	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1113	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1113	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1113	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1113	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1113	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1113

LDP Rep: 1114

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	The vision to create places identified as above is without doubt laudable and I sincerely hope that it comes about satisfactorily.
1114	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	I note 505 homes to be provided per year in the county yet the Porthcawl LDP is to provide in the first instance 1150 homes on Salt Lake /Sandy Bay site, Bridgend 850 on the 'Circus' field site as well as many other sites designated growth areas for housing. This is unbalanced with far more houses to be built in already urbanised areas. I object to this .
1114	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	I fail to see how covering land with housing will benefit the settlements and secure positive impacts.
1114	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
1114	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	As a resident of Porthcawl it would seem that every space in Porthcawl is to be used for housing. I understand that houses are needed but the building programme for Porthcawl particularly means that attractiveness of the town as a 'premier tourist destination' will be denied.
1114	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
1114	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	Please protect our High Streets by making reductions to Business rates to enable them to keep going especially during these very uncertain pandemic times
1114	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
-----------	--

1114	
------	--

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Building on green spaces will destroy much of the natural environment e.g. the Circus field in Laleston
1114	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1114	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	By retail in the Waterfront area I presume you mean the supermarket . I fail to see how a supermarket will enhance the Waterfront. I look forward to the provision of a bus terminus (where?) which should reduce traffic congestion on already congested streets e.g John Street, Mary Street. Improved transport links to Porthcawl and in Porthcawl are vital for residents and tourists. To bring people into the town you have to have safe, free-flowing roadways which at present we do not have. I do not see how a Park and Ride facility from Pyle railway station is going to make things easier for visitors. Cycling routes in Porthcawl particularly along the seafront and New Road are not viable so I welcome improved cycling routes that will actually benefit pedestrians, cyclists and car drivers .
1114	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1114	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1114	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	I am extremely worried about land at Salt Lake / Sandy Bay being used for housing. To build over 1000 houses with all the attendant paraphernalia will be catastrophic in many ways 1. Over intensification of buildings in an area of coastal beauty 2. Increased traffic in an already congested area 3. Increased noise pollution 4. Destruction of an area of natural beauty 5. Removal of parking for the visitors the council hope to persuade to come to Porthcawl (during the summer and on special events days, Salt Lake car park is positively rammed with cars - where are all these people going to park? If it's too much of a burden for them, they won't come, so the idea of making Porthcawl an attractive place for visitors to come and enjoy, goes out of the window. 6. The infrastructure required for this intensification of houses will stretch an already overstretched town with regard to education, medical provision, utilities. I see that you are intending a new Welsh medium 1form entry primary school, plus 4 classrooms for an existing English medium primary (presumably
1114	

Newton Primary ?) but no provision for secondary education. 7. Destruction of natural spaces. It would seem that every available parcel of land is to be built on. 8. Taking away the tennis courts at Griffin Park reduces the availability for sports as per health and well-being. 9. The number of car owners in Porthcawl has increased out of recognition. Many households are now 2 car owners with several owning more. Put that into perspective in a housing estate on Salt Lake. All in all I am extremely worried about what this LDP will mean for Porthcawl particularly and for Bridgend County generally. I sincerely hope you will listen to the responses of Bridgend's residents.

LDP Rep: 1115

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1115	<p>Whilst I appreciate the need to create new homes within Porthcawl, I do not agree with the LDP as regards Salt Lake Car Park or Sandy Bay. Nothing has been put in place for capacity car parking for when the town gets inundated with visitors. We need a beautiful area that attracts more visitors and holiday makers - not people buying top of the range apartments as 2nd homes/holiday lets. Look at Aberavon and Barry Island - get some inspiration for how they have developed their beach fronts. This is what Porthcawl needs to be a premier seaside resort. Create wooden chalets in a natural environment for little local businesses that cannot afford the ridiculous rates for business premises. Use your imagination - it is not all about creating revenue for BCBC. The town cannot cope with the amount of people that will accomodate these residential buildings - there is no road infrastructure that can be created in New road which struggles as is because the road is too narrow in places for 2 way traffic. Sandy Bay should be used for recreation and leisure as it was set aside for - the skatepark that the town wants so badly could go in a section here. There are no leisure facilities for the general public in Porthcawl either.</p>

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1115	<p>If you keep using the "Green" land available then all the individual towns will malgamate into one. No jobs will be provided for residential areas - you will create a further demand on local services such as schools, doctors etc that cannot cope now because of lack of funding.</p>

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1115	<p>The problem here is that you don't provide the adequate infrastructure required or the services needed to allow for the extra numbers. Brown field sites should and can be developed, not the Green sites. This is why people love coming here - the countryside and the beautiful beaches rolled into one.</p>

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1115	<p>I do not approve of any residential buildings on Salt Lake car park or Sandy Bay, I don't approve of the Aldi as it should have been placed in a different location. It will affect the businesses in Porthcawl Town Centre drastically - you should be supporting LOCAL BUSINESSES not foreign ones. Nothing is allocating car parking for the thousands of visitors that come here. Where are they going to park ??? you have not answered this whatsoever. Keep the areas open and pleasant to look at - we need need designs such as Aberavon placed here for our visitors. Nothing in the LDP is creating an amazing seaside resort - open your eyes to what other towns have created - use your imagination - housing is not suitable whatsoever in these locations.</p>

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	Maybe there should be a rule that will stop people buying 2nd homes and holiday lets as our locals are unable to buy here as people from all over the UK are creating empty homes. We need much better community facilities as they are already sadly lacking.
1115	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
1115	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
1115	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1115	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	Conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment is therefore a key function of the Replacement LDP. Appropriate development will need to conserve and enhance valued countryside, landscapes, seascapes and significant geological sites. The Deposit Replacement LDP also seeks to minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide, where possible, net gains in biodiversity whilst protecting or enhancing green infrastructure provision in recognition of its wide ranging benefits. What you have planned for Porthcawl is none of what you have quoted above.
1115	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1115	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	Porthcawl - Residential in a prime seaside location is not needed or wanted in Salt Lake car park or Sandy Bay. Along the front where the funfair is - yes, as it looks run down and dilapidated. The other areas should be recreational, leisure, nature preserving, open and importance to peoples well being.
1115	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
1115	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1115	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	I really wish that BCBC would open their eyes to the potential that Porthcawl could be - we've been run into the ground for too long. We need you to be creating nice open spaces that are enjoyable for the residents, visitors and holiday makers. Use your imagination - look at what other towns - Aberavon, Barry Island, Swansea - have done to create this space and the facilities for people. We don't need or want all of this housing for people that won't even live here. We need greenery, parks, leisure, nice areas, recreational areas, skatepark, paddling pool or water jet areas. It is so sad that you have no foresight of what is best when the people of Porthcawl have made it so clear to you.
1115	

LDP Rep: 1116

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1116	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1116	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	The roads around Bridgend (A48 in particular) are already far too busy. It's almost impossible to join the A48 from Merthyr Mawr Road. People have been killed on the A48 with current traffic levels. The area cannot take any more houses / traffic / sewage / loss of green space etc
1116	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Extra strain on the area's roads / sewage system etc will be detrimental to the environment and people's health and well-being.
1116	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Extra strain on the A48 will not be good for the environment + therefore also not good for health and well-being.
1116	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1116	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1116	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Need improved renewable and low carbon energy and energy efficiency targets and waste management.
1116	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	Island farm, Hut 9, dipping bridge areas need to be preserved as they are to retain their biodiversity, to protect the green infrastructure
1116	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

1116

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

1116

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID

1116

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

1116

Do not touch lands south of Bridgend

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1116

Land south of Bridgend including Island Farm. Already far too much traffic. Already unsafe to cross the A48. Beautiful Merthyr Mawr area must be preserved, not destroyed + made busier. Hut 9 area must be preserved. Wildlife in this area + their habitats must be protected

LDP Rep: 1117

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID 1117	The strategic objectives are in themselves sound and align well to Welsh Government Policy including the Future Generations Act and Wales 2040. However, these objectives should not be used to support urban sprawl on green field land and should be directed at regeneration of existing brown field land and improvement of existing urban centers.

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID 1117	The plan sounds admirable but the County has failed to attract any meaningful jobs in the past years despite seeing the loss of Fords and other large employers. The primary town centre of Bridgend is woeful in what it has to offer and in reality the vast majority of current Bridgend residents go elsewhere for their retail and social needs. In addition, the majority of residents work outside of Bridgend rendering it very much a commuter town. The complete lack of re-development of the Bridgend Town Centre is an obvious omission from the current LDP and is essential if Bridgend is to continue grow as suggested.

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID 1117	Yes: The principles are generally sound although the 'sustainable growth areas' tag seems to be a smoke screen for urban sprawl; The schematic diagram clearly show an anomaly to the south of Bridgend itself where so called sustainable growth is shown occurring south of the A48, its an obvious indication of urban sprawl outside the natural boundary of the A48 into what is historic green field wedge/buffer between the town and the historic environment that is Merthyr Mawr. How this area ref PLA 2 can be considered as a sustainable growth area is beyond belief. The obvious infill expansion zone that appears to have been missed (and the question has to be asked as to why?) is the land to the north of the A48 and south of the A473 linking Laleston to the Broadlands estate, using the natural road boundaries that clearly define an infill space. However, the LA is aware of the congestion currently experienced along the A48 corridor between Broadlands and the Waterton Cross Rdbt. The roads and rdbts along this stretch are way over capacity as indicated by the need for traffic lights at various rdbts, the stacking experienced at the McDonald/KFC rdbt is now regular and occurs most days leading to grid lock which the La seems to do nothing about, its only a matter of time before we have yet more accidents which on this stretch of road is frequent and includes fatalities although again very little has been done to control speed by the LA. Not to mention the already substantial constant stacking on the B4265 approaching the A48 from Ewenny. God forbid the impact on New Road Lane which is used extensively by walkers and cyclist getting away from the A48. The Further sprawl to the south of the A48 (or indeed further expansion of Bridgend Town itself to the south or the west including the suggested infill space toward Laleston) will only exacerbate the road traffic situation leading to more accidents and likely deaths

	<p>on the road along with increased road traffic noise to existing development. With over 800 housing units not matter how well intended, it will bring substantially more road traffic to an already over capacity network. It is easy to write about active travel but this will not prevent the obvious additional traffic use. This development will put enormous pressure on the environment including the existing SINC and will continue to put pressure on adjacent green field land to the south. How can the LA justify this area of development against the Future Generation Act or the leveling up agenda? The level of affordable homes allocation is pitiful at 20%. If the LA wishes to make a difference then this should be closer to 50% if they want to create a fair and equitable place. In reality the space should be left as green field and undisturbed as this is clearly unnecessary urban sprawl. If the LA must develop then omit the residential aspect and develop the space as a green wedge extension to Newbridge fields centered around the relocation of the Heronsbridge school only, providing further excellent amenity to encourage an active population easing links from the town to Merthyr Mawr. the area neither needs nor warrants a further 800 residential units. Again this is simply greed and unnecessary urban sprawl.</p>
--	---

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Placemaking is essential and we have to often got it wrong, many of our existing urban centres need to be re imagined / regenerated and enhanced first to bring a sense of place and wellbeing before the LA starts further expansion.
1117	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	Simply building more homes will not bring economic growth to Bridgend, that is a false statement. Specifically, the primary town centre of Bridgend is dreadful, it has no appeal and very little to offer. Whilst recently there has been one or two new bars and restaurants there is very little else to offer unless you want to drop something to a second hand shop or pick up a takeaway! To generate economic growth you need a thriving town centre that will attract your current substantial residential base, only then will you get economic growth. There is no point in growing if there is no employment and now where decent to go and spend you money. If Bridgend wants to simply be a commuter town, its going the right way about it.
1117	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	This is vital, Bridgend already has a substantial workforce albeit I suspect (but don't know exact numbers, do the LA?) that the vast majority of the existing workforce work outside the County as there is a lack of significant high value employment in the Bridgend County.
1117	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Agree with the above, the regeneration of the current poor quality crop of retail centres is vital to enhance and improve what is on offer to the residents of the LA. The LA should go further and put a moratorium on any out of town development for at least 10 years and get the urban centres back to full force.
1117	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	All development no matter what size should be required to produce an appropriate environmental management plan not just larger developments. This is a very weak statement of intent by the LA. In addition, the LA needs to ensure that renewable generation is at the heart of all development.
1117	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	This is fantastic and I totally agree that the value of the natural environment is indeed of high quality. As a keen cyclist I regularly ride up and down the Bridgend valleys and all across the LA, the green spaces and natural habitat is excellent. It is however a real shame that the LA is ignoring all this and allowing/encouraging urban sprawl south of the A48, an area of particular sensitivity, quiet and calm. Do not hide behind sustainable growth, protect the environment first, the climate emergency demands this.
1117	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	the LA must ensure that jobs and transport links are secured before simply adding more housing stock to avoid just developing sink estates.
1117	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	No
1117	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	No
1117	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	The schematic diagram clearly shows an anomaly to the south of Bridgend itself where so-called sustainable growth is shown occurring south of the A48, it's an obvious indication of urban sprawl outside the natural boundary of the A48 into what is historic green field wedge/buffer between the town and the historic environment that is Merthyr Mawr. How this area ref PLA 2 can be considered as a sustainable growth area is beyond belief. The obvious infill expansion zone that appears to have been missed (and the question has to be asked as to why?) is the land to the north of the A48 and south of the A473 linking Laleston to the Broadlands estate, using the natural road boundaries that clearly define an infill space. However, the LA is aware of the congestion currently experienced along the A48 corridor between Broadlands and the Waterton Cross Rdbt. The roads and rdbts along this stretch are way over capacity as indicated by the need for traffic lights at various rdbts, the stacking experienced at the McDonald/KFC rdbt is now regular and occurs most days leading to gridlock which the LA seems to do nothing about, it's only a matter of time before we have yet more accidents which on this stretch of road is frequent and includes fatalities although again very little has been done to control speed by the LA. Not to
1117	

mention the already substantial constant stacking on the B4265 approaching the A48 from Ewenny. God forbid the impact on New Road Lane which is used extensively by walkers and cyclists getting away from the A48. The further sprawl to the south of the A48 (or indeed further expansion of Bridgend Town itself to the south or the west including the suggested infill space toward Laleston) will only exacerbate the road traffic situation leading to more accidents and likely deaths on the road along with increased road traffic noise to existing development. With over 800 housing units not matter how well intended, it will bring substantially more road traffic to an already over capacity network. It is easy to write about active travel but this will not prevent the obvious additional traffic use. This development will put enormous pressure on the environment including the existing SINC and will continue to put pressure on adjacent green field land to the south. How can the LA justify this area of development against the Future Generation Act or the leveling up agenda? The level of affordable homes allocation is pitiful at 20%. If the LA wishes to make a difference then this should be closer to 50% if they want to create a fair and equitable place. In reality the space should be left as green field and undisturbed as this is clearly unnecessary urban sprawl. If the LA must develop then omit the residential aspect and develop the space as a green wedge extension to Newbridge fields centered around the relocation of the Heronsbridge school only, providing further excellent amenity to encourage an active population easing links from the town to Merthyr Mawr. The area neither needs nor warrants a further 800 residential units. Again this is simply greed and unnecessary urban sprawl. The area ref PLA 3 shows an expansion of development pushing Bryntirion toward Laleston which could be argued to be infill between the two centres. This is a reasonable expansion although I fear it pushes too far to the north and starts to compromise the northern green wedge of the wider Bridgend area. A more linear expansion toward Laleston would be more pragmatic and lessen the impact on the green land to the north. Any enhancement of active travel routes should be welcomed by all, this should include greater reductions in road speeds in and around urban centres. The LA's affordable homes %'s are poor, these should be 40 to 50% not 20%.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	None
1117	

LDP Rep: 1118

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1118	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	It doesn't seem to me that this strategy has worked in the past if you look at the economic growth of Bridgend Town centre. The reverse is true it's in economic decline. Why would more developments reverse this change.
1118	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	The development of site PLA3 will have no positive impact what so ever on the communities of Bryntirion and Laleston. The opposite is true. You say you wish to preserve unique environmental areas and yet you are prepared to destroy ancient oak woodland and boggy areas with its associated flora and fauna. They green areas are use by many local people as walking trails. Never more so than during the pandemic. It is also an area of historical interest containing an ancient ridgeway and neolithic standing stones.
1118	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	How is building 850 houses and creating yet another urban reservation going to improve the environment of PLA3. These green areas with their footpaths have been and still are a an area which help to provide places to improve peoples health and well being. Does walking along streets filled with urban noise or green spaces filled with natural sounds or even silence improve a person's state of mind. Once these are covered over they are gone forever.
1118	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	PLA3 development would greatly add to the traffic flow through the village of Laleston which is already bad. It would also further increase the amount of traffic at the Broadband lights and the A48 and add to the traffic congestion already being experienced there.
1118	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1118	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
---	--

ID	Get out of the office one day and take a walk through what was once a thriving Bridgend town centre and you will see that despite all the housing developments around Bridgend the town centre is a ghost town. The centre is unattractive, seriously in a state of decay in parts and lacks the vitality to attract visitors. Look at the much smaller but vibrant town centre of Treorchy which because of the lack of nearby out of town retail developments is thriving
1118	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1118	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	PLA3 if allowed will put a swathe of concrete through an important historical and environmental landscape. Urbanisation heading closer and closer to the historical village of Laleston destroying the village character. The environmental damage to the local flora in the oak woods and damp areas including species of native orchids and the loss of habitat for buzzards, jays, lapwings etc
1118	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1118	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1118	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1118	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	PLA3 Why does Bridgend need to develop in a westerly direction thus taking away the vital rural buffer between the overpopulated Western edge. We will lose the distinct communities and the identity of Laleston as a village. It will put an increased strain on the already over busy A473. We need to preserve these precious green spaces and look for alternative brownfield site for housing development. Why not look east at Waterton and develop along the A48 with access onto a trunk road which at that stretch is not busy and one in which there are no established communities to merge into reservations and which gives easy access to Cardiff and Swansea via M4
1118	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1118	

LDP Rep: 1119

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1119	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1119	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	The Ogmore valley and schools would greatly benefit from additional land additions to encourage more use of outdoors. Activities such as developing 'forest schools' could be implemented.
1119	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1119	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	An excellent idea as we have recently has a growth of new families to the area, but housing isn't always of any acceptable standard or size for the amount of people living in them. As an example, one of our families is lining in a very small terraced house with six children as well as a friend of the family. The house is damp, putting an asthmatic child at risk.
1119	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1119	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1119	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1119	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

1119

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

1119

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

1119

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID

1119

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

1119

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1119

LDP Rep: 1120

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Yes
1120	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1120	<p>Have studied the LDP , I feel it is totally inappropriate for the development of Porthcawl for the following reasons : A) car parking. Taking away Sakt Lake Car Park deprives the town of its largest parking area. We currently have major issues with parking when all grass areas , residential streets , common land is used to park. The removal of Salt Lake will make this much much worse b) access - Porthcawl has 2 roads in and out. Both get jammed on busy days. The erection of 1200 new houses will only increase this problem C). Porthcawl is an area of natural beauty and as BCBC claims is its jewel in the crown. To destroy public open space with housing developments will destroy this forever d). The town does not have the infrastructure for all these extra houses ie. doctors , dentists, etc etc. It is currently very difficult to arrange a doctors appointment and the LDP will accentuate that issue e) the area under consideration offers an opportunity to move Porthcawl forward as a tourist destination. But NOT with housing. That does nothing to enhance the resort. It needs to be leisure, recreation etc. I am all for improving the area as currently Cosy Corner and the Glamorgan Holiday Hotel are an absolute eyesore. I also have no objection to Aldi. However the town is desperately short of hotels , leisure space and attractions. Cosy Corner and Salt Lake Car Park could be utilised for Aldi, a new hotel, car parking and tourist attractions which we are desperately short of. Turning it into a housing development will destroy the town Build the houses/apartments on the fairground , move the fair towards Trecco Bay and use Sandy Bay for extra parking etc Please consider residents and tourists alike. This offers a once in a lifetime opportunity to improve Porthcawl and make one of the countries prime tourist destinations. It has been kicked in the 1950s for too long and dragged down by the councils lack of foresight and investment. For the sake of future generations , please do not destroy this town with unnecessary commuter homes and consider alternatives which will hugely enhance this area</p>

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1120	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1120	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID

1120

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID

1120

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID

1120

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID

1120

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

1120

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

1120

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

1120

Comments listed in previous section. The proposals for the Salt Lake Car Park area are completely inappropriate for all the reasons given and will destroy the town as a tourist destination, for residents and deprive a huge opportunity to move forward with recreational and leisure facilities, hotel accommodation which is desperately needed etc. Car parking is a major issue and will be made much worse as will access. The infrastructure of this town cannot cope with another 1200 homes

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID

1120

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

1120

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1120

LDP Rep: 1121

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1121	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1121	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1121	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1121	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1121	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1121	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1121	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1121	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1121	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1121	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1121	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1121	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1121	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1121	

LDP Rep: 1122

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1122	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1122	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1122	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1122	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1122	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1122	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1122	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1122	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1122	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1122	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1122	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1122	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1122	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1122	

LDP Rep: 1123

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1123	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1123	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1123	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1123	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1123	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1123	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1123	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1123	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1123	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1123	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1123	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1123	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1123	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1123

LDP Rep: 1124

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1124	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1124	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1124	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1124	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1124	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1124	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1124	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1124	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1124	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1124	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1124	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1124	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1124	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

• The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous. o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated. o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards. • In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP. I fully endorse all of the above but would like to add the following opinion. The proposed development will only benefit the investor and have a detrimental effect on the local flora and fauna of the proposed area, which is an essential asset to the local area. Before such sites are used for development all the other brownfield sites should be considered eg, the empty properties in the town centre above businesses which exist and would benefit from refurbishment and would improve the appearance and prosperity of the town centre - possibly be more affordable accommodation. Also the areas existing near the Waterton roundabout and the redundant factory sites of the Ford Engine plant etc which already have an infrastructure of roads and services. This would prevent any further unnecessary greenfield sites being spoiled. In summary it is not necessary to use up green areas until all the other options have been developed, if indeed they are necessary at all or feasible.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1124	

LDP Rep: 1125

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Dont see protection of natural and dustintive areas losing the Salt lake to residential and retail development denys Porthcawl if a green space which has recently come back from a long lease to straight away be sold to another lease holder without serious consideration to the tiwns people and future generations this land can be better used. Visually the scenery will be destroyed to benefit a few rather than all residents and tourists alike There are better more ideal places for a suoer market ie Hillsborough carpark (less of a blot on the landscape) land to the side of the wilderness (better road links and high volume of residents and tourists for the camp site) fiels along newton nottage rd
1125	
2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	This is a diverse and well balanced population we are all aging but the are always youth behind with good opportunities colleges and universities in near cities
1125	
3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	Every area that sees development of housing need green infastructure, education, social facilities, trabsport etc with no compromise
1125	
4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Who decides the high quality well thought out design, we havnt seen this in Porthcawl
1125	
5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	No leisure centre in porthcawl and given the proposed house building plan this is some thing that shoukd be considered either a lido and exercise facilities in the open or a pavilion style building housing a gym, changing facilities fir water sports abd wet weather facilities soace fir seasonal events do not see this in the plan or regeneration schene for Porthcawl
1125	
6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1125	
7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	Porthcawl has a thriving tiwn centre no empty shops and when there is these are snapped up by enterprising young people
1125	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	Renewable energy and waste efficiency targets need to be sustained and maintained
1125	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	Supermarket on salt lake will impact wildlife habitats build as high as you like on the fun fair with no impact on anyone Hotels apartments abd restaurants would serve as a alternative to salt lake
1125	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1125	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	Yes they ar not fit for purpose
1125	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
1125	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
1125	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1125	

LDP Rep: 1126

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1126	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1126	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1126	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1126	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1126	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1126	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1126	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1126	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1126	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1126	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1126	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1126	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1126	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

• The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous. o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated. o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards. • In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP. I fully endorse all of the above but would like to add the following opinion. The proposed development will only benefit the investor and have a detrimental effect on the local flora and fauna of the proposed area, which is an essential asset to the local area. Before such sites are used for development all the other brownfield sites should be considered eg, the empty properties in the town centre above businesses which exist and would benefit from refurbishment and would improve the appearance and prosperity of the town centre - possibly be more affordable accommodation. Also the areas existing near the Waterton roundabout and the redundant factory sites of the Ford Engine plant etc which already have an infrastructure of roads and services. This would prevent any further unnecessary greenfield sites being spoiled. In summary it is not necessary to use up green areas until all the other options have been developed, if indeed they are necessary at all or feasible.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1126	

LDP Rep: 1127

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1127	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1127	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1127	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1127	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1127	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1127	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1127	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1127	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1127	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1127	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1127	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1127	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1127	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1127	

LDP Rep: 1128

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	No
1128	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	I would hope that the council begins to provide adequate housing for families.
1128	Currently new flats have been developed on what were small pieces of land that were previously attractive areas of greenery. However I believe houses with gardens should be built in appropriate areas like the land that was previously a council run campsite. We should learn from the recent pandemic two bedroom houses with a garden are more beneficial to parents/single parents with children. Apartments/flats without gardens do not aid the wellbeing of the individual

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	I agree with the above strategies to meet the needs of these communities.
1128	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Housing should meet the needs of the young and old. Small bungalows with small gardens/courtyards should be considered for over 65year olds. It is always good to have out door space possible around a quadrangle with a community garden in the middle of the quadrangle with seating outside the front of each house so that you can have a social gathering outdoors in fine weather.
1128	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	I believe that there needs to be improved transport links for the town of Porthcawl. Consideration should be given to local schooling, however schools should be developed to encourage children to walk to school. Schools that need additional transport eg school buses to transport children from outside the Porthcawl area only adds additional pressure to a limited access entry to the town not to mention the pollution levels of the environment. Thought need to be given to improving the parking in Porthcawl. If serious thought is being given to the infrastructure then improvements to the roads in and around Porthcawl need serious repair. A multi-storey car park should be built on the car park behind B and M or another location in that area of town.
1128	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	

1128	It is good to see some new businesses coming into Porthcawl we should encourage these independent businesses to use some of the empty banks and shops in the town.
------	--

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	It would be good to have community centre to support activities like U3A in the town centre. The old Barclays Bank or Nat West Bank would make ideal centres to be divided into smaller meeting rooms. These could be hired out at a reasonable cost of £10 - £15per hour a communal coffee shop inside could provide extra income. This could be a good way of generating money for the council. Evening classes in craft/cookery skills could be run by volunteers to encourage the next generation to develop skills that are no longer on the school curriculum.
1128	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	I think we need to continue to educate people on recycling. An improvement for the residents of the county borough is to have a clear list of what plastics are recyclable e.g. can you recycle black/ble/brown plastic containers? If not why not? The council should have a comprehensive page on their website that clearly states what can be recycled in the weekly collections. The council should be putting pressure on our Welsh Government to challenge all supermarkets in their use of plastic in fresh products. It would be good if the council could use the food waste to produce energy for local libraries/leisure centre re heating to reduce the cost of running these centres there donating them more sustainable.
1128	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	We should continue to invest in these areas the council should also look to build and support community/voluntary groups to assist the council in its plans for future development.
1128	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	No
1128	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	I am in agreement with the proposals.
1128	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	No
1128	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
-----------	--

1128	
------	--

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	I have no further comments
1128	

LDP Rep: 1129

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1129	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1129	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1129	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1129	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1129	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1129	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1129	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1129	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1129	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1129	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1129	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1129	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1129	<p>We are residents of Island Farm Road who has recently been informed of the new proposals by Merthyr Mawr Estates as an alternative LDP for the land surrounding Island Farm Road. I believe the community council are voting week commencing 26th July on whether this alternative is LDP proposal will be submitted on behalf of the community residents on the 27th July. We have been on your website and noticed that our current chair is Councillor Iona McLaggan, can you confirm she has no relationship with Rory McLaggan of Merthyr Mawr Estates who has submitted the most recent LDP alternative proposal for the land at Island Farm please? If she is, we believe there is a conflict of interest and therefore she should not be part of any voting process regarding the Merthyr Mawr Estate proposal, we are am hoping she abstains from any voting regarding this matter. Furthermore, we cannot access the minutes on the website for the meeting on the 21st July. Please can we have a copy emailed to us. We oppose any development of housing on Island farm and would want you, our local council, to fight against any proposal that will blight our environment, create traffic congestion, reduce air quality and add additional stress to what is already a heavily burdened infrastructure e.g. access to GP services, not offer an alternative! We also feel that there has been no thought given to the impact on the residents in terms of light, noise and traffic pollution should there be residential housing placed behind our property. We are aware of the bats that are residents of hut no9, they have up to a 2.6km feeding ground that we feel will be significantly impacted on should the Merthyr Mawr Estate proposal or the Council LDP proposal go ahead. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing</p>

development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1129

LDP Rep: 1130

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1130	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1130	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1130	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	Proposed site: SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds; Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover.
1130	

This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area. Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 - The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedence on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk. Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmore Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmore) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
1130	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
1130	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
1130	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1130	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
1130	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1130	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1130	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	
1130	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	
1130	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1130	

LDP Rep: 857

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
857	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
857	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
857	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
857	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
857	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
857	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
857	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
857	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

857	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
857	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
857	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
857	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
857	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Proposed site: SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds;
857	<p>Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe</p>

bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area. Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 - The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedance on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk. Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmores Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmores) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

LDP Rep: 1131

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1131	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1131	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1131	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1131	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1131	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1131	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1131	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1131	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1131	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1131	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1131	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1131	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1131	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	I'd like to apply my opposition against the proposed housing development at Craig-y-parcau. Not only will the natural environment in that area be significantly damaged, but the traffic would be detrimental to the dipping bridge. Safety wise, this is a popular route I take to walk my dog and the extra traffic is not welcome. The bridge is blind as it is and safety would be a big concern the more cars this area gains. I love this area and do not want to see it damaged. Overall, I'm in favour of extra housing but not at the cost of natural beauty.
1131	

LDP Rep: 1132

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1132	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1132	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1132	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1132	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1132	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1132	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1132	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1132	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1132	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1132	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1132	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1132	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1132	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	We are writing this mail to affirm our opposition to the proposed Island Farm Development and particularly the latest updated proposal from Merthyr Mawr Estate, that I understand, is not on the agenda. We will never support any proposal that fundamentally changes the existing Cul de sac nature of Island Farm Road and Close.
1132	

1133	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1133	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1133	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1133	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1133	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1133	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental</p>

capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

LDP Rep: 1134

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1134	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1134	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1134	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1134	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1134	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1134	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1134	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1134	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1134	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1134	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1134	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1134	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1134	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1134	

LDP Rep: 1135

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	More houses are needed and to make it commercially viable they need to be in areas people may complain about, but to sell its all about location. But please remember public facilities like bus links doctors schools and roads all need to be updated.
1135	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	Remember more infrastructure needed
1135	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	Keep up the good work
1135	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	Make sure the builders are as green as possible
1135	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	Affordable houses is good but needs to be a balance
1135	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	More local jobs is always good
1135	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	Shops are reducing replace with warehouses and houses
1135	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	More is needed
1135	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	No issue
1135	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	Good idea
1135	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Good idea
1135	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	Good idea but how many people own bikes? Cars need to be priority
1135	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Open the town centre
1135	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Good work overall
1135	

1136	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1136	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1136	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1136	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1136	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1136	

LDP Rep: 1137

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1137	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1137	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1137	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1137	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1137	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1137	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1137	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1137	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1137	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1137	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1137	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1137	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1137	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1137	

LDP Rep: 1138

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1138	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1138	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1138	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1138	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1138	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1138	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1138	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1138	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1138	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1138	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1138	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1138	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1138	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1138

LDP Rep: 1139

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1139	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1139	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1139	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1139	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1139	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1139	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1139	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1139	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1139	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1139	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1139	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1139	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1139	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1139

LDP Rep: 1141

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1141	<p>The plan to build over a thousand dwellings in Porthcawl seems contrary to SOBJ1 as the number of dwelling will likely mean that will no Key Issues, drivers, vision and objectives A range of national, regional and local key issues and drivers have been identified as part of the Replacement Local Development Plan (LDP) process. These have directly informed development of the Deposit Replacement LDP vision and objectives: vision for 2033, council priorities and spatial vision. The LDP vision will be delivered through the achievement of four strategic objectives: SOBJ1: To create high quality sustainable places (placemaking) SOBJ2: To create active, healthy, cohesive and social communities SOBJ3: To create productive and enterprising places SOBJ4: To protect and enhance distinctive and natural places The strategic objectives have been defined to reflect identified key issues, align with national policy and ensure an appropriate balance between the different elements of sustainability.</p> <p>They are cross-cutting in their nature and also cross-reference the goals and objectives of the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 and Bridgend Local Well-being Plan. In turn, the vision and four strategic objectives are supported by 35 specific objectives. The objectives will also form part of the basis for monitoring the implementation of the plan, once adopted and operational. The key issues and drivers identified through the Deposit Replacement LDP preparation process have directly informed the development of the LDP vision and objectives. Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan? t be high quality, if they are, they will not represent affordable housing in Bridgend County. They will likely be bought up as holiday lets which will not help to house local people. The plan to build so many dwellings also appears contrary to SOBJ2 as any land that could provide leisure facilities will presumably be used for housing, thus the space to keep healthy and active and to develop cohesive communities though leisure activities, will be diminished. If the vast majority of land is used for housing where is the space to develop productive enterprises as per objective SOBJ3? How will the plan to develop a housing estate on the land behind New Road, adjacent to the Hi Tide, protect and enhance the sand dunes? This is a distinctive and natural place, but it is not clear how objective SOBJ4 will be fulfilled.</p>

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1141	<p>Where will the jobs come from? How will young people able to afford housing in Porthcawl? Jobs could be created in the Leisure industry by focussing on the creation of leisure facilities and visitor attractions in Porthcawl, rather than the emphasis being on housing.</p>

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	

1141	<p>With the proposed 1000+ dwellings this will doubtless increased the flow of traffic in and out of Porthcawl. Currently there are only three routes in and out of Porthcawl, and only two to get to the sea front, both of which go through major residential areas. What assessment of the increase flow of traffic, has been made on the impact that it will have on the quality of life for existing residents? What plans are there to provide adequate parking spaces for each of the proposed new dwellings? If it is proposed to increase the number of younger, working residents in Porthcawl, they will need to commute. Current public transport does not meet a hugely increased need and as already stated, I doubt that, with the advent of electric cars, we will give up private ownership of vehicles anytime soon. In terms of preparing Porthcawl for the future, what plans are there to include electric vehicle charging points for each new dwelling? With the proposed number of new dwellings, assuming that they provide affordable residential housing, there will be an increased strain on local services in Porthcawl such as the local schools and Doctors surgery, not to mention the increased strain on the local hospitals due to the influx of new residents across the entire County. It is unlikely that new housing in Porthcawl will provide affordable housing for residents in Bridgend County. Wouldn't it be better fo focus on providing leisure and tourism facilities, to provide jobs and to increase the economy through visitor input.</p>
------	--

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1141	<p>If the plan is to make Porthcawl a premier seaside destination, resources need to be spent on leisure facilities and spaces to develop small businesses that will attract visitors. The residents of Porthcawl, have for years been asking for a public swimming pool; this would help to achieve SOBJ2 by provide a space to keep fit by swimming. As a regular swimmer, I also know how this helps to develop a social community. It would also reduce travel by car to other pools in the County. There need to be facilities for young people, both visitors and residents, for outside activities. I know that there is great interest in providing a Pump Track in Porthcawl. Surely facilities such as these would help to achieve the above objectives better. The Goodsheds in Barry is a fantastic example of how Porthcawl could provide sustainable, productive and enterprising spaces that would serve both residents and attract visitors. A small coffee shop built from a reclaimed shipping container has recently been set up near the Hi Tide; we are also lucky enough to have a Zero Waste Shop, both of which are excellent examples of sustainability and enterprise, provided by a small local businesses. The Transformation of the Jennings building into a wonderfully sociable, cafe area, with the improved harbour facilities, is another excellent example of the potential of Porthcawl. BCBC needs to provide more spaces for opportunities such as this, to provide services for residents and to attract visitors. Currently, although Salt Lake is not an attractive area, it provides much needed parking space for both visitors and residents, during the peak tourist season and for events such as the Elvis Festival, the Bonfire Night Fireworks display and the Porthcawl 10k. There must be much more consideration given to this issue. With the advent of electric cars, it is unlikely that we, as a nation, will give up our independent means of transport; the parking issue will not go away. If parking space is reduced in the town centre, there will likely be increased congestion in residential areas and on the remaining open spaces, as was the case with parking on Locks Common in the recent spell of hot weather; this is clearly contradictory to SOBJ4, particularly with regard to the wildlife that inhabits the grassland. The idea of a Park and Ride outside Porthcawl, does not appear to take into account the volume of traffic it needs to accommodate, further this</p>

	<p>is not an appealing option for visitors to Porthcawl, who are likely to still want to park nearer the beaches. With reduced parking spaces, parking will be an issue for residents too, as they jostle with visitors for spaces. We might find ourselves in a ridiculous situation, when in summer months, residents have to drive out to the park and ride, in order to park to use town centre facilities! A solution to this could be to build housing on the land earmarked for the Park and Ride (which will doubtless be more affordable than housing built on the seafront) and invest in leisure facilities, cafe culture, small businesses and parking in the town. If Porthcawl is to become a premier tourist destination, it needs investment as a tourist destination, not a housing development. In my opinion, thought should also be given to providing more upmarket tourist facilities. We have wonderful facilities for tourists in Trecco Bay and such visitors are “bread and butter” for many local businesses, but it would be good to see other types of visitors catered for. It seems to me that although making Porthcawl an premier seaside resort, is stated as a goal, there is precious little of substance in the proposed plans. I would like to see a Tourism Strategy for Porthcawl along side the proposed development plans. Past planning decisions for Porthcawl town have made me very sceptical of the BCBC planning department. Take for example the hideous “Bottle Bank” which replaced the Esplanade Hotel, and the awful and incongruous extension to “The Rest”. I am concerned that there will be an influx of flat roofed apartment blocks that will completely change the character of the town.</p>
--	---

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
1141	<p>If the plan is to make Porthcawl a premier seaside destination, resources need to be spent on leisure facilities and spaces to develop small businesses that will attract visitors. The residents of Porthcawl, have for years been asking for a public swimming pool; this would help to achieve SOBJ2 by provide a space to keep fit by swimming. As a regular swimmer, I also know how this helps to develop a social community. It would also reduce travel by car to other pools in the County. There need to be facilities for young people, both visitors and residents, for outside activities. I know that there is great interest in providing a Pump Track in Porthcawl. Surely facilities such as these would help to achieve the above objectives better. The Goodsheds in Barry is a fantastic example of how Porthcawl could provide sustainable, productive and enterprising spaces that would serve both residents and attract visitors. A small coffee shop built from a reclaimed shipping container has recently been set up near the Hi Tide; an excellent example of sustainability and enterprise, provided by a small local business. The Transformation of the Jennings building into a wonderfully sociable, cafe area, with the improved harbour facilities, is another excellent example of the potential of Porthcawl. BCBC needs to provide more spaces for opportunities such as this, to provide services for residents and to attract visitors. Economic growth for Bridgend, should optimise facilities for leisure and tourism in Porthcawl, to generate income, rather than focussing on a huge housing project that is unlikely to provide affordable homes for local people.</p>

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
1141	<p>As previously stated, investment in tourism, rather than housing, would be a better option for Porthcawl. Improved leisure facilities would attract visitors and provide employment. The land earmarked for housing is a prime site for building leisure facilities, such as a Pump Track, cafés, sustainable shops, a boutique hotel and/or</p>

	perhaps facilities for rainy days such as a small public swimming pool or small cinema. Porthcawl could be made a place that appeals to a wider range of visitors by providing a wider variety of facilities. This would provide much needed income to the town and would increase employment opportunities for local people. This would, in my opinion provide greater economic opportunity than housing that's unaffordable to most local people, which will likely be bought up by investors and remain empty for a large proportion of the year. Further, if the land is taken up with housing, what will there be in Porthcawl to attract visitors?
--	--

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	So how do the proposals to build 1000+ dwellings along the seafront in Porthcawl, support the need for the above? All the town has been offered so far is housing and a budget supermarket. Where will the community open spaces and leisure facilities be? What will there be to attract businesses? The plans so far, seem to lack enthusiasm and vision. Porthcawl already has a wonderful community feel, but this could be enhanced by providing more sociable community spaces, with provision for leisure and spaces for small businesses. If all the town gets are houses and no facilities, there will be no provision for life outside of work, which will not foster health and vitality.
1141	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Haven't had time to read this fully so can't comment
1141	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	If parking space is reduced in Porthcawl town centre, there will likely be increased congestion in residential areas and on the remaining open spaces, as was the case with parking on Locks Common in the recent spell of hot weather; this is clearly contradictory to SOBJ4, particularly with regard to the wildlife that inhabits the grassland. Past planning decisions for Porthcawl town have made me very sceptical of the BCBC planning department. Take for example the hideous "Bottle Bank" which replaced the Esplanade Hotel, and the awful and incongruous extension to "The Rest". I am concerned that there will be an influx of flat roofed apartment blocks that will completely change the character of the town. The policing of tree felling and wildlife conservation needs to be more rigorous as has been recently highlighted by the felling of trees on the old St John's School site and the old funeral home in South Road, as well as the burning of a building containing a colony of bats. Construction should not be at the expense of protecting the environment. In terms of Future Generations the environment is paramount.
1141	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1141	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1141	<p>Without the time to read all the related documents, it is very difficult to make any informed decision. There has been very little in the way of public engagement regarding the regeneration of Porthcawl. The residents should be much more widely involved, there are many talented and creative people in our community, who could provide valuable input to the regeneration process. The consultation period has been way to short; if the reason for not extending it, really is due to COVID-19, this is appalling; this should be exactly the reason to extend it. BCBC have done very little to make residents away of their plans, which is equally appalling; most people I know, myself included, have only become aware via small community groups on Social Media and via our Conservative MP! To summarise, * I object to the proposals for over 1000 new dwellings on Salt Lake and Behind Sandy Bay. I am not opposed to providing housing, but this is too much and is unlikely to be affordable to most local people. * There needs to be much more emphasis on providing and improving leisure and small businesses facilities for both residents and for attracting visitors. * Greater thought needs to be given to town centre parking facilities. * There needs to be much more open engagement with residents. * The consultation period has been to short, considering the complexity of the LDP and associated documents, particularly without public meetings. * The proposal will change the nature of Porthcawl, from seaside town to housing estate. I appreciate that there may be aspects of my response that do not entirely fit the remit of the current consultation, but this is symptomatic of the lack of knowledge and confusion, over the proposals for the future development of Porthcawl, faced by many residents. The plan to build over a thousand dwellings in Porthcawl seems contrary to SOBJ1 as the number of dwelling will likely mean that will not be high quality, if they are, they will not represent affordable housing in Bridgend County. They will likely be bought up as holiday lets which will not help to house local people. The plan to build so many dwellings also appears contrary to SOBJ2 as any land that could provide leisure facilities will presumably be used for housing, thus the space to keep healthy and active and to develop cohesive communities though leisure activities, will be diminished. If the vast majority of land is used for housing where is the space to develop productive enterprises as per objective SOBJ3? How will the plan to develop a housing estate on the land behind New Road, adjacent to the Hi Tide, protect and enhance the sand dunes? This is a distinctive and natural place, but it is not clear how objective SOBJ4 will be fulfilled. With the proposed 1000+ dwellings this will doubtless increased the flow of traffic in and out of Porthcawl. Currently there are only three routes in and out of Porthcawl, and only two to get to the sea front, both of which go through major residential areas. What assessment of the increase flow of traffic, has been made on the impact that it will have on the quality of life for existing residents? What plans are there to provide adequate parking spaces for each of the proposed new dwellings? If it is proposed to increase the number of younger, working residents in Porthcawl, they will need to commute. Current public transport does not meet a hugely increased need and as already stated, I doubt that, with the advent of electric cars, we will give up private ownership of vehicles anytime soon. In terms of preparing Porthcawl for the future, what plans are there to include electric vehicle charging points for each new dwelling? With the proposed number of new dwellings, assuming that they provide affordable residential housing, there will be an increased strain on local services in Porthcawl such as the local schools and Doctors surgery, not to mention the increased strain on the local hospitals due to the influx of new residents across the entire County. It is</p>

unlikely that new housing in Porthcawl will provide affordable housing for residents in Bridgend County. Wouldn't it be better to focus on providing leisure and tourism facilities, to provide jobs and to increase the economy through visitor input. Currently, although Salt Lake is not an attractive area, it provides much needed parking space for both visitors and residents, during the peak tourist season and for events such as the Elvis Festival, the Bonfire Night Fireworks display and the Porthcawl 10k. There must be much more consideration given to this issue. With the advent of electric cars, it is unlikely that we, as a nation, will give up our independent means of transport; the parking issue will not go away. If parking space is reduced in the town centre, there will likely be increased congestion in residential areas and on the remaining open spaces, as was the case with parking on Locks Common in the recent spell of hot weather; this is clearly contradictory to SOBJ4, particularly with regard to the wildlife that inhabits the grassland. The idea of a Park and Ride outside Porthcawl, does not appear to take into account the volume of traffic it needs to accommodate, further this is not an appealing option for visitors to Porthcawl, who are likely to still want to park nearer the beaches. With reduced parking spaces, parking will be an issue for residents too, as they jostle with visitors for spaces. We might find ourselves in a ridiculous situation, when in summer months, residents have to drive out to the park and ride, in order to park to use town centre facilities! A solution to this could be to build housing on the land earmarked for the Park and Ride (which will doubtless be more affordable than housing built on the seafront) and invest in leisure facilities, cafe culture, small businesses and parking in the town. If Porthcawl is to become a premier tourist destination, it needs investment as a tourist destination, not a housing development. In my opinion, thought should also be given to providing more upmarket tourist facilities. We have wonderful facilities for tourists in Trecco Bay and such visitors are "bread and butter" for many local businesses, but it would be good to see other types of visitors catered for, as well as residents. It seems to me that although making Porthcawl an premier seaside resort, is stated as a goal, there is precious little of substance in the proposed plans. I would like to see a Tourism Strategy for Porthcawl along side the proposed development plans. In terms of improved cycling and walking routes please, please, make them separate! Currently it is difficult to determine the cycle paths from the pavement in Porthcawl. I would suggest a raised kerb between the two. Perhaps make the cycle paths the same height as the road, but separated by a kerb, then have a normal raised pavement. The current system makes it unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists. Past planning decisions for Porthcawl town have made me very sceptical of the BCBC planning department. Take for example the hideous "Bottle Bank" which replaced the Esplanade Hotel, and the awful and incongruous extension to "The Rest". I am concerned that there will be an influx of flat roofed apartment blocks that will completely change the character of the town. If the plan is to make Porthcawl a premier seaside destination, resources need to be spent on leisure facilities and spaces to develop small businesses that will attract visitors. The residents of Porthcawl, have for years been asking for a public swimming pool; this would help to achieve SOBJ2 by provide a space to keep fit by swimming. As a regular swimmer, I also know how this helps to develop a social community. It would also reduce travel by car to other pools in the County. There need to be facilities for young people, both visitors and residents, for outside activities. I know that there is great interest in providing a Pump Track in Porthcawl. Surely facilities such as these would help to achieve the above objectives better. The Goodsheds in Barry is a fantastic example of how Porthcawl could provide sustainable, productive and enterprising spaces that would serve both residents and attract visitors. A small

	<p>coffee shop built from a reclaimed shipping container has recently been set up near the Hi Tide; an excellent example of sustainability and enterprise, provided by a small local business. The Transformation of the Jennings building into a wonderfully sociable, cafe area, with the improved harbour facilities, is another excellent example of the potential of Porthcawl. BCBC needs to provide more spaces for opportunities such as this, to provide services for residents and to attract visitors. Economic growth for Bridgend, should optimise facilities for leisure and tourism in Porthcawl, to generate income, rather than focussing on a huge housing project that is unlikely to provide affordable homes for local people. As previously stated, investment in tourism, rather than housing, would be a better option for Porthcawl. Improved leisure facilities would attract visitors and provide employment. The land earmarked for housing is a prime site for building leisure facilities, such as a Pump Track, cafés, sustainable shops, a boutique hotel and/or perhaps facilities for rainy days such as a small public swimming pool or small cinema. Porthcawl could be made a place that appeals to a wider range of visitors by providing a wider variety of facilities. This would provide much needed income to the town and would increase employment opportunities for local people. This would, in my opinion provide greater economic opportunity than housing that's unaffordable to most local people, which will likely be bought up by investors and remain empty for a large proportion of the year. Further, if the land is taken up with housing, what will there be in Porthcawl to attract visitors</p>
--	--

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1141	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1141	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1141	<p>Without the time to read all the related documents, it is very difficult to make any informed decision. There has been very little in the way of public engagement regarding the regeneration of Porthcawl. The residents should be much more widely involved, there are many talented and creative people in our community, who could provide valuable input to the regeneration process. The consultation period has been way too short; if the reason for not extending it, really is due to COVID-19, this is appalling; this should be exactly the reason to extend it. BCBC have done very little to make residents aware of their plans, which is equally appalling; most people I know, myself included, have only become aware via small community groups on Social Media and via our Conservative MP! The online response form is awful! The visible space provided for comments is too small and there is no facility to save responses in order to return at a later opportunity. Hence my frequent repetition of comments. I appreciate that there may be aspects of my response that do not entirely fit the remit of the current consultation, but this is symptomatic of the lack of knowledge and confusion, over the proposals for the future development of Porthcawl, faced by many residents.</p>

LDP Rep: 1142

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1142	<p>These objectives are laudable. Immediately to locals though they are only credible when seen through the reality of their application to current plans, notably the Island Farm and beyond, Development. The proposed plan to develop land at Island Farm and towards Merthyr Mawr doesn't seem compatible with the objectives 2-4 above. (Not having seen housing specs cannot comment on sustainability in terms of build, though access issues seem to impact upon "sustainability".) The proposed development seems to be destructive in terms of quality of life and local identity of existing residents...likely creating a corridor of housing for Cardiff via access to M4. Much loved local habitat and recreational areas will be destroyed and very special places transformed to a non-descript housing estate. It seems incredibly short-sighted and fuels local view that those with money and expensive lawyers can basically override locals' priorities. In fact objective 4 is not possible in relation to this proposed development. To add insult the area marked "Natiere Reserve" is actually a floodplain where buildings cannot be constructed.</p>

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1142	<p>There is a balance to be considered between this increase in housing and destruction of environment. There must be brown-field sites to be redeveloped in the area. Surely those would be more compatible with sustainability. A lack of vision that future generations will be critical of.</p>

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1142	<p>As a starting point there should be greatest focus upon developing urban areas...bringing people closer to existing amenities...and reducing reliance upon cars and being mindful of retaining community identities. (As an observation the Spatial Strategy should be something into which is much local input...but documents like this must be impenetrable to many of the people affected! Inevitably, there is also subjectivity in the interpretation of some of the phrasing...referencing of a value-system that not everyone would concur with eg there are terms like "greatest positive impacts" which needs clarification and there are phrases within it that beg questions when applied to specifics proposals eg"infrastructure improvements". What for instance might an infrastructure improvement to the A48 look like!)</p>

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1142	<p>Clearly, development should be sympathetic with surrounding area: so many new developments all look the same. Good design must be as eco-friendly as possible...with electric car pods, natural/eco insulation and solar panels etc Focus should be upon the materials being used in the construction. What people "want" should be tempered by other considerations.</p>

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	Am concerned about the link acknowledged above between house-building (ie the interests of private developers, by and large) and being able to secure the accompanying infrastructure needed for communities. Certainly doesn't feel that the quality of our existing communities' lives is being "sustained" or even genuinely being a consideration.
1142	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	Like the other strategies...it is vague and aspirational. Basically, yes it is sensible to retain lots of options.
1142	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	It would be good to see dwellings developed the town centre and post Covid the opportunities for outside cafes. CO-working spaces are a good idea. Anything that reduces need for travel is good! (I just worry about the accuracy of profiling of residents/users of these town centre facilities.. I don't feel it reflects me but only a specific demographic...to which I don't feel I belong!)
1142	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	With climate change now undeniable we should be doing all we can to recycle, re-use and re-purpose. This should be one of our main aims as a community.
1142	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	If we trash our local environment it will have gone for good: we need vision and realise that preservation of it makes the area more attractive. If we spoil what we have it will in the end damage economic growth in the area.
1142	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	No
1142	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	No
1142	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID	No
1142	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID 1142	<p>Yes. Only feel qualified to comment on my surrounding area: I despair at the potential destruction of open spaces and the destruction of habitat for wildlife. (It is insulting that the area on the proposed diagram marked Nature Reserve is actually a floodplain that cannot be built upon!) I feel that whilst acknowledging the massive, no doubt, financial difficulties faced by the Council, that ultimately developers are the ones who will profit from this development and that in many ways existing residents will be the poorer. Am already thinking whether I will want to remain living here if the places I am familiar with are ruined. Traffic is already a huge problem in and around Bridgend. We all know the impact on health from that! The roads are dangerous. Many of us know have known individuals injured and worse on the A48. (I have also heard ...rumours, I guess...that there are plans for an alternative route likely to be put forward by developers involving Heronstone Lane...Am hoping there is no truth in this! Destruction of yet more sensitive habitat and areas of historical significance...directly opposite to the objectives set out at the start of this survey.) Island Farm has not been respected and much of the potential there re tourist-focus, site of historical note has been largely lost. Many local residents like myself feel powerless...knowing that in the end developers get their way. Always the case that those large moneyed companies with expensive lawyers can trump local interests. Incidentally, to me the profile of the "local resident" who is being catered for here is narrow and rather stereotypical. It is one-dimensional...and suggests that local identity is worth sacrificing for vague expressions of economic gain and promises of infrastructure that will not otherwise materialise. It is no wonder that locals despair! "Locals" will not be the main beneficiaries. If the proposed numbers of houses are built at Island Farm...then that is it...there will be nothing to stop encroachment further towards the coast. On so many levels this is wrong. So to sum up counter reasons to this include: traffic congestion; destruction of habitat and historical sites; a disregard for locals' quality of life and values because of a false premise; a disregard for identity; the prioritising of vague "economic growth" above all other considerations; the antithesis of the Council's stated objectives and it being "the thin end of a very thick wedge!".</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID 1142	<p>I think I would just be repeating the comments in the previous section. Note: I am not against economic growth and aware that financial cuts must be crippling Councils. Neither do I think I am a NIMBY. I do however think my views to be representative of many residents. As I have said in body of survey, I think many people would be put off from airing their views when confronted only with language used in the writing of official documents like the strategies and LDP. There must be a way to make information more accessible to the people directly affected.</p>

LDP Rep: 1143

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1143	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1143	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1143	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1143	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1143	<p>In relation to Penyfai: • GREEN SPACE: Residents believe the LDP should recognise and mark both the Pheasant Field (Pen y fai Kick about area - NHCC CAT Transfer for 35 years) and Cavendish Park BOTH as green leisure spaces. o I request these green spaces be recognised and marked as such in the published LDP. • TRAVELLER/ROMA SITE COURT COLMAN: There is a small settlement proposed in Court Colman (SP7 (1) for the Travelling /Roma community - the key for which appears to be missing on the plans. The ward of Aberkenfig already has a site less than 1 mile away form the one proposed. Also the LDP plans to place one in Bryncethin. I understand the need for such sites for the travelling /Roma community, but am opposed to the current plan concentrating on the ward and immediate area, particularly in a rural area of natural beauty (near Pennsylvania Woods). The area is a valued ecological / habitat area which, in a network to surrounding sites and woodlands, contributes to wider biodiversity. I ask BCBC to consider other options for placing this site outside of the wards. o I am opposed to this and wish for a more appropriate site to be considered. • 'SMALL DEVELOPMENTS: Smaller scale developments in recent years have eroded green space, ecologically rich habitats, and changed the face of our community as well as put additional pressure on infrastructure. This fundamentally flies in the face of what the LDP (this one and the previous on) states it will not do. Additionally such developments often fail to make a full case that they are meeting the overall objectives of the LDP. There seems to be a lack of consideration of sustainable communities and the Wellbeing of Future</p>

	<p>Generations Act within the plan. The LDP notes that 'small developments' may be placed in Penyfai, but fails to clearly identify potential places / candidate sites and therefore I do not feel it is a complete or sufficient consultation document for Penyfai area. I wish it to be noted that I am opposed to 'small scale' developments and believe this should be removed from the plan. Permitted householder developments would be acceptable. Further housing developments are not required in village. Experience has shown where small developments have been built previously (and most recently Colman Vale), it has not added any positive social or economic value or impact or benefit to the community whatsoever. In fact, it has put more pressure on our village roads, created more environmental disruption, huge inconvenience to residents and damage to householders property and grass verges that have been carefully planted up by NHCC using residents precept payments over the years. It has created further unnecessary pressure on the infrastructure in terms of the local school and health care services. There are still no safe routes to schools and there is no safe walking route to the 'economically regenerated' sites such as Bridgend Town Centre from the village community - it would not be sustainable development. Many parents are forced to pay for buses or use their own vehicles to get their children safely to school (whether that be the catchment school or others). o My view is the LDP should delete small scale developments as permissible in Penyfai Village.</p>
--	---

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1143	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1143	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1143	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	
1143	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1143	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1143	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1143	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1143	<p>In relation to PLA3 Land West of Bridgend, Locally known as the “Circus Field” (and surrounding) site I hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. · The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. A further 850 house would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles and the statements made within the LDP. · Potentially the site could erode the boundary /wedge with Court Coleman and Newcastle Higher Ward as this urbanisation could create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area’s boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west. · Even housing stock deemed as ‘affordable housing’ in this area would likely be beyond the means of most young persons due to the nature of the area. · Infrastructure is not in place and would be unable to cope. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. · Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. · Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. · The site forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. · This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage · The proposed site is crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Proposals for “corridors” would not mitigate the impact and loss. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. · No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. · Park Street is known as an area that is struggling with pollution, exacerbated by the heavy traffic utilising that main road, this is of concern, as is the volume of traffic that will likely increase through the Cefn Glas lane through Pen y fai</p>

	<p>Village in the aim to bypass Park Street congestion and to access the M4. · The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous :- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated. o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a “natural” boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
--	---

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1143	<p>In summary we are against this proposal as it goes against much of what the LDP says it is trying to achieve - this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. Other sites in Bridgend County may be better placed to support a development of this nature, with less impact. General observations on the wider planning issues: I have observed developers can, and have made arguments after planning consent has been granted, to reduce the levels of social housing based on financial viability and profits and to negotiate changes in conditions. This should not be allowed to continue. Similarly Section 106 monies are not benefitting areas where development and disruption takes place, and is often reneged on; community voices in relation to Section 106 monies are not represented. Road adoption is an issue on new developments, and maintenance of sites at points where they have not been adopted is creating problems and unsafe routes creating hazards and falls risks. Additionally, the plan as a whole could and should be more ambitious in terms of the figures/percentages for social housing, and developers should be expected to deliver a higher percentage that that proposed. Bridgend County appears to have become a commuter County and young people cannot afford to stay and get on the property ladder. In terms of economic regeneration, we should be aiming to keep more young people employed and living locally with truly affordable housing..</p>

LDP Rep: 1144

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1144	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1144	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1144	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1144	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1144	<p>In relation to Penyfai: • GREEN SPACE: Residents believe the LDP should recognise and mark both the Pheasant Field (Pen y fai Kick about area - NHCC CAT Transfer for 35 years) and Cavendish Park BOTH as green leisure spaces. o I request these green spaces be recognised and marked as such in the published LDP. • TRAVELLER/ROMA SITE COURT COLMAN: There is a small settlement proposed in Court Colman (SP7 (1) for the Travelling /Roma community - the key for which appears to be missing on the plans. The ward of Aberkenfig already has a site less than 1 mile away form the one proposed. Also the LDP plans to place one in Bryncethin. I understand the need for such sites for the travelling /Roma community, but am opposed to the current plan concentrating on the ward and immediate area, particularly in a rural area of natural beauty (near Pennsylvania Woods). The area is a valued ecological / habitat area which, in a network to surrounding sites and woodlands, contributes to wider biodiversity. I ask BCBC to consider other options for placing this site outside of the wards. o I am opposed to this and wish for a more appropriate site to be considered. • ‘SMALL DEVELOPMENTS: Smaller scale developments in recent years have eroded green space, ecologically rich habitats, and changed the face of our community as well as put additional pressure on infrastructure. This fundamentally flies in the face of what the LDP (this one and the previous on) states it will not do. Additionally such developments often fail to make a full case that they are meeting the overall objectives of the LDP. There seems to be a lack of consideration of sustainable communities and the Wellbeing of Future</p>

	<p>Generations Act within the plan. The LDP notes that 'small developments' may be placed in Penyfai, but fails to clearly identify potential places / candidate sites and therefore I do not feel it is a complete or sufficient consultation document for Penyfai area. I wish it to be noted that I am opposed to 'small scale' developments and believe this should be removed from the plan. Permitted householder developments would be acceptable. Further housing developments are not required in village. Experience has shown where small developments have been built previously (and most recently Colman Vale), it has not added any positive social or economic value or impact or benefit to the community whatsoever. In fact, it has put more pressure on our village roads, created more environmental disruption, huge inconvenience to residents and damage to householders property and grass verges that have been carefully planted up by NHCC using residents precept payments over the years. It has created further unnecessary pressure on the infrastructure in terms of the local school and health care services. There are still no safe routes to schools and there is no safe walking route to the 'economically regenerated' sites such as Bridgend Town Centre from the village community - it would not be sustainable development. Many parents are forced to pay for buses or use their own vehicles to get their children safely to school (whether that be the catchment school or others). o My view is the LDP should delete small scale developments as permissible in Penyfai Village.</p>
--	---

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1144	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1144	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1144	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	
1144	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1144	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1144	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1144	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1144	<p>In relation to PLA3 Land West of Bridgend, Locally known as the “Circus Field” (and surrounding) site I hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. · The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. A further 850 house would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles and the statements made within the LDP. · Potentially the site could erode the boundary /wedge with Court Coleman and Newcastle Higher Ward as this urbanisation could create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area’s boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west. · Even housing stock deemed as ‘affordable housing’ in this area would likely be beyond the means of most young persons due to the nature of the area. · Infrastructure is not in place and would be unable to cope. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. · Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. · Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. · The site forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. · This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage · The proposed site is crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Proposals for “corridors” would not mitigate the impact and loss. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. · No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. · Park Street is known as an area that is struggling with pollution, exacerbated by the heavy traffic utilising that main road, this is of concern, as is the volume of traffic that will likely increase through the Cefn Glas lane through Pen y fai</p>

	<p>Village in the aim to bypass Park Street congestion and to access the M4. · The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous :- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated. o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a “natural” boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
--	---

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1144	<p>In summary we are against this proposal as it goes against much of what the LDP says it is trying to achieve - this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. Other sites in Bridgend County may be better placed to support a development of this nature, with less impact. General observations on the wider planning issues: I have observed developers can, and have made arguments after planning consent has been granted, to reduce the levels of social housing based on financial viability and profits and to negotiate changes in conditions. This should not be allowed to continue. Similarly Section 106 monies are not benefitting areas where development and disruption takes place, and is often reneged on; community voices in relation to Section 106 monies are not represented. Road adoption is an issue on new developments, and maintenance of sites at points where they have not been adopted is creating problems and unsafe routes creating hazards and falls risks. Additionally, the plan as a whole could and should be more ambitious in terms of the figures/percentages for social housing, and developers should be expected to deliver a higher percentage than that proposed. Bridgend County appears to have become a commuter County and young people cannot afford to stay and get on the property ladder. In terms of economic regeneration, we should be aiming to keep more young people employed and living locally with truly affordable housing..</p>

LDP Rep: 1145

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	Detrimental to wildlife, green spaces and natural environment. Does not seem to be any vision!
1145	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	We do not have room in Bridgend county for continual development. We are supposed to be preseving our green open spaces and heritage. A concrete jungle will not encourage people to put down roots in the area. Encouraging new industry to empty brown field sites and retail to fill our town centre again is the way to grow Bridgend. There are so many unemployed here already.
1145	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	There is not adequate infrastructure to support any of the most recent developments.
1145	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	Not sure how 'overcrowding' of a town supports peoples health and well being!! The most succesful towns have thriving town centres and plenty of green spaces.
1145	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	I wish to reiterate that housing development in Bridgend already does not support the infrastructure! Also PLEASE do not be responsible for eradicating our already diminishing natural environment. What happened to protection of green field sites?
1145	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	Look at all the empty buidings in town. Look at how retail can be encouraged back into the town centre. And also look at how some of the larger empty buildings can be used for manufacturing. Manufacturing doesn't have to be huge scale! Make business affordable.
1145	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	More house building sites will not regenerate the town centre. Existing house building has not done so.
1145	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1145	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	It sounds as though the proposals are to retain the minimum natural and historic environment. How is this a good policy?
1145	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID	
1145	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID	
1145	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID	
1145	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID	Improved public transport seems the only good idea.
1145	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	Listen to local constituents
1145	

LDP Rep: 1146

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
1146	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
1146	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
1146	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
1146	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
1146	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
1146	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
1146	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1146	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
-----------	--

1146	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1146	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1146	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1146	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1146	<p>To whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council We the undersigned hereby object to this proposal and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP on the following grounds. 1= The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development . 2 = Overload to the existing local infrastructure with its already busy and clogged up roads. (Assuming each house has approximately 1.5 vehicles , total would be an extra 1275 vehicles at least), such an increase would put further traffic on the A473 junction with Elm Crescent and Heol Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau and the A48 Broadlands roundabout already strained to capacity. 3 = Overload to our local N H S' services e.g. Doctors and Dentists . (These always seem so busy at present it is difficult to obtain an appointment). 4 = This development would coalesce the Community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston which is NOT in the best interests of the local people. Also it would be contrary to the current Planning principles. 5 = Such a scheme of some 850 houses etc. (What this etc will be is not clear) would swamp the village of Laleston with its individual character and separateness in Bridgend County. 6 = This proposal is criss-crossed. by Public Rights of Way which are used and valued by local people . These ancient rights of way would be lost forever. 7 = Llangewydd Road and it, s surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridge-way , a medieval pilgrims way and a drivers road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on the site. 8 = This very large (Some 850 dwellings etc ?.) development is not necessary in this area of the west side of Bridgend. This part of Bridgend has had some 3000 new houses added over recent years . This is already a disproportionate amount for the area. It would surely be unfair and poor,,planning to add such a large number of houses to this area . Even with a proposed portion of houses being so-called " affordable housing " even these would be beyond the means of most young people of today . 9 = Infrastructure is not in place to support further development . For example the local Comprehensive School , has not yet caught up with the house building of the previous decade . The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints . Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Other</p>

	aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services etc, have not been adequately addressed.
--	---

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
--	--

ID	
1146	

LDP Rep: 1147

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1147	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1147	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1147	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1147	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1147	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1147	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1147	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1147	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1147	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1147	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1147	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1147	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1147	<p>To whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council We the undersigned hereby object to this proposal and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP on the following grounds. 1= The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development . 2 = Overload to the existing local infrastructure with its already busy and clogged up roads. (Assuming each house has approximately 1.5 vehicles , total would be an extra 1275 vehicles at least), such an increase would put further traffic on the A473 junction with Elm Crescent and Heol Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau and the A48 Broadlands roundabout already strained to capacity. 3 = Overload to our local N H S' services e.g. Doctors and Dentists . (These always seem so busy at present it is difficult to obtain an appointment). 4 = This development would coalesce the Community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston which is NOT in the best interests of the local people. Also it would be contrary to the current Planning principles. 5 = Such a scheme of some 850 houses etc. (What this etc will be is not clear) would swamp the village of Laleston with its individual character and separateness in Bridgend County. 6 = This proposal is criss-crossed. by Public Rights of Way which are used and valued by local people . These ancient rights of way would be lost forever. 7 = Llangewydd Road and it, s surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridge-way , a medieval pilgrims way and a drivers road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on the site. 8 = This very large (Some 850 dwellings etc ?.) development is not necessary in this area of the west side of Bridgend. This part of Bridgend has had some 3000 new houses added over recent years . This is already a disproportionate amount for the area. It would surely be unfair and poor,,planning to add such a large number of houses to this area . Even with a proposed portion of houses being so-called " affordable housing " even these would be beyond the means of most young people of today . 9 = Infrastructure is not in place to support further development . For example the local Comprehensive School , has not yet caught up with the house building of the previous decade . The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints . Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Other</p>

	aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services etc, have not been adequately addressed. sewerage, drainage, NHS services etc., have not been adequately addressed.
--	--

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1147	

LDP Rep: 1148

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1148	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1148	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1148	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1148	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1148	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1148	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1148	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1148	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1148	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1148	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1148	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1148	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1148	<p>To whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council We the undersigned hereby object to this proposal and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP on the following grounds. 1= The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development . 2 = Overload to the existing local infrastructure with its already busy and clogged up roads. (Assuming each house has approximately 1.5 vehicles , total would be an extra 1275 vehicles at least), such an increase would put further traffic on the A473 junction with Elm Crescent and Heol Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau and the A48 Broadlands roundabout already strained to capacity. 3 = Overload to our local N H S' services e.g. Doctors and Dentists . (These always seem so busy at present it is difficult to obtain an appointment). 4 = This development would coalesce the Community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston which is NOT in the best interests of the local people. Also it would be contrary to the current Planning principles. 5 = Such a scheme of some 850 houses etc. (What this etc will be is not clear) would swamp the village of Laleston with its individual character and separateness in Bridgend County. 6 = This proposal is criss-crossed. by Public Rights of Way which are used and valued by local people . These ancient rights of way would be lost forever. 7 = Llangewydd Road and it, s surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridge-way , a medieval pilgrims way and a drivers road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on the site. 8 = This very large (Some 850 dwellings etc ?.) development is not necessary in this area of the west side of Bridgend. This part of Bridgend has had some 3000 new houses added over recent years . This is already a disproportionate amount for the area. It would surely be unfair and poor,,planning to add such a large number of houses to this area . Even with a proposed portion of houses being so-called " affordable housing " even these would be beyond the means of most young people of today . 9 = Infrastructure is not in place to support further development . For example the local Comprehensive School , has not yet caught up with the house building of the previous decade . The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints . Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Other</p>

	aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services etc, have not been adequately addressed. sewerage, drainage, NHS services etc., have not been adequately addressed.
--	--

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1148	

LDP Rep: 1149

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1149	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1149	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1149	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1149	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1149	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1149	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1149	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1149	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1149	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1149	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1149	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1149	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1149	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Dear Sir/Madam, Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Please find below my rebuttal and objection to the allocation of PLA2 and COM1 (2) south of the A48 in the Bridgend LDP for Housing and Growth Allocation. Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ - maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through place making; - reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; - provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; - guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and - ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. BCBC have previously identified Island Farm as SINC allocation requiring management and protection, due to the diversity of animal and plant life identified on the site. The last SINC review was conducted in 2011, and since that time the ecological importance of the site has grown. Apart from protected species such as doormice and bats there are an abundance of orchid species and various fauna and flora on site. There is a thriving hedgehog population that enjoys hibernation and feeding stations in the gardens of Island Farm Road and Island Farm Close. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48
1149	

would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. The agricultural value of the land has been played down and it continues to be a productive and important contribution to farming output in the area. Once its gone, its gone and we will lose an important open space that contributes to the wealth of the area. Over years the fields are renowned for the presence and appearance of sink holes due to underground streams and mineral deposits. It is clearly not suitable for the building of houses, and could in fact be dangerous for future residents, who would look to the Council for compensation. I have photographic evidence to support the presence of sink holes in the area designated for housing under the plan. The current road network is not capable of supporting such a large scale development. Once normal daily travel has resumed post pandemic, the A48 and Ewenny roundabout will be at a gridlock if this proposal is agreed. Local services are stretched to beyond that which they can cope with. Whilst the plan provides growth in school allocation there is no mention of GP, dental, or other important community services, all of which have shrunk due to government austerity measures. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural

	lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough. My position is to reject the proposal in relation to land at PLA2 and COM1(2) in the revised LDP. Thank you,
--	--

LDP Rep: 1150

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1150	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1150	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1150	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1150	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1150	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1150	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1150	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1150	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1150	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1150	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1150	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1150	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1150	<p>To whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council We the undersigned hereby object to this proposal and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP on the following grounds. 1= The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development . 2 = Overload to the existing local infrastructure with its already busy and clogged up roads. (Assuming each house has approximately 1.5 vehicles , total would be an extra 1275 vehicles at least), such an increase would put further traffic on the A473 junction with Elm Crescent and Heol Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau and the A48 Broadlands roundabout already strained to capacity. 3 = Overload to our local N H S' services e.g. Doctors and Dentists . (These always seem so busy at present it is difficult to obtain an appointment). 4 = This development would coalesce the Community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston which is NOT in the best interests of the local people. Also it would be contrary to the current Planning principles. 5 = Such a scheme of some 850 houses etc. (What this etc will be is not clear) would swamp the village of Laleston with its individual character and separateness in Bridgend County. 6 = This proposal is criss-crossed. by Public Rights of Way which are used and valued by local people . These ancient rights of way would be lost forever. 7 = Llangewydd Road and it, s surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridge-way , a medieval pilgrims way and a drivers road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on the site. 8 = This very large (Some 850 dwellings etc ?.) development is not necessary in this area of the west side of Bridgend. This part of Bridgend has had some 3000 new houses added over recent years . This is already a disproportionate amount for the area. It would surely be unfair and poor,,planning to add such a large number of houses to this area . Even with a proposed portion of houses being so-called " affordable housing " even these would be beyond the means of most young people of today . 9 = Infrastructure is not in place to support further development . For example the local Comprehensive School , has not yet caught up with the house building of the previous decade . The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints . Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Other aspects of</p>

	infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services etc, have not been adequately addressed. sewerage, drainage, NHS services etc., have not been adequately addressed.
--	---

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1150	

LDP Rep: 1151

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1151	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1151	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1151	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1151	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1151	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1151	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1151	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1151	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1151	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1151	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1151	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1151	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1151	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Dear Sir/Madam, Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Please find below my rebuttal and objection to the allocation of PLA2 and COM1 (2) south of the A48 in the Bridgend LDP for Housing and Growth Allocation. Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘· maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through place making; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. BCBC have previously identified Island Farm as SINC allocation requiring management and protection, due to the diversity of animal and plant life identified on the site. The last SINC review was conducted in 2011, and since that time the ecological importance of the site has grown. Apart from protected species such as doormice and bats there are an abundance of orchid species and various fauna and flora on site. There is a thriving hedgehog population that enjoys hibernation and feeding stations in the gardens of Island Farm Road and Island Farm Close. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48
1151	

would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. The agricultural value of the land has been played down and it continues to be a productive and important contribution to farming output in the area. Once its gone, its gone and we will lose an important open space that contributes to the wealth of the area. Over years the fields are renowned for the presence and appearance of sink holes due to underground streams and mineral deposits. It is clearly not suitable for the building of houses, and could in fact be dangerous for future residents, who would look to the Council for compensation. I have photographic evidence to support the presence of sink holes in the area designated for housing under the plan. The current road network is not capable of supporting such a large scale development. Once normal daily travel has resumed post pandemic, the A48 and Ewenny roundabout will be at a gridlock if this proposal is agreed. Local services are stretched to beyond that which they can cope with. Whilst the plan provides growth in school allocation there is no mention of GP, dental, or other important community services, all of which have shrunk due to government austerity measures. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural

	lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough. My position is to reject the proposal in relation to land at PLA2 and COM1(2) in the revised LDP. Thank you,
--	--

LDP Rep: 1152

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1152	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1152	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1152	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1152	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1152	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1152	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1152	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1152	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1152	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1152	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1152	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1152	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1152	<p>To whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council We the undersigned hereby object to this proposal and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP on the following grounds. 1= The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development . 2 = Overload to the existing local infrastructure with its already busy and clogged up roads. (Assuming each house has approximately 1.5 vehicles , total would be an extra 1275 vehicles at least), such an increase would put further traffic on the A473 junction with Elm Crescent and Heol Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau and the A48 Broadlands roundabout already strained to capacity. 3 = Overload to our local N H S' services e.g. Doctors and Dentists . (These always seem so busy at present it is difficult to obtain an appointment). 4 = This development would coalesce the Community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston which is NOT in the best interests of the local people. Also it would be contrary to the current Planning principles. 5 = Such a scheme of some 850 houses etc. (What this etc will be is not clear) would swamp the village of Laleston with its individual character and separateness in Bridgend County. 6 = This proposal is criss-crossed. by Public Rights of Way which are used and valued by local people . These ancient rights of way would be lost forever. 7 = Llangewydd Road and it, s surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridge-way , a medieval pilgrims way and a drivers road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on the site. 8 = This very large (Some 850 dwellings etc ?.) development is not necessary in this area of the west side of Bridgend. This part of Bridgend has had some 3000 new houses added over recent years . This is already a disproportionate amount for the area. It would surely be unfair and poor,,planning to add such a large number of houses to this area . Even with a proposed portion of houses being so-called " affordable housing " even these would be beyond the means of most young people of today . 9 = Infrastructure is not in place to support further development . For example the local Comprehensive School , has not yet caught up with the house building of the previous decade . The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints . Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Other aspects of</p>

	infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services etc, have not been adequately addressed. sewerage, drainage, NHS services etc., have not been adequately addressed.
--	---

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1152	

LDP Rep: 1153

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1153	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1153	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1153	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1153	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1153	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1153	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1153	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1153	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1153	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1153	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1153	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1153	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1153	<p>To whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council We the undersigned hereby object to this proposal and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP on the following grounds. 1= The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development . 2 = Overload to the existing local infrastructure with its already busy and clogged up roads. (Assuming each house has approximately 1.5 vehicles , total would be an extra 1275 vehicles at least), such an increase would put further traffic on the A473 junction with Elm Crescent and Heol Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau and the A48 Broadlands roundabout already strained to capacity. 3 = Overload to our local N H S' services e.g. Doctors and Dentists . (These always seem so busy at present it is difficult to obtain an appointment). 4 = This development would coalesce the Community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston which is NOT in the best interests of the local people. Also it would be contrary to the current Planning principles. 5 = Such a scheme of some 850 houses etc. (What this etc will be is not clear) would swamp the village of Laleston with its individual character and separateness in Bridgend County. 6 = This proposal is criss-crossed. by Public Rights of Way which are used and valued by local people . These ancient rights of way would be lost forever. 7 = Llangewydd Road and it, s surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridge-way , a medieval pilgrims way and a drivers road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on the site. 8 = This very large (Some 850 dwellings etc ?.) development is not necessary in this area of the west side of Bridgend. This part of Bridgend has had some 3000 new houses added over recent years . This is already a disproportionate amount for the area. It would surely be unfair and poor,,planning to add such a large number of houses to this area . Even with a proposed portion of houses being so-called " affordable housing " even these would be beyond the means of most young people of today . 9 = Infrastructure is not in place to support further development . For example the local Comprehensive School , has not yet caught up with the house building of the previous decade . The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints . Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Other</p>

	aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services etc, have not been adequately addressed. sewerage, drainage, NHS services etc., have not been adequately addressed.
--	--

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1153	

LDP Rep: 1154

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1154	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1154	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1154	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1154	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1154	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1154	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1154	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1154	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1154	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1154	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1154	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1154	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1154	<p>To whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council We the undersigned hereby object to this proposal and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP on the following grounds. 1= The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development . 2 = Overload to the existing local infrastructure with its already busy and clogged up roads. (Assuming each house has approximately 1.5 vehicles , total would be an extra 1275 vehicles at least), such an increase would put further traffic on the A473 junction with Elm Crescent and Heol Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau and the A48 Broadlands roundabout already strained to capacity. 3 = Overload to our local N H S' services e.g. Doctors and Dentists . (These always seem so busy at present it is difficult to obtain an appointment). 4 = This development would coalesce the Community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston which is NOT in the best interests of the local people. Also it would be contrary to the current Planning principles. 5 = Such a scheme of some 850 houses etc. (What this etc will be is not clear) would swamp the village of Laleston with its individual character and separateness in Bridgend County. 6 = This proposal is criss-crossed. by Public Rights of Way which are used and valued by local people . These ancient rights of way would be lost forever. 7 = Llangewydd Road and it, s surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridge-way , a medieval pilgrims way and a drovers road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on the site. 8 = This very large (Some 850 dwellings etc ?.) development is not necessary in this area of the west side of Bridgend. This part of Bridgend has had some 3000 new houses added over recent years . This is already a disproportionate amount for the area. It would surely be unfair and poor,,planning to add such a large number of houses to this area . Even with a proposed portion of houses being so-called " affordable housing " even these would be beyond the means of most young people of today . 9 = Infrastructure is not in place to support further development . For example the local Comprehensive School , has not yet caught up with the house building of the previous decade . The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints . Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Other aspects of</p>

	infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services etc, have not been adequately addressed. sewerage, drainage, NHS services etc., have not been adequately addressed.
--	---

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1154	

LDP Rep: 1155

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1155	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1155	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1155	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1155	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1155	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1155	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1155	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1155	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1155	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1155	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1155	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1155	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Additional development as proposed for Pencoed is not supported by increased infrastructure such as better train services instead of one train per hour. Lack of school places and doctors surgeries. Road networks are already overstretched following new and planned housing developments between Pencoed and Llanharan due in part to the lack of a by pass road at Llanharan forcing traffic westward towards Pencoed. Continued destruction of green belt land is unacceptable.
1155	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Additional housing should be done at a gradual small scale level not increased a breakneck speed with scant thought to improve infrastructure before any increase. I also ask the question as to why we need to increase housing in an already densely populated area.
1155	

LDP Rep: 1156

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1156	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1156	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1156	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1156	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1156	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1156	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1156	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1156	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1156	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1156	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1156	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1156	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1156	<p>To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I/We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds; Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the</p>

development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area.

Safety To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48

The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedence on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this grade 2* listed iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk.

Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmore Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmore) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. This is a place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undergraded, to the next generation.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1156

LDP Rep: 1157

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable): -

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1157	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1157	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1157	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1157	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1157	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1157	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1157	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1157	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1157	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1157	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1157	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1157	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1157	<p>Dear Sirs, Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current</p>

and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: ‘Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.’ It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of ‘safe, healthy and inclusive’. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1157	

LDP Rep: 1158

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1158	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1158	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1158	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1158	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1158	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1158	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1158	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1158	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1158	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1158	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1158	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1158	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Proposed site: SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I/We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds; Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity
1158	

of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the “Dipping Bridge” and arguably include the “Showground Field” which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, “To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places”. Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area. Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 - The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedence on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk. Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmores Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmores) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1158	

LDP Rep: 1159

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1159	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1159	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1159	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1159	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1159	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1159	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1159	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1159	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1159	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1159	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1159	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1159	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1159	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	We wish to register our concern for the proposed development for 847 houses on Island Farm and 110 at Craig Y Parcau We understand there is to be no upgrade to the A48 which is extremely busy especially during the hours between Seven and Nine in the morning and between Five and Seven in the evening. Merthyr Mawr is a beautiful area enjoyed by many and particularly the residents and approached by roads unsuitable for heavy traffic. Island Farm is an area of importance both for nature conservation and the environment. The dipping bridge has historical importance and will eventually not cope with the ensuing weight of extra traffic, which will be an enormous loss to the area. Therefore we strongly oppose the suggested Local Development Plan, it appears that no consideration has been given to the current residents of this area of Bridgend.
1159	

LDP Rep: 1160

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1160	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1160	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1160	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1160	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1160	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1160	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1160	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1160	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1160	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1160	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1160	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1160	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1160	<p>To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I/We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds; Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the</p>

development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area.

Safety To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48

The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedence on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this grade 2* listed iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk.

Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmores Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmores) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. This is a place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undergraded, to the next generation.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1160

LDP Rep: 1161

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	I cannot see any creation for the people of Porthcawl, young and old
1161	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	I will at public meeting
1161	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	I do not understand
1161	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1161	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	I do not agree
1161	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	What is happening to all empty factory building in Bridgend
1161	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	lower the rates to fill empty shops on John St
1161	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Working well at present
1161	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	This is all we have please do not touch our 'natural environment'

1161	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1161	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1161	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1161	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1161	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1161	

LDP Rep: 1162

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable): -

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1162	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1162	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1162	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1162	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1162	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1162	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1162	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1162	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1162	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1162	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1162	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1162	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1162	<p>Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and</p>

would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1162	

LDP Rep: 1163

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1163	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1163	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1163	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1163	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1163	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1163	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1163	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1163	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1163	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1163	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1163	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1163	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds. • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”), and a drovers’ road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. •
1163	

The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1163	

LDP Rep: 1164

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1164	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1164	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1164	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	I enthusiastically object to the proposed plans to build 847 houses on the historic 'Island Farm' prisoner of war site. This would be no less than a travesty. The site's historical significance should be preserved, as should the beautiful flora and fauna surrounding it which enriches of lives of those who make use of this beautiful green space, myself included.
1164	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1164	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1164	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1164	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1164	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

1164

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

1164

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

1164

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys

ID

1164

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

1164

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1164

LDP Rep: 1166

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	Refer to separate form
1166	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1166	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1166	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1166	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1166	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1166	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1166	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1166	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1166	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1166	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1166	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1166	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1166	<p>I refer to the Replacement Local Development Plan Consultation currently underway and being undertaken by BCBC. This response specifically refers to the above site and proposal in the LDP replacement for 850 houses located on what is currently identified as Green Wedge between the villages of Laleston and Bryntirion. I consider that this site should be deleted from the LDP proposals, on the following grounds.</p> <p>Where appropriate I refer to pages (P.) and paragraphs (Pr.) of the Deposit Consultation Document. P.74, Pr. 52.21: Coalescing of communities References in this paragraph claiming that the development would “form a natural green buffer” is just not true. The proposal takes a green wedge, which is already a “natural green buffer” beyond the built-up boundary of Bridgend and urbanises it by shifting that boundary to the west, encroaching on a Special Landscape Area and covering it with housing. The last sentence of this paragraph admits to this encroachment by referring to a plan to prevent any “further encroachment” using a legal agreement. This plan does not exist. No evidence is provided to guarantee that this agreement ever will exist. The contents of this paragraph are not consistent with the “Masterplan Development Principles” mentioned at P.71, Pr.(d). To the east of the green wedge is the community of Bryntirion which, with its adjoining communities of Cefn Glas, Llangewydd Court, West House and Broadlands, constitute a densely populated outer suburb of the town of Bridgend. To the west of the green wedge is the village of Laleston, which while being part of a wider Laleston Community Council area, is also currently recognisable as a distinct village community. These plans will completely destroy the sense of place which exists in all the above settlements completely contrary to both the Councils own advice and that set out in future Wales by Welsh Government. Laleston village currently benefits from the proximity of the urban area to the east, for access to shops, secondary school and other services. Bryntirion benefits from its proximity to Laleston, for its green, rural aspect, access routes and footpaths which improve the quality of life. Removing the green wedge would present a considerably worse aspect to both communities and would reduce amenity to residents over a wide area and have negative visual impact on this important gateway into Bridgend town. Both visually and as a mater of fact the new development will coalesce the two settlements so that in the eyes of any normal person Laleston will</p>

just run into Bryntirion with no visual break. In Appendix 5, P.20 the statement by the consultants engaged by the developer that there are “no significant effects”, that Laleston will “retain its character as a discrete settlement” and that coalescence has an “impact of a minor order” are open to serious challenge, and acquiescence on this flimsy “evidence” by the planning authority could even form a firm basis for judicial review. Despite claims made in the Deposit Document the development would objectively coalesce the two communities. The development would end Laleston as a village and remove a green space from the visual and physical amenity of residents of Bryntirion and other urban areas to the west and south. P.71, Pr. (a) refers to an “urban extension of Bridgend”. This is inconsistent with the claim that communities are not being coalesced. Landscape and loss of visual amenity; well-being and future generations; sustainability Given that the document concedes that this is an “urban extension”, it follows that this site is best described as a “development outside defined settlement boundaries”. It is also a fact that the council ward of Laleston is designated as “rural” by BCBC for the purposes of its RDP (rural development programme). The development would inflict a serious loss of valued landscape and visual amenity. It would violate historic rights of way, which have always been treasured by local people and nurtured by the Community Council, and which are even more vital to well-being and future generations in a post-Covid context. The so-called green corridors the developers would leave behind would present a comparatively miserable aspect, and once the developers have made their profit and left the area the responsibility for and cost of their upkeep would pass on to the community. This raises the serious issue of sustainability. These aspects alone provide sufficient reason to dismiss the application as they are contrary not only to Welsh Government policy but also to Wales’s basic constitutional commitment to sustainable development and future generations. History and archaeology; ancient and semi-ancient woodland; biodiversity. The proposed development is clearly in conflict with the following principles of good planning as outlined in the draft document. P.27, LS1: Important landscapes LS2: Historic environment P.182, SP17: Conservation and enhancement of the natural environment P.193, DNP5: Local and Regional Nature Conservation Sites, including DNP5(2), Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) In the draft document, Page 71, Pr.(a), the developer makes light of the above considerations. A SINC and Scheduled Ancient Monument are mentioned, without any proper consideration of their significance. Pr.(c) mentions trees, hedgerows and habitat. Pr.(d) mentions landscape, a Special Landscape Area, and a “sense of place”. No detail is attached to any of these topics, the underlying issues are skimmed over. Merely mentioning these aspects is not good enough. The onus is on the developer to demonstrate that all these aspects can be fully mitigated. Appendix 5, P. 15-21, contains the findings of consultants, paid for by the developer. These findings are incomplete, inaccurate and biased. They are based on desk research, and there is no evidence of fieldwork research. The qualifications and credentials of the person(s) tasked with this item are not revealed. The viewing of Google Maps and satellite pictures is no substitute for local knowledge and investigation on the ground. Opinions expressed by consultants on certain areas such as “limited botanical interest” and “species poor” are unevenced and some are manifestly untrue. They are based on speculation as opposed to hard evidence. Statements on P.19 Pr. “Arboculture” put in plain sight the likely damage and loss of trees. It is also important to note that the site mainly consists of Grade 2 agricultural land, the highest grade available in Wales. At a time when the twin problems of Brexit and Covid are threatening supply chains, and the media are reporting empty

supermarket shelves, it is difficult to explain why BCBC is being asked to even consider low density development, in what has in the recent past called “executive” style at this particular greenfield site, when as will be argued below, there is potential for affordable and social housing more attuned to the economic and social need of modern local families, on brownfield sites that have not been incorporated into the housing allocations in the draft document. It is also relevant to mention that the public of both Laleston and Bryntirion value the fact that the PLA3 site provides their children and grandchildren the opportunity to see sheep and cattle, in a natural environment, a short walk from their homes. Such considerations are not to be dismissed in a world where we claim to be concerned about well-being and mental health, and where the most highly qualified physicians in this field are stressing the importance of greenery in the environment, In response to P.20, Pr. “Archaeology”, It is important to note that the written historical record, together with the experience of local people who use the extensive Rights of Way network that there is a definite “sense of place” which already exists, and which would be destroyed by any development. The development puts pressure on the field known as Cae’r Hen Eglwys and it is clear that the remains of Llangewydd Church and Churchyard and its standing stones, both Ancient Monuments, would be endangered by this development. Unbalanced development; pressure on infrastructure; alternatives. At a recent meeting of the Community Council and BCBC, it was estimated that roughly 10,000 houses had been built in the county in recent years. Of those 10,000 over 3000 had been built within a two mile radius of the site PLA 3 (locally known as the “Circus Field”). This is already a severe case of over-intensification. All five of the so-called “strategic sites” in the deposit plan are in the Bridgend constituency, none in the Ogmore constituency. Four of the five are south of the M4. This has led to a serious north-south imbalance in terms of the development of the County.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?										
ID										
1166	<p>Other correspondents will have commented at length about various infrastructure pressures but one key issue which seems to have been missed is in relation to secondary education. It is a statement of fact that Bryntirion Comprehensive School is full. there are instances of families living within yards of the school who must send their children elsewhere. Recent and current housing developments have created a need for further spaces as shown here. Location</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>No. of houses</td> <td>Heol ty Maen (off Barnes Ave)</td> <td>200 Elm Crescent</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>(former OCLP car park)</td> <td>5 Ysgol Bryn Castell, Phase 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>127 Sunnyside</td> <td>59 TOTAL</td> </tr> </table> <p>391 Using Welsh Government planning guidance this is estimated to create 93 additional students on the school roll. BCBC estimates that, considering the utilisation rate for each teaching space, this will require a block of 6 additional classrooms, with additional services including toilets. A feasibility study is currently being carried out, and it must be stressed that planning permission is not a foregone conclusion. Neither is the outcome of a traffic assessment, which could quite possibly conclude that highway conditions approaching the school could not support this expansion. In summary therefore, the position is as follows: Yes, the developer is incorporating a primary school on the proposed site, but where would secondary students go? The developer might be required to contribute to secondary places through a Section 106 Agreement. But provision at Bryntirion has yet to catch up with housebuilding under the existing LDP, and there is at the time of writing no guarantee that even this can be</p>	No. of houses	Heol ty Maen (off Barnes Ave)	200 Elm Crescent		(former OCLP car park)	5 Ysgol Bryn Castell, Phase 2		127 Sunnyside	59 TOTAL
No. of houses	Heol ty Maen (off Barnes Ave)	200 Elm Crescent								
	(former OCLP car park)	5 Ysgol Bryn Castell, Phase 2								
	127 Sunnyside	59 TOTAL								

achieved as the site is already constrained and at capacity. To plan now for yet more housing in the same school catchment area for the next LDP is just bad planning, bordering on the irresponsible. If highway capacity, budgetary pressures, or other factors prevent further expansion at Bryntirion, then secondary students from PLA 3 would have to be directed to schools at other locations, at worst requiring statutory home-to-school transport, or at best within a lengthy walking distance that would violate central principles of the "Place Making Charter" to which BCBC is committed.

Deleting PLA3 would align the LDP more closely with the environmental issues identified on P.27-29, in particular: LS1 – important landscapes LS2 – historic environment LS6 – areas with known poor air quality (the A473 at Park Street) LS7 – highway network congestion (Bryngolau, Merlin Crescent, Broadlands A473 traffic lights, Broadlands A48 roundabout, Heol y Nant) LS10 – shortfall in affordable housing LS 11 – shortage in the provision of smaller dwellings LS14 – accessible natural open space. I strongly request that you delete this location from PLA 3 which would help provide the right type of housing in the right places instead of the wrong type of housing in the wrong place. From a personal perspective our property Ton Philip due to it's location would be severely affected by the proposed development. Our outlook would change from fields in every direction to houses encroaching onto our property from the North, East and South. [REDACTED]

LDP Rep: 1167

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1167	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1167	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1167	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1167	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1167	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1167	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1167	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1167	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1167	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1167	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1167	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1167	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1167	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ - maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; - reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; - provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; - guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and - ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale
1167	

housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

LDP Rep: 1168

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1168	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1168	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1168	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1168	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1168	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1168	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1168	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1168	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1168	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1168	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1168	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1168	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1168	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Proposed site: SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds;
1168	<p>Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe</p>

bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status.

Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area.

Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 - The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedance on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk.

Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmores Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmores) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

LDP Rep: 743

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
743	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
743	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
743	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
743	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
743	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
743	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
743	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
743	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

743	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
743	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
743	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
743	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
743	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Proposed site: SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds;
743	<p>Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe</p>

bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area. Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 - The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedance on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk. Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmores Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmores) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

LDP Rep: 1169

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1169	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1169	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1169	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1169	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1169	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1169	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1169	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1169	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1169	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1169	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1169	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1169	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1169	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	To Whom It May Concern, I wish to express my concern and object to the plans to build over 1800 homes along the A48 in Bridgend, from Laleston to Ewenny Roundabout. Bridgend does not have the infrastructure to cope with more traffic or people, especially on the Ewenny Roundabout which is already a dangerous and congested spot. Our local Schools, Dental surgeries and Doctors surgeries are already over subscribed too. The development of 847 homes at Island Farm will be a blight on the countryside, not only destroying the beauty of the environment, but also affecting the wildlife and biodiversity in the area. Merthy Mawr Village is already overburdened with tourists and their cars during the Summer months. As it is such a unique and beautiful place, it would be reprehensible to destroy this area with over 800 new homes on Island Farm, leading to the village being overwhelmed with cars and people. I do hope BCBC take on board the concern and objections of so many people living in the locality and rethink it's ludicrous plans to wipe out such a beautiful part of this county forever!
1169	

1170	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1170	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1170	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1170	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1170	<p>I refer to the Replacement Local Development Plan Consultation currently underway and being undertaken by BCBC. This response specifically refers to the above site and proposal in the LDP replacement for 850 houses located on what is currently identified as Green Wedge between the villages of Laleston and Bryntirion. I consider that this site should be deleted from the LDP proposals, on the following grounds.</p> <p>Where appropriate I refer to pages (P.) and paragraphs (Pr.) of the Deposit Consultation Document. P.74, Pr. 52.21: Coalescing of communities References in this paragraph claiming that the development would “form a natural green buffer” is just not true. The proposal takes a green wedge, which is already a “natural green buffer” beyond the built-up boundary of Bridgend and urbanises it by shifting that boundary to the west, encroaching on a Special Landscape Area and covering it with housing. The last sentence of this paragraph admits to this encroachment by referring to a plan to prevent any “further encroachment” using a legal agreement. This plan does not exist. No evidence is provided to guarantee that this agreement ever will exist. The contents of this paragraph are not consistent with the “Masterplan Development Principles” mentioned at P.71, Pr.(d). To the east of the green wedge is the community of Bryntirion which, with its adjoining communities of Cefn Glas, Llangewydd Court, West House and Broadlands, constitute a densely populated outer suburb of the town of Bridgend. To the west of the green wedge is the village of Laleston, which while being part of a wider Laleston Community Council area, is also currently recognisable as a distinct village community. These plans will completely destroy the sense of place which exists in all the above settlements completely contrary to both the Councils own advice and that set out in future Wales by Welsh Government. Laleston village currently benefits from the proximity of the urban area to the east, for access to shops, secondary school and other services. Bryntirion benefits from its proximity to Laleston, for its green, rural aspect, access routes and footpaths which improve the quality of life. Removing the green wedge would present a considerably worse aspect to both communities and would reduce amenity to residents over a wide area and have negative visual impact on this important gateway into Bridgend town. Both visually and as a mater of fact the new development will coalesce the two settlements so that in the eyes of any normal person Laleston will</p>

just run into Bryntirion with no visual break. In Appendix 5, P.20 the statement by the consultants engaged by the developer that there are “no significant effects”, that Laleston will “retain its character as a discrete settlement” and that coalescence has an “impact of a minor order” are open to serious challenge, and acquiescence on this flimsy “evidence” by the planning authority could even form a firm basis for judicial review. Despite claims made in the Deposit Document the development would objectively coalesce the two communities. The development would end Laleston as a village and remove a green space from the visual and physical amenity of residents of Bryntirion and other urban areas to the west and south. P.71, Pr. (a) refers to an “urban extension of Bridgend”. This is inconsistent with the claim that communities are not being coalesced. Landscape and loss of visual amenity; well-being and future generations; sustainability Given that the document concedes that this is an “urban extension”, it follows that this site is best described as a “development outside defined settlement boundaries”. It is also a fact that the council ward of Laleston is designated as “rural” by BCBC for the purposes of its RDP (rural development programme). The development would inflict a serious loss of valued landscape and visual amenity. It would violate historic rights of way, which have always been treasured by local people and nurtured by the Community Council, and which are even more vital to well-being and future generations in a post-Covid context. The so-called green corridors the developers would leave behind would present a comparatively miserable aspect, and once the developers have made their profit and left the area the responsibility for and cost of their upkeep would pass on to the community. This raises the serious issue of sustainability. These aspects alone provide sufficient reason to dismiss the application as they are contrary not only to Welsh Government policy but also to Wales’s basic constitutional commitment to sustainable development and future generations. History and archaeology; ancient and semi-ancient woodland; biodiversity. The proposed development is clearly in conflict with the following principles of good planning as outlined in the draft document. P.27, LS1: Important landscapes LS2: Historic environment P.182, SP17: Conservation and enhancement of the natural environment P.193, DNP5: Local and Regional Nature Conservation Sites, including DNP5(2), Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) In the draft document, Page 71, Pr.(a), the developer makes light of the above considerations. A SINC and Scheduled Ancient Monument are mentioned, without any proper consideration of their significance. Pr.(c) mentions trees, hedgerows and habitat. Pr.(d) mentions landscape, a Special Landscape Area, and a “sense of place”. No detail is attached to any of these topics, the underlying issues are skimmed over. Merely mentioning these aspects is not good enough. The onus is on the developer to demonstrate that all these aspects can be fully mitigated. Appendix 5, P. 15-21, contains the findings of consultants, paid for by the developer. These findings are incomplete, inaccurate and biased. They are based on desk research, and there is no evidence of fieldwork research. The qualifications and credentials of the person(s) tasked with this item are not revealed. The viewing of Google Maps and satellite pictures is no substitute for local knowledge and investigation on the ground. Opinions expressed by consultants on certain areas such as “limited botanical interest” and “species poor” are unevenced and some are manifestly untrue. They are based on speculation as opposed to hard evidence. Statements on P.19 Pr. “Arboculture” put in plain sight the likely damage and loss of trees. It is also important to note that the site mainly consists of Grade 2 agricultural land, the highest grade available in Wales. At a time when the twin problems of Brexit and Covid are threatening supply chains, and the media are reporting empty

supermarket shelves, it is difficult to explain why BCBC is being asked to even consider low density development, in what has in the recent past called “executive” style at this particular greenfield site, when as will be argued below, there is potential for affordable and social housing more attuned to the economic and social need of modern local families, on brownfield sites that have not been incorporated into the housing allocations in the draft document. It is also relevant to mention that the public of both Laleston and Bryntirion value the fact that the PLA3 site provides their children and grandchildren the opportunity to see sheep and cattle, in a natural environment, a short walk from their homes. Such considerations are not to be dismissed in a world where we claim to be concerned about well-being and mental health, and where the most highly qualified physicians in this field are stressing the importance of greenery in the environment, In response to P.20, Pr. “Archaeology”, It is important to note that the written historical record, together with the experience of local people who use the extensive Rights of Way network that there is a definite “sense of place” which already exists, and which would be destroyed by any development. The development puts pressure on the field known as Cae’r Hen Eglwys and it is clear that the remains of Llangewydd Church and Churchyard and its standing stones, both Ancient Monuments, would be endangered by this development. Unbalanced development; pressure on infrastructure; alternatives. At a recent meeting of the Community Council and BCBC, it was estimated that roughly 10,000 houses had been built in the county in recent years. Of those 10,000 over 3000 had been built within a two mile radius of the site PLA 3 (locally known as the “Circus Field”). This is already a severe case of over-intensification. All five of the so-called “strategic sites” in the deposit plan are in the Bridgend constituency, none in the Ogmore constituency. Four of the five are south of the M4. This has led to a serious north-south imbalance in terms of the development of the County.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?										
ID										
1170	<p>Other correspondents will have commented at length about various infrastructure pressures but one key issue which seems to have been missed is in relation to secondary education. It is a statement of fact that Bryntirion Comprehensive School is full. there are instances of families living within yards of the school who must send their children elsewhere. Recent and current housing developments have created a need for further spaces as shown here. Location</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>No. of houses</td> <td>Heol ty Maen (off Barnes Ave)</td> <td>200 Elm Crescent</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>(former OCLP car park)</td> <td>5 Ysgol Bryn Castell, Phase 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>127 Sunnyside</td> <td>59 TOTAL</td> </tr> </table> <p>391 Using Welsh Government planning guidance this is estimated to create 93 additional students on the school roll. BCBC estimates that, considering the utilisation rate for each teaching space, this will require a block of 6 additional classrooms, with additional services including toilets. A feasibility study is currently being carried out, and it must be stressed that planning permission is not a foregone conclusion. Neither is the outcome of a traffic assessment, which could quite possibly conclude that highway conditions approaching the school could not support this expansion. In summary therefore, the position is as follows: Yes, the developer is incorporating a primary school on the proposed site, but where would secondary students go? The developer might be required to contribute to secondary places through a Section 106 Agreement. But provision at Bryntirion has yet to catch up with housebuilding under the existing LDP, and there is at the time of writing no guarantee that even this can be</p>	No. of houses	Heol ty Maen (off Barnes Ave)	200 Elm Crescent		(former OCLP car park)	5 Ysgol Bryn Castell, Phase 2		127 Sunnyside	59 TOTAL
No. of houses	Heol ty Maen (off Barnes Ave)	200 Elm Crescent								
	(former OCLP car park)	5 Ysgol Bryn Castell, Phase 2								
	127 Sunnyside	59 TOTAL								

achieved as the site is already constrained and at capacity. To plan now for yet more housing in the same school catchment area for the next LDP is just bad planning, bordering on the irresponsible. If highway capacity, budgetary pressures, or other factors prevent further expansion at Bryntirion, then secondary students from PLA 3 would have to be directed to schools at other locations, at worst requiring statutory home-to-school transport, or at best within a lengthy walking distance that would violate central principles of the "Place Making Charter" to which BCBC is committed.

Deleting PLA3 would align the LDP more closely with the environmental issues identified on P.27-29, in particular: LS1 – important landscapes LS2 – historic environment LS6 – areas with known poor air quality (the A473 at Park Streer) LS7 – highway network congestion (Bryngolau, Merlin Crescent, Broadlands A473 traffic lights, Broadlands A48 roundabout, Heol y Nant) LS10 – shortfall in affordable housing LS 11 – shortage in the provision of smaller dwellings LS14 – accessible natural open space. I strongly recommend deleting PLA 3 which would help provide the right type of housing in the right places instead of the wrong type of housing in the wrong place.

LDP Rep: 1171

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1171	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1171	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1171	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1171	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1171	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1171	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1171	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1171	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1171	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1171	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1171	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1171	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1171	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Proposed site: SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I/We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds; Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice,
1171	

Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area. Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 - The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedance on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk. Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmere Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmere) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

LDP Rep: 1172

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1172	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1172	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1172	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1172	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1172	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1172	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1172	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1172	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1172	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1172	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1172	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1172	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1172	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1172	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Please find below my rebuttal and objection to the allocation of PLA2 and COM1 (2) south of the A48 in the Bridgend LDP for Housing and Growth Allocation. Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘· maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through place making; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. BCBC have previously identified Island Farm as SINC allocation requiring management and protection, due to the diversity of animal and plant life identified on the site. The last SINC review was conducted in 2011, and since that time the ecological importance of the site has grown. Apart from protected species such as doormice and bats there are an abundance of orchid species and various fauna and flora on site. There is a thriving hedgehog population that enjoys hibernation and feeding stations in the gardens of Island Farm Road and Island Farm Close. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to</p>

walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. The agricultural value of the land has been played down and it continues to be a productive and important contribution to farming output in the area. Once its gone, its gone and we will lose an important open space that contributes to the wealth of the area. Over years the fields are renowned for the presence and appearance of sink holes due to underground streams and mineral deposits. It is clearly not suitable for the building of houses, and could in fact be dangerous for future residents, who would look to the Council for compensation. I have photographic evidence to support the presence of sink holes in the area designated for housing under the plan. The current road network is not capable of supporting such a large scale development. Once normal daily travel has resumed post pandemic, the A48 and Ewenny roundabout will be at a gridlock if this proposal is agreed. Local services are stretched to beyond that which they can cope with. Whilst the plan provides growth in school allocation there is no mention of GP, dental, or other important community services, all of which have shrunk due to government austerity measures. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development

	<p>in the County Borough. My position is to reject the proposal in relation to land at PLA2 and COM1(2) in the revised LDP. However if the Local Authority wishes to support the plans for these areas under the revised LDP, then it is my submission that the number of houses proposed be significantly reduced to a number that is more sustainable and will have a less detrimental affect on the current infrastructure and biodiversity of the area.</p>
--	---

LDP Rep: 1173

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1173	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1173	<p>According to pre covid current statistics there are 6,000 people aged between 16 to 64 that are currently unemployed in Bridgend and searching for work. With a further 16,400 unemployed not searching for work. As it stands if all 500 jobs estimated a year are filled by these 6,000 people, it would take 12 years to get the currently unemployed people who want to work already live in Bridgend county in jobs. This time frame will increase as the 26,185 people between 0 to 15 reach working age and a percentage of them will become unemployed. This strategy states Bridgend councils wants more youthful skilled population but would rather build 500 house a year at a high cost rather than implement a lower cost strategy to educate, train and teach the skills they want to see in the county to the 26,185 people who currently live in the area who will reach working age with in the next 15 years with a continuing cycle of people coming to age. There are only 505 estimated jobs a year with 500 house being built that accounts roughly to one house for each person with a job. Surely the ratio should be around half the amount of houses (200 to 250) to jobs. This would allow current people residing in the area a chance to find work with less competition. On top of this, all houses having the potential to house at a minimum 2 working adults there could be 1000 people already applying for the 505 jobs without the people currently residing in the area. So by building 500 house a year with only 505 job you could actually be creating a 495 job deficit adding to the already 6,000 previous mentioned unemployed each year and those who are already in employed but wish to change jobs for satisfaction reasons or betterment. Furthermore if the estimated 505 jobs a year didn't arise or meet that estimated it would add to the unemployment. Furthering the need for people to move out of the county and render it unattractive and speed up the rate of outward migration. The building of 500 homes makes an assumption that everyone getting one of the predicted jobs want to move to the county rather than commute from their family homes and villages where their friends and family currently reside and potentially children's are settled. Further to this the strategy fails to address that below average wage of £526.90 per week in the county compared to the Welsh average of £541.70 (£587.10 uk). In order to retain or attract the expected 500 people this would have to be address especially as Bridgend is recognised as an underprivileged area by residents and the media. On top of this the strategy fails to state that out of those 500 house 15% will be social house and wether any house not filled/bought will go for social housing. Therefore not enhance the area or for the purpose of retaining skills outlined above. When you compile the above statements to the write up provided this strategy needs to be reevaluated to make sure it benefits the current community, students and job seekers within Bridgend county rather than lining the councils pockets with councils tax and business</p>

	tax they stand to get for 500 house a year and the new businesses they hope to attract or from current expansion.
--	---

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
---	--

ID	While the strategy state it will use brown sites a large number of the areas outlined in the plan especially for development are green sites and prime agricultural land. Such as the proposed area in kenfig hill and that in Laleston. Which could have a detrimental affect on the environment. Which should be a priority to the council especially as the Welsh government aims to hit carbon neutral targets by 2030. Also Urbanisation could put people off buying in the area as it loses its appeal is a village and with large number of people seeking the tranquility of village and countryside life building new house rather than regeneration could affect that. Social housing is a good concept however it actually prevents people from buying house on that estate. People who are paying thousands or there hard earns money for a home, that they will pay off for the rest of there lives dont want to live by or next to people who have had the same house as them given to them for free and payed for by there taxes. It's makes people feel used and causes a negative mentality and off putting especially in some case where you do not know who your living next to. Typically if your neighbours are also spending thousands on their house they have the same mentality as you and are going to treat the house street and living environment well. Whereas those getting it for free typically don't care and do the opposite. It could cause a significant outward migration off the site after purchase and the lack of skilled people
1173	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
--	--

ID	
1173	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
---	--

ID	
1173	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
--	--

ID	
1173	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
--	--

ID	
1173	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
--	--

ID	
1173	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	
1173	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1173	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1173	<p>Firstly I am going to start by stating my objection to the building of 2000 to 3,000 home on the green site proposed for kenfig hill, Pyle and Cornelly. As it will negatively affect the area and will have a significant impact to everyone both during building work and after completion. Including the negative effect it will have on the environment from a wild life and pollution factor. Firstly the land proposed for building is good agricultural land and although currently used for livestock farming could be used for arable farming. This could allow house, schools and businesses in the area to be more environment friendly with less food miles, better quality food with better welfare standards and tractability. Produce grown and produced on this ground could go toward making the school eco friendly and carbon neutral like a current initiative in a secondary school in Carmarthen, where the school grows it's own veg and buys in locally sourced meet and milk. It could also reduce the councils costs as it means buying direct from the seller and help Bridgend county to meet with Welsh and uk government carbon neutral targets. Further to this, the identified growth in the countries and the worlds population, it is important to ensure we have enough good quality ground to provided for ourselves and community should food shortages occur. During the current pandemic we have seen shortage due to disruption of supply chain and a growing demand for the products. However changing climate condition could affect the amount of crops produce and where. Therefore having land free and farmers in our community's throughout the county could potentially prevent the area for suffering in the future if the current predictions of food shortages fall true. This in turn would make the county a desirable place rather than a deprived place. This sector of farming could also increase the jobs and make Bridgend county a leader for sustainability rather than destroying the environment and habitats for greed and profit with unsustainable development leading to over crowding and deprivation. Secondly the current land allows for absorption of the co2 emissions from the motorway and those produced by the railway and industrial estate. Without this land all the emissions produced at these places would go into the atmosphere without being absorbed. By building the amount of houses proposed, if there was a minimum of two people who drove in each house out of 3,000 builds there is the potential for a minimum of 6,000 more cars in the area. These cars will produce emission which won't be absorbed due to the lack of green space and add to the previous mentioned emissions. They will also cause problems on the already inadequate roads in the area which currently struggle with the volume of cars and maintenance. You also have to factor in the possibility of electric cars. If everyone is electric by 2050 the the power grid will experience extensive blackouts cause by overpowering the grid. The current bus system which runs from Bridgend to Porthcawl has a number of times through out the day and can be caught at various place in kenfig hill, Pyle and Cornelly. There is</p>

no need to build a park and ride which requires people to pay to park there car when bus stops are at adequate walking distance from everyone's house. By building a park and ride you are encouraging people to be unhealthy and drive rather than walk to a bus stop, no to mention the added co2 emissions this would cause along with noise air pollution and traffic build up. If you wanted to improve links to village farm just open up the old railway station there and the train could stop and people could walk to work, but most place have car parking for customers and staff, with good pavement sizes and a walkable location from Pyle and kenfig hill. Cycle lanes just cause more disruption and waste more money as they don't use them and still cycle in the road causing anguish and unnecessary stress. Thirdly, building that amount of house on a green belt will drastically change the risk of flooding on the roads and in the village. The amount of water the land absorbs prevents the rivers for receiving the full amount of water. The new underground drains and sewerage systems put in would change the underground water course with unknown effect as they would not have previously been affected by farming. Flood prevention would need to be put in place along the roads to prevent them flooding because of run off. As well as storm systems to prevent the railway flooding and the current drainage systems in the area being overwhelmed as in bad weather they already overflow. All of this is at a huge cost to the local villages as it affects will be unprecedented and unknown, with the work causing years of disruption. Fourthly the work will cause huge disruption to the villages and people travelling on the roads past the building sites for work with changes to the road layout which are currently unnecessary to current road users. The air pollution of the building work could cause problems for residents and workers on the estate, with potential for air and noise pollution effects on cynffig comprehensive school due to the close proximity. Fifthly, wildlife will be negatively affected as they a highly president in headgrows and other areas of the farms found on the green belt. The farms will be involved with requirement to comply (cross compliyents and BPS) to protect and enhance wildlife. However the building of 2,000 to 3,000 homes will decimate this regardless of how many trees or grass patches you are required to put in. It will also make the appeal to the area less and it will be very urban rather than countryside which attracts many buyers to the area. With the building of houses next to the motorway, a48 and a busy industrial estate which has a variety of fume producing company and now recycling plant. Could have serious health effect on residents in the new house because of the leaves of air pollution. Finally the current service in the village of kenfig hill, Pyle and Cornelly are already over run. The doctors Sugery in kenfig hill serves people everyone from kenfig hill, majority of Pyle and cefn. This has resulted in the lack of ability to get appointments and the 6 doctors and 2 nurses being overwhelmed. The same goes for dental Sugery and options in the area. There should be plans made to give Cefn and Pyle there own service before you build more house and put more pressure on them. This also has negative effects on residents as they can't get the treatment they need in a reasonable time, which need addressing more importantly than building. To conclude the council should look at benefitting and helping the current residents first and improving their quality of life and living before the consideration of building which will make there standers of living worse. The general perception from people in the community is that the council don't care and just want more money and that's what this housing is as this is going to negatively effect the area but will go ahead regardless of concerns.

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID

1173

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

1173

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1173

LDP Rep: 1174

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable): N/A

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1174	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1174	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1174	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1174	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1174	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1174	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1174	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1174	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1174	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1174	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1174	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1174	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	We are opposed to the proposed Development Land East of Pencoed, due to the current inadequate infrastructure and services within Pencoed Village, not being able to cope with the influx of 700+ further households , there would be an unbearable increase in the traffic and the impact on shopping facilities , Doctors, Dentists, Schools and Nurseries, which are already at full capacity! There are also inadequate leisure facilities and green spaces for the well being of current residents, these issues must be taken into consideration along with improvements to the transport infrastructure!
1174	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	No
1174	

LDP Rep: 1175

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1175	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1175	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1175	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1175	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1175	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1175	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1175	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1175	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1175	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1175	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1175	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1175	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1175	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1175	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental</p>

capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- no capacity to deal with deal with additional sewage as Welsh Water plant at Ogmored Merthyr mawr sewage works is overwhelmed and currently polluting the River Ogmored. It has no further capacity.
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

LDP Rep: 798

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
798	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
798	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
798	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
798	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
798	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
798	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
798	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
798	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

798	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
798	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
798	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
798	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
798	<p>I'm a resident of Island Farm Road and would like to make my objections known for the HD Ltd proposal and also the potential plan by Merthyr Mawr Estate. Currently, the A48 is a very fast and busy road, especially during peak times and weekends. Any development on the land behind will detrimentally affect the residents ability to travel either by road or on foot. The traffic on the A48 would increase substantially. Where the proposed amendment by Merthyr Mawr Estate may divert the traffic through Island Farm Close, this would also have a significant effect on the safety of the street, since it has not been designed as a thoroughfare and the significant increase in traffic could cause a hazard for residents, children and pets. Any development on the land will also remove a valuable green space for locals and wildlife. As an example, there is a protected species of lesser horseshoe bats currently residing in Hut 9 (a listed building) and are protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside act of 1981, and a priority species under the UK Post 2010 Biodiversity Framework. Any work nearby could cause harm to the bats, their ability to nest and forage. The bat conservation Trust states : "Lesser horseshoe bats are particularly sensitive to disturbance, especially in their nursery and winter roosts, and these sites need specific protection. Sensitive management of their foraging habitats is very important." It has also been noted by Natural Resources Wales that Island Farm is a key area for dormouse. The LDP states that the relocation of heronsbridge school requires 4 hectares. This appears to not have been considered in the revised proposal by Merthyr Mawr Estate. The sheer volume of houses and the removal of green spaces would not help to increase the well-being of locals. I know other residents have also voiced their concerns so I've tried not to repeat what has already been said.</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
798	

LDP Rep: 1176

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable): -

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1176	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1176	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1176	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1176	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1176	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1176	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1176	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1176	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1176	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1176	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1176	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1176	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1176	<p>I cannot understand the reasoning behind the proposed development on and near Island farm, haven't we built enough houses on prime agricultural land already? Broadlands , Brackla and Coity have all devoured precious resources that a) will never be replaced and b) are not being recreated. The ground being proposed is valuable arable/ prime agricultural land whereas the ground around Sarn, Heol y Cyw etc can barely supports sheep let alone arable crops, but you decide to maintain these areas in preference to grounds that can provide food for the future. What would happen if we couldn't import grain from abroad - would it grow on the aforementioned ground - not likely !! Therefore if we have abundant arable ground it must be true that Bridgend BCB be self supporting in food production for its population? If this is not the case then surely the choice of development sites should be directed to sites that do not reduce the prime land that we do have. The LDP in my opinion is extremely short sighted and does not take into account the possible future needs of this community or country. Lateston or the surrounding grounds will be next more houses and less land for our sustainability. There is no mention anywhere though of New Hospitals, Dentists, Parks and open spaces , shops, recreational facilities or schools in theses in new developments, never mind improving the sewage system or the power and water supply or waste disposal, civic amenity sites for so many houses and littering issues in the area, is the authority building another sewage treatment works and if so where , are they upgrading the road system , unlikely ! So if they are building all yeses houses , can they say how many LONG term jobs it is going to create (not those short term construction jobs) the forecast is around 200 -300 a year - not many for such a large development, or is the plan to make Bridgend merely a commuter centre for other towns on cities that make provision for employment more of a priority than thousands of houses. It would be advisable to revise the plan and look for a more sustainable alternative , utilising ground that is unproductive and marginal to build on whereby adding value to those Areas bolstering communities that are declining but leaving the next generations the options and resources that they may well need to continue to inhabit this part of the world.</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1176

LDP Rep: 1177

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	unaffordable housing for the many built where there should be leisure facilities as provided to all major towns but not Porthcawl is the antithesis of providing the well being for future generations
1177	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	the growth strategy as outlined above misses the declining job market and obstacle that is the M4 that makes anything west of newport unattractive
1177	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	you are not regenerating porthcawl your plans are going to make it a worse place to live not better but then as the decision makers do not live here or will not be affected by them why should they care
1177	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	more traffic on overcrowded roads building houses with no gardens especially after taking away green spaces
1177	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	big plans for houses no plans for health and leisure facilities
1177	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1177	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1177	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1177	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID

1177

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley

ID

1177

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill

ID

1177

you are not in any way shape or form regenerating porthcawl you are going to make where i live a traffic congested nightmare but as no one making your ill thought out plans live here why should you care less

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys

ID

1177

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed

ID

1177

how do you expect the a48 by island farm will cope with all that extra traffic

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1177

porthcawl and me has been waiting 45+years for a swimming pool though mostly jealously one incarnation after another has failed or fobbed us off after you have finished covering everywhere in house,s which few locals will be able to afford built shops to replace the empty ones in john street you will say theres no land left to build one bcbc cabinet council members have the advantage of the bravery of being out of range of the ballot box the schemes they are pulling here wound not happen north of the m4

LDP Rep: 1178

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable): -

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1178	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1178	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1178	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1178	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1178	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1178	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1178	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1178	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1178	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1178	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1178	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1178	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1178	<p>Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ - maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; - reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; - provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; - guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and - ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current</p>

and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1178	

1179	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1179	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1179	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1179	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	To whom it may concern. Myself and my wife would like to formally log our opposition to the proposed L.D.P. for the Island Farm site on the grounds of extra traffic on an already very busy road the A48 and the adverse affect on local wildlife and further possible environmental issues.
1179	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1179	

LDP Rep: 1180

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	SOBJ4 I doubt enough thought will be given to nature and what does the council deem as distinctive?
1180	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	As we have many "dead " towns lets hope building will take place there and not greenfield sites.I suggest you look at the work of Barnabus Caulder and the impact of building rather than re using. All life matters flora and fauna.We are interdependent.
1180	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	Again, the areas mentionef have semi rural aspects and should be respected not obliterated.
1180	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	Well, it will be a first if Bridgend planning pull that one off.Bridgend had a tradition of demolishing anything with historicl significance eg.Old town hall, Embassy cinema, Park hospital, Duneaven Castle etc. What is the councils idea of "sustainable"?.People's health and well being is not considered when you want to ruin people's current living conditions and peace of mind,which tends to keep them out of the Doctors and NHS systems.Yoyr mention of space is to ram as much into a soace as you can.Just look at the developments around Bridgend the space between houses become smaller and smaller.It would be interesting to see where the planners live. Planners should be out in the community regularly to see how life goes on before the "paper exercises." It will be interesting to see what develops,but I don't think it will be pleasing.
1180	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	You don't make communities, they mske themselves."Birds of a feather flock together" as the old adage goes.By putting people who don't work with people who do is unfair and a recipe for disaster, as those who have to get up for work are disturbed by those who have an entirely different body clock. Refer to "Maslowes hierarchy of need" and Freud's " Id, Ego and Super ego." It is difficult to change the nature of the beast.Just take a look at the housing association houses.The people have neen given every opportunity and they can't be nothered to look after the properties! Easy come, easy go
1180	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
-----------	--

1180	Pie in the sky! Bring back apprenticeships and self value. Change the education system back to not being all academic based but skills based, and leave leadership to the really clever ones.
------	---

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	I think you should have thought about these things before you allowed MacArthur Glen and other retail parks. I will be surprised if you can turn the clock back. You forget about free will.
1180	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Sounds great but you haven't said how you will achieve this.
1180	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	This is the most important issue! With my recent involvement in a planning app. it didn't seem the council was very interested in any of this
1180	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1180	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1180	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1180	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Leave everything as it is. It was built historically to fit into the surrounds perfectly.
1180	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Bridgend county used to be lovely now 😞.
1180	

LDP Rep: 1181

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1181	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1181	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1181	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1181	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1181	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1181	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1181	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1181	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1181	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1181	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1181	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1181	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1181	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	I have just received a leaflet stating that you plan to develop more houses at Island Farm plus a development south of Broadlands roundabout. Who in the Planning Department can pass such ideas whilst the Bridgend area is in such A MESS. The reason that I am AGAINST this Development are :- [1] The population of Bridgend is to LARGE at the moment. The Princess Of Wales Hospital is struggling to cope, with the influx of Patients from the AREA. [2] There are not enough schools in the area, what are here are overcrowded and the amount of traffic at the beginning and end of the school day is ridiculous. You only have to be outside the Brynteg School to see the traffic, parking on pavements etc. Some one is going to have an ACCIDENT one day because of this overcrowding. [3] You have difficulty in getting an appointment at the DOCTORS SURGERY because of the population and lack of surgeries. [4] The traffic around Bridgend is already congested anymore and it will be GRIDLOCKED. [5] I live in Priory Close and we have difficulty getting out onto the Main Road at the moment God Help Us if there is MORE TRAFFIC. These are some of the reasons why I AM AGAINST THIS PROPOSAL. ALSO you only have to look at what the Planning Department have done overall to BRIDGEND IN THE PAST.
1181	

LDP Rep: 1182

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1182	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1182	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1182	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1182	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1182	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1182	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1182	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1182	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1182	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1182	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1182	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1182	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1182	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1182	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: '·maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term.' It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand-alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental</p>

capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough; not enough capacity for schools, medical and dental surgeries to cope with influx of new home dwellers.

LDP Rep: 573

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable): -

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
573	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
573	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
573	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
573	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
573	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
573	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
573	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
573	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

573	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
573	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
573	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
573	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
573	<p>PLA3, LAND WEST OF BRIDGEND Locally known as the “Circus Field” (and surrounding) site Proposal for 850 houses, etc. I / We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further housing is not necessary at this location. An evidence-based case has not been made. The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. It would be bad planning to add a further 850 houses to this area. To make this delicate site profitable, even so-called “affordable” housing would be beyond the means of most young persons. • Infrastructure is not in place to support further development. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP. Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed. • Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP. • Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity. • The site would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles. • The site has an inherently rural aspect, It forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council’s objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough. • This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage. Llangewydd Road and its surrounding lane network have been identified by historians as a pre-historic ridgeway, a medieval pilgrims’ way, Ffordd y Gyfraith (“The Way of the Law”),

and a drivers' road. There is a strong possibility of Roman and Celtic archaeology on site. • The proposed site is criss-crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people and visitors. Urbanising them would create a miserable aspect, which the developer's proposals for "corridors" would not mitigate. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. • No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. • The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. • This urbanisation would create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.

- The proposal to close Llangewydd Road to vehicular traffic is undesirable and disingenuous.
 - o Undesirable because this lane is already a popular walking and cycling route, and vehicular traffic coexists without difficulty on this stretch. Alternative vehicle movements, along the lane north from the A473 at Crossways, towards the Old Church Field, as apparently recommended by the developer, would cause unacceptable conflict with walkers and cyclists. Alternative vehicle movements would not be equally convenient to any users of the lane network, and the unintended consequences could be severe. They have not been investigated.
 - o Disingenuous, because no evidence has been put forward to argue for the closure of Llangewydd Road. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that a credible motive for this closure is to eliminate Llangewydd Road as a "natural" boundary for the development. Removing vehicular traffic removes this boundary and leaves the way wide open to future applications for further housing development towards Penyfai, which planners would find difficult to resist. This would repeat the experience of Broadlands, where an initial development of only slightly larger size than this proposal grew from a new settlement measured in hundreds of dwellings to one now numbered in thousands. The inclusion of the Old Church Field (north of Llangewydd Road) in the proposal, while on the face of it a philanthropic measure, could in reality be a further indication of an ambition to expand this development further northwards.
- In a nutshell, this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. A case is not made and the proposal should be set aside and not progressed in the LDP. Please note: A second letter to follow, with some further comments.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
573	

LDP Rep: 454

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
454	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
454	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
454	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
454	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
454	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
454	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
454	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
454	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

454	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
454	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
454	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
454	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
454	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
454	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental</p>

capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

LDP Rep: 1183

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable): -

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1183	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1183	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1183	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1183	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1183	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1183	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1183	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1183	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1183	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1183	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1183	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1183	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1183	<p>To whom it may concern at BCBC, I hereby object to the proposal to build on land at Island Farm and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP for a number of reasons as follows. The site provides invaluable habitat for numerous flora and fauna. As someone who walks there everyday all year round I have become very aware of what this land has to offer. Currently we have fox cubs, rabbits, buzzards , red kite, owls, kestrels and numerous others, to many to mention. It is teeming with insect life , bees, ladybirds, butterflies dragonflies to name a few. Last winter it was common to see up-to twelve heron gathered in the same field feeding in the pools there. The plant life is just as varied with , wild primrose, cowslips and foxgloves to the many different types of trees and fungi including the not very widespread Scarlett Elf Cap. Destroying this land for ever would be criminal in removing such sights from future generations , it's all very well leaving the grass verges grow wild in the borough in the name of conservation but instead of token gestures what about real conservation. I know that many others will have made you aware of the traffic issues, and the strain such a development will put on local schools and services. Try getting a dental or doctors appointment in Bridgend these days already. Plus the sewage works at Ogmore is currently running at above maximum capacity , how do you propose they cope with the additional pressure this development will add. More pollution at Ogmore beach seems the likely outcome, threatening marine life and the health of water users. My next point would be the stability of the land in question, while it is excellent arable land it is extremely unstable with various sized sinkholes appearing there every winter after heavy rainfall. Last winter I counted at least seventeen of various widths and depths. These take tonnes of earth to fill in but reform or appear again after the next heavy winter rain. There is clearly a lot of underground water movement here and even if this water course were damned or diverted it will find another route, maybe resulting in more serious flooding possibly of the lower lying Merthyr Mawr. There are also locals who say that there are indeed clay pits beneath this ground from old extractions to supply the local potteries. Who will accept responsibility for any potential future disaster that occurs as a result of building here. It is time that the concerns of current local residents were put before the wishes of a few wealthy businessmen seeking to expand their empire.</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID

1183

LDP Rep: 976

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
976	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
976	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
976	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
976	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
976	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
976	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
976	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
976	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

976	
-----	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
976	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
976	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
976	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
976	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
976	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental</p>

capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

LDP Rep: 1184

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1184	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1184	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1184	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1184	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1184	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1184	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1184	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1184	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1184	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1184	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1184	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1184	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1184	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1184	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental</p>

capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

LDP Rep: 1185

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable): -

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1185	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1185	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1185	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1185	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1185	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1185	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1185	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1185	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1185	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1185	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1185	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1185	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	Proposed Development of 847 Houses on Island Farm plus Craig Y Parcau and Broadlands Roundabout I live in Merthyr Mawr Road at the junction between the lower end of Bowham Avenue and Merthyr Mawr Road and I am totally against these Developments, specifically the Proposed Island Farm one, as it is more or less on my and other neighbours' doorsteps. I have been a resident here for 35 years and seen the amount of traffic rise at an alarming rate. It's stressful trying to negotiate leaving and entering my drive at present, and residents nearer than me to the A48 obviously have greater difficulty, as our part of the road significantly narrows. Plus, I would have thought that the infrastructure in this region will not sustain the amount of building works and increase in traffic you are considering. To add to this would be a safety hazard to say the least. Lastly, there would be a detrimental effect on the environment, nature and wildlife in this area. The countryside surrounding Bridgend Town is well known nationally for its beauty, specifically Merthyr Mawr. Must we destroy what little we have left?
1185	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1185	

LDP Rep: 1186

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1186	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1186	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1186	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1186	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1186	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1186	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1186	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1186	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1186	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1186	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1186	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1186	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1186	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Please consider the following in respect of Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33: Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘· maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the
1186	

case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

LDP Rep: 1187

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1187	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1187	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1187	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1187	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1187	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1187	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1187	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1187	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1187	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1187	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1187	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1187	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1187	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1187	<p>Please see below for consideration: Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48</p> <p>Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not</p>

posses the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

LDP Rep: 1188

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable): -

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1188	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1188	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1188	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1188	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1188	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1188	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1188	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1188	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1188	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1188	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1188	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1188	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1188	<p>SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I/We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds; Settlement Boundary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic • The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. • The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. • The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. • The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. • The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature • Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development

on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr • To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the “Dipping Bridge” and arguably include the “Showground Field” which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, “To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places”. Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area. Safety • To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 • The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedence on the A48. • The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk. Placemaking • The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmere Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmere) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1188	

LDP Rep: 1189

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1189	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1189	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1189	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1189	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1189	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1189	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1189	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1189	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1189	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1189	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1189	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1189	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1189	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1189	<p>I'm writing to object to the proposed development at Island Farm. Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: '· maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning</p>

response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

LDP Rep: 1190

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1190	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1190	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1190	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1190	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1190	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1190	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1190	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1190	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1190	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1190	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1190	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1190	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1190	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	To whom it concerns Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: '· maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental
1190	

capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

LDP Rep: 1191

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1191	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1191	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1191	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1191	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1191	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1191	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1191	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1191	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1191	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1191	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1191	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1191	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1191	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Proposed site: SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds;
1191	<p>Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe</p>

bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status.

Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area.

Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 - The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedance on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk.

Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmores Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmores) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

LDP Rep: 1192

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1192	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1192	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1192	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1192	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1192	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1192	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1192	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1192	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1192	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1192	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1192	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1192	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1192	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1192	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental</p>

capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough

LDP Rep: 1193

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1193	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1193	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1193	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1193	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1193	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1193	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1193	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1193	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1193	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1193	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1193	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1193	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1193	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1193	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental</p>

capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would: • fail to command community support; • would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48; • would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes; • frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

LDP Rep: 1194

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1194	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1194	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1194	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1194	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1194	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1194	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1194	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1194	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1194	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1194	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1194	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1194	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1194	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1194	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental</p>

capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

LDP Rep: 1195

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable): -

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1195	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1195	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1195	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1195	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1195	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1195	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1195	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1195	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1195	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1195	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1195	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1195	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1195	<p>SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I/We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds; Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the</p>

SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area. Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 - The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedence on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk. Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmore Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmore) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?

ID	
1195	

LDP Rep: 1196

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1196	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1196	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1196	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1196	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1196	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1196	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1196	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1196	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1196	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1196	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1196	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1196	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1196	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Proposed site: SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I/We hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds; Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice,
1196	

Lesser Horseshoe bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area. Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 - The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedance on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk. Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmores Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmores) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

LDP Rep: 1197

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1197	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1197	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1197	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1197	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1197	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1197	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1197	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1197	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1197	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1197	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1197	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1197	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1197	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	The Deposit Replacement LDP appears to have been issued in stealth mode. The first I heard about this was two weeks ago, leaving little or no time to review what is a lengthy but highly important document. I understand that Covid-19 restrictions have impacted matters, but there must be alternative ways of informing the public that a Replacement LDP was being circulated together with a deadline for comments. I believe it would be entirely appropriate to grant a 90 day extension to the process. This will allow time for proper consideration of the LDP, together with wider communication amongst the public.
1197	

LDP Rep: 1198

Representor Name: █████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1198	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1198	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1198	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1198	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1198	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1198	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1198	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1198	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1198	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1198	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1198	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1198	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1198	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	To whom it may concern, Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not pose the environmental
1198	

capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

LDP Rep: 1199

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1199	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1199	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1199	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1199	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1199	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1199	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1199	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1199	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1199	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1199	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1199	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1199	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1199	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	I've lived in the Broadlands the past twenty years. It's a fair size and is lacking the facilities that a community needs. I object to the proposed development for all of the reasons that you are no doubt aware of. For me, the destruction of the environment would unforgivable. The strain on the roads would add to the already overwhelming traffic in Broadlands and that part of the A48. Facilities can't cope already.
1199	Infrastructure like schools, local health facilities, community services.. There's no community hall on Broadlands as it is. The estate is a warehouse of people, with a pub, small supermarket, chemist, dentist (currently failing the people anyway). Has this scheme been properly researched? If consultation is meaningful, please listen.

LDP Rep: 1200

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1200	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1200	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1200	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1200	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1200	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1200	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1200	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1200	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1200	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1200	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1200	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1200	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1200	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	I have just studied the proposals for the new proposed development of Island Farm and the area covering Merthyr Mawr. I cannot believe that yet again another proposal is being made for such a development in one of the most scenic areas of the borough. Nearly an additional thousand houses proposed, is in my opinion such an absurdity it makes me angry. As having been a resident in this Borough nearly all my life I have always been so proud to be living near such a unique setting which has always been such a draw to local visitors to enjoy. I am very aware that new housing etc may be needed, but it is the proposed place is my sincere objection. Knowing the area well I can for -see so many reasons why this project is doomed to fail, besides the huge ecological considerations which need to be taken into serious consideration. Traffic will be a major issue if this proposal goes ahead. The traffic through to Merthyr Mawr and surrounding area cannot take an increase in volume. My last point is this. Why would Bridgend need a Tennis Academy? As you will be aware Bridgend Tennis Club over the past two years has been transformed with a tremendous amount of local money being put into it making it a wonderful venue. I am hoping that my views will be taken into consideration.
1200	

LDP Rep: 1201

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1201	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1201	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1201	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1201	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1201	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1201	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1201	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1201	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1201	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1201	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1201	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1201	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1201	<p>I'd like to voice my concern regarding the proposed housing development between Island Farm and Laleston. I'm a resident of the area and frankly this development would ruin the area. Safety The nearby A48 and New Inn Road are already very busy and I often see Brynteg School children crossing the A48 during busy times. A child was hit by a motorbike and killed on the A48 within recent memory. ~1800 houses being built on the proposed sites will increase the volume of traffic on the roads and pose a greater risk to schoolchildren. The dipping bridge is an old bridge and enjoyed by families in the local area. The increased volume of traffic which the proposed development would bring would ruin this and pose a safety risk. Natural Beauty The dunes and the Merthyr Mawr are a part of the heritage of the local area. People come from all around the UK to take in the quiet rural surroundings. Do you really want to ruin such a beautiful area with a housing development? Island Farm hosts beautiful rare wildlife. Why would you want to ruin their habitat with a housing development?</p>

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1201	

LDP Rep: 1202

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1202	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1202	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1202	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1202	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1202	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1202	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1202	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1202	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1202	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1202	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1202	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1202	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1202	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1202	<p>As a resident of Ewenny Road/ roundabout, for 30 years, I have ,on a daily basis, been subject to the difficulties and pollution of the ever increasing volumes of traffic along these roads. It is with this in mind that I find myself shocked by the proposals for the development of so many houses when there is clearly not the infrastructure or facilities, social and academic, to cope with the increases in demand this will place on the area. It is most difficult on the weekend as it is to travel along the A48 especially on the approach to the McDonald's mini roundabout. There are very few green areas left around Bridgend since the further development joining Brackla and Litchard to Coity and Broadlands joining Laleston and Cefn Glas. We already have two of the largest housing estates in the country with facilities, hospital, surgeries, schools, college in the area under strain. There is insufficient quality employment opportunities in the area with most residents commuting out of the area. The traffic along the A48 does not stop all night. It is constant. Bridgend is already at saturation point with traffic. It has been rumoured that there are also plans for further housing development, alongside the bypass from the site of the old council property, old John Raymond transport yard and plans to sell the police club grounds for development. If this were to go ahead also the roads would become gridlocked. I hope you will have the best intentions for our town and area at heart and realise that this development especially the larger area of Island Farm would not be the wisest thing to approve affecting most current residents of Bridgend. Many thanks for your consideration with the issues raised.</p>

LDP Rep: 1203

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1203	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1203	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1203	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1203	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1203	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1203	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1203	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1203	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1203	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1203	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1203	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1203	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1203	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1203	<p>In relation to the proposed plan and its content in relation to Penyfai and Court Colman area, I would like my response as follows to be taken into consideration in the public consultation process. 1) GREEN SPACE: I believe the LDP should recognise and mark both the Pheasant Field (Pen y fai Kick about area) and Cavendish Park as green leisure spaces. o I request these green spaces be recognised and marked as such in the published LDP. 2) TRAVELLER/ROMA SITE COURT COLMAN: There is a small settlement proposed in Court Colman (SP7 (1) for the Travelling /Roma community - the key for which appears to be missing on the plans. The ward of Aberkenfig already has a site less than 1 mile away from the one proposed. Also the LDP plans to place one in Bryncethin. I understand the need for such sites for the travelling /Roma community, but am opposed to the current plan concentrating on the ward and immediate area, particularly in a rural area of natural beauty (near Pennsylvania Woods). The area is a valued ecological / habitat area which, in a network to surrounding sites and woodlands, contributes to wider biodiversity. I ask BCBC to consider other options for placing this site outside of the wards. The proposed site is right next to a Welsh Waters reservoir and workers are constantly working there. o I am opposed to this and wish for a more appropriate site to be considered. 3) 'SMALL DEVELOPMENTS: Smaller scale developments in recent years have eroded green space, ecologically rich habitats, and changed the face of our community as well as put additional pressure on infrastructure. This fundamentally flies in the face of what the LDP (this one and the previous one) states it will not do. Additionally such developments often fail to make a full case that they are meeting the overall objectives of the LDP. There seems to be a lack of consideration of sustainable communities and the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act within the plan. The LDP notes that 'small developments' may be placed in Penyfai, but fails to identify places /candidate sites and therefore I do not feel it is a complete or sufficient</p>

consultation document for Penyfai area. I wish it to be noted that I am opposed to 'small scale' developments and wish this to be removed from the plan. Permitted householder developments would be acceptable, but over development of the community is not. Further housing developments are not required in village.

Experience has shown where small developments have been built previously (and most recently) Colman Vale, it has not added any positive social or economic value or impact or benefit to the community whatsoever. In fact, it has put more pressure on our village roads, created more environmental disruption, huge inconvenience to residents and damage to householders and public property. It has created further unnecessary pressure on the infrastructure in terms of the local school and health care services. There are still no safe routes to schools and there is no safe walking route to the 'economically regenerated' sites such as Bridgend Town Centre from the village community - it would not be sustainable development. I want the LDP to delete small scale developments as permissible in Penyfai Village. It is clear to me that such a small village doesn't have the necessary roads and other infrastructures to deal with additional houses.

4) In relation to PLA3 Land West of Bridgend, Locally known as the "Circus Field" (and surrounding) site I object to the above proposal, and ask for this site to be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds.

- The West of Bridgend area has been the site of some 3000 new houses in recent years. This is already a disproportionate amount. A further 850 house would coalesce the community boundaries of Bryntirion and Laleston, contrary to good planning principles and the statements made within the LDP.
- Potentially the site could erode the boundary /wedge with Court Colman and Newcastle Higher Ward as this urbanisation could create an undesirable precedent for further urbanisation to south, north and west. It would move the built-up area's boundary, making further greenfield development difficult to resist. This would cause further coalescence, with Broadlands to the south, Penyfai to the north, and towards Pyle in the west.
- Even housing stock deemed as 'affordable housing' in this area would likely be beyond the means of most young persons due to the nature of the area.
- Infrastructure is not in place and would be unable to cope. The local comprehensive school, for example, has not yet caught up with the housebuilding of the previous decade. The viability of further expansion of Bryntirion Comprehensive School is very doubtful due to road access constraints. Section 106 contributions from a developer would therefore be futile for this purpose. Sending children from the proposed site to other comprehensive schools would violate the local place making principles stated in the draft LDP.
- Other aspects of infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, NHS services, etc. have not been anywhere nearly adequately addressed.
- Further along the A473, air quality testing in Park Street reveals it to be one of the most polluted locations in the county. Generating more traffic to use the A473 violates the sustainable development principles contained in the draft LDP.
- Further road traffic would also put further strain on the A473 junctions with Elm Crescent and Heol y Nant, the traffic lights at Bryngolau, and the A48 Broadlands roundabout, which is already strained for capacity.
- The site forms a green wedge bordering a ward that is officially rural, and a ward that is officially urban. The overall effect would be the urbanisation of the entire district. Urbanisation would violate the council's objective of maintaining and enhancing the natural resources and biodiversity of the county borough.
- This green wedge is the location of the Laleston Stones Trail, and the Bridgend Circular Walk, and is a field, woodland and hedgerow system with an historical heritage
- The proposed site is crossed by public rights of way which have been conscientiously maintained by the Community Council and which are highly valued by local people

and visitors. Proposals for “corridors” would not mitigate the impact and loss. Developers would leave the site transferring corridor maintenance costs onto the community. · No evidence has been produced to show that the commercial benefits of building at this location would more than outweigh the loss of positive social value of the site in its current condition. Overall, there would be a severe loss of visual, social and public amenity. · Park Street is known as an area that is struggling with high levels of pollution, exacerbated by the heavy traffic utilising that main road. This is of concern, as is the volume of traffic that will likely increase through the narrow Cefn Glas lane through Pen y fai Village in the aim to bypass Park Street congestion and to access the M4. · The loss of the rich and diverse flora and fauna of the woodland, fields and hedgerows is not justified by any commercial benefit from this development. In summary I am against this proposal as it goes against much of what the LDP says it is trying to achieve - this proposal puts the wrong type of development with the wrong type of houses in the wrong location. Other sites in Bridgend County may be better placed to support a development of this nature, with less impact. General observations on the wider planning issues: I have observed developers can, and have made arguments after planning consent has been granted, to reduce the levels of social housing based on financial viability and profits and to negotiate changes in conditions (without further public/meaningful consultation). This should not be allowed to continue. Similarly Section 106 monies are not benefitting areas where development and disruption takes place, and is often reneged on; community voices in relation to Section 106 monies are not represented. Road adoption is an issue on new developments, and maintenance of sites at points where they have not been adopted is creating problems in our community. Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]

LDP Rep: 1204

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1204	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1204	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1204	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1204	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1204	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1204	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1204	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1204	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1204	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1204	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1204	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1204	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1204	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	I wish to register my strong objections to these proposed developments. I have lived in The Retreat Bridgend for thirty years and in that time have seen the results of the Broadlands development. The volume of traffic on the A48 has increased enormously together with the attendant noise levels and pollution. At times it is impossible to cross the road safely due to the speed and sheer volume of traffic. There are regularly long tailbacks and traffic jams from Ewenny roundabout in all directions. You are no doubt aware there have been a number of fatal pedestrian and vehicular incidents on the A48 in the vicinity of these proposed developments. Island Farm is an oasis of greenery and wildlife part of Bridgends heritage. It has already been vandalised by demolishing the historic prisoner of war camp. If these developments go ahead not only will that be lost but also the jewel in the crown of Merthyr Mawr will undoubtedly be damaged with the increased traffic in New Inn Road and the surrounding area. The infrastructure of Bridgend is already struggling to cope nearly 2000 extra homes will obviously add to these problems. This is a very short sighted proposal that may generate a lot of money for private landowners and developers however it will destroy the beauty that is currently on the doorstep for the people of Bridgend.
1204	

LDP Rep: 1205

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1205	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1205	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1205	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1205	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1205	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1205	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1205	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1205	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1205	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1205	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1205	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1205	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1205	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Proposed site: SP2(2)/PLA2 Land South of Bridgend (Island Farm) Proposal for 847 houses etc and Com 1(2) Craig-Y-Parcau, Proposal for 110 houses To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I hereby object to the above proposal, and ask that the site be deleted from the final LDP, on the following grounds;
1205	<p>Settlement Boundary - Both these sites are outside of the settlement boundary of Bridgend as defined by the A48. Traffic - The traffic congestion at the nodal points between Broadlands and Waterton is often over-capacity during the AM and PM rush hours. Traffic on Ewenny Hill also backs up below the potteries and Summer traffic can back up to Waterton roundabout. The country lane, New Inn Road has become a rat run already used by many to avoid congestion on the A48 and is now dangerous for walkers and cyclists. This development will increase traffic on the A48, Ewenny Hill, Ewenny Road and New Inn Road. - The Traffic Strategic Appraisal commissioned by HD Developments acknowledges that it has been impossible to conduct any meaningful appraisal of the traffic situation because of Covid. To include such a large development in the LDP at such a traffic hotspot and without up-to-date data and analysis is reckless. - The effect of a development of this size on traffic, must also be seen in the context of proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau (110 house), Laleston (850 houses) and Parc Afon Ewenni (650 houses). There is no evidence that the cumulative effect of all these developments, has been properly assessed at this point. - The comparison in the draft deposit LDP consultation document with the previously granted application, is misleading, supporting claims by the developer that fewer car trips will be generated by the housing development than would have been by their previous approved application for a sports village. - The air quality on Ewenny Roundabout has been known to regularly exceed the legal limit. Adding more traffic will certainly exacerbate the problem. Nature - Roughly a quarter of the Island Farm site is a SINC and home to European protected species; dormice, Lesser Horseshoe</p>

bats and Brown Long Eared bats. Dormice require continuous hedgerow/tree cover. This will be severed by the entrance road. They will also be very vulnerable to domestic cats. Lesser Horseshoe bats are extremely negatively affected by light pollution, added to which they will have to travel further to find suitable feeding areas. The cumulative pressures of a dense housing development on the biodiversity of the SINC will reduce its value for biodiversity which could result in it losing its SINC status. Merthyr Mawr - To take the development boundary up to New Inn Road would irreparably degrade the rural context within which Merthyr Mawr lies. The environs of Merthyr Mawr, without a doubt, extend to the "Dipping Bridge" and arguably include the "Showground Field" which extends to the A48. New Inn Road should be seen as part of the context of this well-loved, unique and nationally regarded historic area. Apart from its function as a rat run, it serves solely as the approach to Merthyr Mawr and it should be valued by BCBC in accordance with their policy, "To Protect and Enhance Distinctive and Natural Places". Merthyr Mawr is a unique asset for Bridgend and the wider area. Safety - To ensure the safety of children crossing the A48 from the development at Island Farm to get to school, the traffic will have to be slowed and a pedestrian crossing point put in. This will further impede the traffic flow at busy times on the A48 - The LDP states that the junction of Ewenny Road and New Inn Road is already forecast to get busier i.e., more fast traffic on New Inn Road Lane. This is part of the Sustrans Route 88 from Newport to Margam Park which currently stops at the bottom of Ewenny Hill. Safe active travel along New Inn Road for pedestrians and cyclists is currently difficult and will get much more so with increased traffic and impedance on the A48. - The Dipping Bridge is a much loved recreation area for kids and young people particularly during hot weather. Increased traffic over the bridge will negatively affect the enjoyment of this iconic landmark and potentially pose a safety risk. Placemaking - The proposed developments at Craig-Y-Parcau and Island Farm will enclose and impinge upon the Ogmores Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLCA018 Ogmores) as well as Merthyr Mawr Registered Historic Landscape area and the grade 2* Park and garden of Merthyr Mawr House. These designations point to a unique and valuable landscape that is placed in trust for the next generation. A place that has already been made and it is the duty of Bridgend Council to pass it on, undegraded, to the next generation.

LDP Rep: 1206

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
1206	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	Care needs to be taken in striking a balance between growth and the level capacity that our creaking infrastructure can support. Untrammled growth in housing in areas already at capacity would cause huge reductions in the liveability and general wellbeing of our communities.
1206	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	While developing brownfield sites has its merits, it must be borne in mind that hundreds of houses may put significantly more pressure on existing infrastructure than a sparsely attended commercial yard. When considering such development, the question of how, or even whether, the infrastructure can be developed to support it should be the primary concern, not an inconvenient afterthought.
1206	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
1206	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	The infrastructure, transport and green spaces should be the primary consideration here. Giving areas over to housing where the infrastructure is already stretched and/or where transport links are poor would be detrimental to the wellbeing, cohesiveness and levels of healthy activity. Without viable infrastructure plans, the houses should not follow.
1206	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	The switch to homeworking during the pandemic should be taken into account here. Many more people will be working from home at the moment and many employers will continue to support workers in homeworking for at least part of the week for the foreseeable future. In such a world, areas which are complete communities would be preferable to what would essentially be dormitory estates.
1206	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
-----------	--

1206	Again, with the rise of homeworking there may be scope for more traditional villages, with independent retailers being close to home.
------	---

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1206	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	It should be borne in mind that we need to protect green spaces in developed areas, where they may be in short supply, as much if not more than less developed places. A parcel of green land in a generally built-up area can be hugely beneficial to the wellbeing of its community.
1206	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1206	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1206	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1206	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1206	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	I would advise strongly against allowing further residential development in the area behind Meadow Street and Tondu Primary School in Aberkenfig. The infrastructure of the village is already struggling with major issues for waste collection amongst other things, not to mention the pressures on the various amenities. Any further development in this area would likely have a detrimental effect on the quality of life for the community.
1206	

LDP Rep: 1037

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1037	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1037	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1037	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1037	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1037	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1037	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1037	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1037	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1037	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1037	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1037	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1037	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1037	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1037	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the ‘wrong side’ of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not posse the environmental</p>

capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

LDP Rep: 1207

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1207	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1207	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1207	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1207	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1207	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1207	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1207	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1207	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1207	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1207	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1207	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1207	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1207	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	847 HOUSES ON ISLAND FARM 110 SOUTH OF BROADLANDS ROUNDABOUT at Craig-Y-Parcau 1. For Traffic 2. For Safety 3. For Merthyr Mawr 4. For Nature 5. For Heronsbridge School 6. For Employment and Sustainability 1. Traffic: - The proposal in the draft LDP is for a single exit from Island Farm onto the A48. The Situation Now - Traffic backs up to below the potteries on Ewenny Hill in certain conditions – with this development it’s going to be a regular event. - Traffic heading to the seaside creates queueing back to Waterton already – lots of additional cars will not help this problem. - Queues at rush hours at Broadlands and Ewenny roundabouts - Traffic backs up from Tescos roundabout frequently as cars queue to get into MacDonalds and the shops -At a conservative estimate of 1.5 cars per household, an extra 1,535 cars would be entering and exiting the A48. What will it mean for traffic at Ewenny roundabout? - How will 847 houses at Island Farm, 850 houses at Laleston as well as 110 south of Broadlands roundabout affect traffic congestion? - How will the country lane (New Inn Road), that links the A48 to the bottom of Ewenny Pottery Hill, and passes over the Dipping Bridge, be able to safely and easily manage such a high increase in cars/vans etc. seeking to avoid congestion on the A48? 2. Safety - Safety concerns for children crossing A48 to get to school etc. - New Inn Road is already a rat run and the draft LDP forecasts the junction onto Ewenny road will get busier. It is already dangerous as the road itself has barely sufficient room for 2 cars, often travelling fast; What about the other road users such as cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians, many with their pet dogs? -The Dipping Bridge is well used and loved by everyone, the kids and teenagers who use it as an informal recreation area, having fun and causing no problems. Any increase in traffic will impact people’s enjoyment of this beautiful area and potentially their safety. As a historic and iconic monument with in the county it should surely have protected status. How will a large development at Island Farm impact active travel as well as the safety,
1207	

enjoyment and well-being of other road users in this much loved and well used area?

3. Merthyr Mawr Wales Online ranks Merthyr Mawr as the second prettiest village in all Wales, beaten only by Beddgelert in Snowdonia which is more than helped by its spectacular surroundings. The environs of Merthyr Mawr stretch from the A48 to the sea and draw both local visitors and tourists. It is a unique and beautiful place which should be cherished and protected for the enjoyment of future generations. Its setting should be enhanced rather than compressed by insensitive development. The roads in and out of the village, including New Inn Road are often so busy, the enjoyment of walkers and cyclists, is already severely affected. In order to incorporate the SINC (Site of Importance for Nature Conservation) the housing development will be high density at 40 houses per hectare which will surely impact the rural nature and setting of Merthyr Mawr. - How will the rural setting of Merthyr Mawr and its attraction for visitors and locals be impacted by 847 new houses at Island Farm?

4. Nature The LDP proposes keeping the majority of the SINC - However the integrity of the SINC will be fractured by the spine road. Rare and vulnerable wildlife inhabit this area including European protected species such as dormice (which need continuous hedgerows) and lesser horseshoe bats (which are extremely sensitive to light pollution). In addition barn owls, lapwing, fieldfares and redwing currently use the greater Island Farm site area. The value of an area for biodiversity is contingent upon what surrounds it and an area only retains its designation as a SINC for as long as its value for nature holds. The pressure of a high density housing development (40 houses per hectare) with people, cats, dogs and light pollution may very well reduce the value for wildlife to an extent whereby the SINC designation is lost. Once the designation is gone, it is still within the development boundary and could be ripe for further housing development. - How will wildlife survive here and what is the long term fate of the SINC if the rest of the site is developed with high density housing?

5. Heronsbridge School It is well known that once a site is designated for housing the number of houses can easily go up. Heronsbridge School does need a new premises and Island Farm is the preferred site. If the developer says they need to build more houses to pay for the school, is the council going to stand in their way? Bridgend College is going to be moved into the town centre and the college buildings and Heronsbridge School will surely be demolished to make way for housing. Why can't a new fit for purpose Heronsbridge School be rebuilt on the same site and paid for through developing the Bridgend College site?

6. Growth: Employment and Sustainability Land for over 1800 houses is to be designated from Laleston to Ewenny roundabout. The vast majority of this is currently good farmland Throughout the county the LDP is promoting the building of over 7000 houses. They are allowing a 20% leeway which means designating enough land for over 9000 houses. The vast majority of these are to be on the coastal plain south of the valleys 7000 houses can be broken down to an average of 505 houses per year over the 15 year lifespan of the LDP. The council is basing the need for 505 new houses per year on the hope of attracting 500 new jobs a year. This is the amount of jobs they are hoping for if all the employment development land in the LDP is taken up, which is a wildly optimistic scenario. The council however is using this scenario on which to base its housing strategy. The jobs may or may not come but it will always be in the interest of developers to build on green field spaces especially when they are within easy commuter distance to Cardiff and the M4 corridor. This though, is within the strategy of the LDP. It is called CARMS and aims to increase the number of younger people in the county to adjust for the ageing population. However, although we are generally living longer, the ageing population is due, in part, to a very high birth rate in the

	<p>1950s and 1960s which has been steadily reducing since then. Simply building lots of houses on green fields is not a way to solve the by-problems that come with longer, healthier lives. - Why so many houses when the number of jobs currently forecast is somewhere between 219 – 266 per year or around 3750 for the whole period? - Is Bridgend to be a commuter area for Cardiff and the M4 corridor? - 2 of 3 secondary schools in Bridgend are overfull. Brynteg school is one of the largest in Wales. How much more can it expand? - GPs & hospitals are already under pressure.</p>
--	---

LDP Rep: 1208

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1208	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1208	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1208	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1208	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1208	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1208	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1208	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1208	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1208	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1208	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1208	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1208	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1208	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1208	<p>Hello, I'm writing to object to the proposed development at Island Farm. Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: '· maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend which would result in housing being orphaned on the 'wrong side' of this major transport corridor. This will be the case particularly for the proposed Craig Y Parcau houses under COM1 that are allocated as a stand alone isolated housing allocation, seemingly having no justification other than a house once stood there. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning</p>

response should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

Kind regards,

LDP Rep: 1210

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	
1210	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	
1210	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	
1210	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	
1210	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	
1210	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	
1210	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
1210	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?

ID	
1210	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?

ID	
-----------	--

1210	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1210	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1210	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmore and Garw valleys	
ID	
1210	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1210	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	To: whom it may concern at Bridgend County Borough Council I hereby object to any further development along the Llynfi Valley and surrounding area and ask for BCBC to consider the potential direct and indirect impact these developments would have on the Tondy and Aberkenfig area, which form part of the Valleys Gateway and believe more local consultation is required on these issues. <input type="checkbox"/> I believe any proposed significant residential developments in Maesteg and Llangynwyd would have a significant effect on an area which BCBC has within the LDP already acknowledged, has major capacity issues when looking at the access to the M4 corridor at J36. <input type="checkbox"/> The LDP states - 'Unspecified improvements to the A4063 between Tondy and Maesteg' - this suggests that BCBC recognises this road is at capacity but has no idea how to resolve it. The extra volume of HGV traffic from WEPA when their expansion is complete, along with further developments along the route, will punish the homeowners in both Tondy and Coytrahean with excessive noise and air pollution. <input type="checkbox"/> Whilst pleased to see that the LDP acknowledged that there are capacity issues which would constrain further significant residential development, we are concerned the LDP lacks insufficient plans for affordable housing and that the targets set are far too low and that the suggestion that S106 will deliver social and affordable housing is unrealistic. <input type="checkbox"/> I feel a lack of consideration has been given to the provision of medical facilities. At present there is already a 2 -3 week waiting period for a call back from most local surgeries. The electorate will not accept that this is dismissed as out of BCBC authority. We want to see and take confidence that these concerns are being address or are BCBC prepared for the backlash when surgeries reach capacity? <input type="checkbox"/> More housing means an increase in noise and air pollution, the LDP shows a lack of attention to the impact these developments will have! This leads us to question how this LDP fits with BCBC's promotion of improving the environment and people's health and well-being? <input type="checkbox"/> I/We consider policies over green spaces and play areas should be
1210	

strengthened to ensure more of them and better access to walk/cycle routes and more investment in public transport! □ We must raise concerns about the significant residential development planned near PYLE (estimated 2000+ new homes) and whether they are needed. The growth strategy in the Deposit Consultation document states that with an expected population growth of 500, 505 new homes are required. However, we consider this statement is not evidence based and simply speculative. □ Sites for housing should be revised in light of the pandemic as the likelihood is that fewer people will be regularly commuting to the town centre offices post pandemic. This will lead to more empty office space and the LDP should focus on converting this to housing and arts/cultural/hospitality to create a vibrant town centre. □ Targets for affordable housing are far too low – all the evidence suggests relying on S106 is not delivering affordable or social housing.

LDP Rep: 1211

Representor Name: ██████████

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?	
ID	
1211	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?	
ID	
1211	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?	
ID	
1211	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?	
ID	
1211	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?	
ID	
1211	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?	
ID	
1211	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?	
ID	
1211	

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	
1211	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	

1211	
------	--

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	
1211	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	
1211	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1211	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1211	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	
1211	<p>Bridgend LDP Review 2018-33 Rebuttal to Allocation Of COM1 (2) and PLA 2 - Housing and Growth Allocations, South of A48 Bridgend Para 1.1.2 of the Deposit Consultation Document (DCD) states that the LDP is required to produce outputs including: ‘ · maximising well-being and creating sustainable places through placemaking; · reflect local aspirations for the County Borough, based on a vision agreed by the Council and other stakeholders; · provide a basis for rational and consistent development management decisions; · guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character, and sensitive environments; and · ensure the social and economic resilience of settlements and their ability to adapt to change over the long term. It is argued that the allocation of substantial areas of green field land south of the A48 that have previously received long term protection from previous Council administrations and Planning Inspectors would not meet the objectives set by the Council and Welsh Government for high quality place making. The environment south of the A48 has long been viewed as an area of restraint due to its high landscape and ecological value and as part of a holistic view of protection of the environs of the nationally important Merthyr Mawr village and National Nature Reserve. In particular the impact that such large scale housing allocations will have on the highway infrastructure of the area would be significantly detrimental. In terms of the LDP promotion of Active Travel, the A48 would remain a dangerous obstacle to walking and cycling routes to facilities in Bridgend and the additional traffic associated with the development would result in extreme overloading of major roads that are already very busy and result in overspill of traffic onto country lanes which are already used as rat runs. The proposal does not command local support. A previous attempt to promote large scale development in this location was overturned in the previous LDP. It is the case that this area does not possess the environmental capacity to promote such large scale housing development and the strategic planning response</p>

should be for management and maintenance of the area for low key countryside management as with other protected areas in the County Borough. As stated in the objectives to the LDP Review, the proposals should protect local diversity, character and sensitive environments. The current proposals would produce the opposite impact for current and future generations. The Island Farm area is home to protected species such as dormice, and contributes significantly to the diversity of wildlife in the area. This would be compromised by the proposed development and undoubtedly result in the demise of the protected species. In short the strategic allocations would fail to meet the objectives of sustainable development and would frustrate the opportunities of future generations to enjoy and benefit from the natural environment surrounding Bridgend in the way that previous generations have been allowed to. The LDP Vision to 2033 is stated as: 'Since the turn of the millennium, Bridgend and the wider County Borough has been on a journey to expand access to key services, enhance physical environmental quality and improve quality of life for residents, workers and visitors. This transformation will continue throughout the LDP period, resulting in the continued development of a safe, healthy and inclusive network of communities that connect more widely with the regions to enable sustainable economic growth.' It is contended that the large scale allocation of housing and growth areas south of the A48 will not help the County Borough and its residents meet this vision. In fact, it is argued that creating isolated housing estates on high environmental quality land in accessible walking/cycling locations will prevent achievement of the vision. The development would not be able to meet the vision of 'safe, healthy and inclusive'. The development of such a large scale nearly 50 ha development at PLA2 will irrevocably change the whole character of the southern area of Bridgend and detrimentally impact on areas of high quality landscape that are recognised in LANDMAP designations and protection via previous LDP policies. In conclusion, the proposed Island Farm PLA2 and COM 1 Craig Y Parcau Strategic Growth and Housing Allocations would:

- fail to command community support;
- would adversely impact wildlife and protected species and deny future generations the opportunity to enjoy green infrastructure and biodiversity south of the A48;
- would not allow for active travel given the extensive and dangerous barrier of the A48 and would clog up existing rural lanes;
- frustrate the aims of producing sustainable development in the County Borough.

LDP Rep: 1214

Representor Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable):

Type of Representor: Member of the Public

1: Do you have any comments to make on the key issues and drivers, vision and objectives of the Deposit Replacement Local Development Plan?

ID	I think the key issues should focus on residents and developments that will enhance their lives, all ages, all generations.
1214	

2: Do you have any comments to make on the growth strategy?

ID	It is important to genuinely balance all and not be biased towards the 'new'z
1214	

3: Do you have any comments to make on the spatial strategy?

ID	Prioritise land for developments that will benefit residents and the environment. These will not be the most profitable but will be the most beneficial. DO NOT fill All open spaces with housing. It's totally inappropriate. Use existing housing - work with landlords/owners to improve and use existing housing as affordable housing for those who need it. New housing developments are out of price range for locals and end up as second homes/holiday homes for the rich. This does not solve the housing crisis, just makes lots of money for developers.
1214	

4: Do you have any comments to make on design and sustainable placemaking policies?

ID	We need facilities that are beneficial to residents. This should be more important than company profits. Indoor leisure facilities for Porthcawl are a must. Facilities that compliment local businesses are essential.
1214	

5: Do you have any comments to make on the active, health, cohesive and social communities policies?

ID	New housing developments need to be affordable and accompanied by investment in healthcare, education And leisure otherwise the new housing has a negative effect on existing residents due to seduces being stretched. However developments want maximum profit so will less interested in this. The council Must put existing residents of Portfhcawl first and ensure any development does not have a negative effect of the community and its services.
1214	

6: Do you have any comments to make on the employment strategy?

ID	Supporting self-employed and small businesses will meet all the aims of your strategy whilst supporting local people and being good for the environment.
1214	

7: Do you have any comments to make on retail centres and development policies?

ID	
-----------	--

1214	Porthcawl is in desperate need of indoor leisure facilities for all ages. Small business owners in Porthcawl are in desperate need of support by lowering business rates to help these businesses thrive.
------	---

8: Do you have any comments to make on the renewable energy, mineral resources and waste management policies?	
ID	Work with smaller, local Businesses. They are more eco-friendly. Large companies such as ALDI are damaging to the environment, using more energy than necessary, creating more waste than necessary.
1214	

9: Do you have any comments to make on the natural and built environment policies?	
ID	Conserve the natural environment do Porthcawl- do not build shops and housing on Porthcawl Seafront. Do you know of any other seaside resort that has a supermarket right next to the beach? Your decision to seek prime land to ALDI is a poor and lazy one. Where is your imagination? Porthcawl could be so great but you are ruining it. Thousands of people visit here and you are building on the main car park? Where do you expect people to park? Surely you can see the error here. Do not build on Sandy Bay - The Bowl. Leave it as it is. It is enjoyed by locals as a natural reserve. Insect populations are decreasing due to loss of habitat. Do not destroy this habitat. Bees are so important for us - bees are responsible for every third mouthful of our food. Do not destroy their habitat. The benefits of having this habitat far outweigh any gains from development.
1214	

10: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley	
ID	As a Porthcawl resident I am not familiar with this area and feel unqualified to make any judgement here.
1214	

11: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Porthcawl, Pyle, North Cornelly and Kenfig Hill	
ID	Please, please, please prioritise public open space, leisure, and tourism (in that order). This is what is desperately needed in Porthcawl. It is not the most profitable but us the most beneficial. You have an opportunity here to create something wonderful - do not ruin it!
1214	

12: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Ogmere and Garw valleys	
ID	
1214	

13: Do you have any comments to make on the key proposals? Bridgend and Pencoed	
ID	
1214	

14: Do you have any other comments to make on the Deposit Replacement LDP?	
ID	Please consider what is needed in the borough and listen to residents' Views. These people know what is needed and what will be pleasant to live with. Do not be swayed
1214	

	<p>by profits. Do not sell to the highest bidder. This is important to get right as the residents will be living with the results for years to come. Please support your residents as they have supported you in paying vast amounts of council tax. Put that money to good use.</p>
--	--