

Director of Environmental and Planning Services
Bridgend County Borough Council
Civic Offices
Angel Street
BRIDGEND
CF31 4WB

Dear Mr Thomas

Inspector's Report on the Objections to the Bridgend Unitary Development Plan

I have pleasure in submitting my report, following the Public Inquiry into objections to the UDP, which was held last year.

As you will know, the Inquiry opened on 23 April 2002 and ran until 22 July 2002, with formal closure on 10 December 2002. The Inquiry sat for 19 days in total, and 10 and a half days were spent on site visits. The Inquiry considered 1,935 sustained objections to the deposit UDP and the Pre-Inquiry Modification Statement, of which 413 were dealt with orally.

I was assisted at the Inquiry and subsequently by Mr David Crook, who is a Higher Planning Officer with the Planning Inspectorate. His principal tasks were to review and document evidence submitted for the Housing Round Table session, and to assist with the initial draft of sections of the Inspector's report. However, I confirm that all the objections have been scrutinised by me personally. I have visited all the objection sites. The report's conclusions and recommendations are my own.

My report should not be treated as a 'free standing document'. In addition to the report and its Appendices, there is a wealth of Inquiry evidence and core documents which cover the wide and detailed range of matters raised by the representations and discussed at the Inquiry. I have taken account of all the matters raised in my consideration of the representations. However, my conclusions on all the objections and counter-objections are given as succinctly as possible in the report. A schedule of my recommendations for the Unitary Development Plan is attached to this letter. My main recommendations are briefly summarised below.

Part 1 and Introduction

Chapters 1 and 2 of the UDP include the Part 1 strategic policies and the underlying aims and objectives of the Plan. The guiding principle of the UDP is '*To improve the quality of life for the residents of Bridgend County Borough in ways which are compatible with the principles of sustainable development.*' A land use strategy follows from this principle, favouring limited dispersal of new development in the main urban areas, wherever possible on redundant or under-utilised urban land and optimising the use of committed development sites. Chapter 2 records that a Sustainability Appraisal of the UDP's policies by independent

consultants has been carried out. I consider that Chapters 1 and 2 provide a strong and purposeful introduction to the UDP, and modifications recommended in this report are designed only to enhance and clarify the chosen approach.

Environment

Chapter 3, with its 53 policies, is the longest in the Plan, and it has attracted many objections. The chapter, correctly in my view, begins with a group of strong policies to resist development in the countryside. It includes a definition of 'countryside' which should be helpful to users and readers of the Plan, notwithstanding my recommendation to modify its wording. The UDP shows the boundaries of all the smaller settlements, but none of the main settlements. I am not convinced that these boundaries can be identified 'logically', and consider that the Council has the appropriate local knowledge to specify the boundaries appropriately and draw them on the Proposals Map. In my view, this should be done.

Policies EV9, EV10 and EV11 concern the protection of high quality landscape and green wedges. Objectors correctly point out that Policy EV9 confuses landscapes which are designated because of their natural beauty/scenic quality with those valued for nature conservation. Changes to the Plan are needed to ensure that this important distinction is made. National planning policy requires non-statutory designations to be soundly based on a formal assessment of their value, and to be limited to areas where normal planning policies cannot provide the necessary protection. Much of the countryside in the County Borough is included in special landscape areas and green wedges, and I recommend that the coverage should be reduced in a number of specific places and in general, following new and more critical analysis. My concern is that Policy EV1 will be undermined if there is excessive use of, and inconsistent application of, these designations, since land which is 'only countryside' will be perceived wrongly as suitable for development.

Very large numbers of objectors seek the inclusion of land at Island Farm in the green wedge between Bridgend and Ewenny/ Merthyr Mawr. The future of this land depends in part on the Council's decision on a planning application for a national rugby academy and associated development. Assuming that this development proposal does not go ahead, it is essential that the UDP defines the green wedge shown as EV11(15) in accordance with the principles of national policy, taking particular care over its purpose, extent and boundaries. PPWales clarifies that green wedges should serve the same purpose as Green Belts, and that a presumption against inappropriate development will apply. The deposit UDP makes no reference to 'inappropriate development', but I recommend that it should be included in Policy EV11 to strengthen its impact and distinguish it from the more general Policy EV1.

On nature conservation and diversity, I recommend changes to ensure that internationally and nationally important sites are given a different level of protection from sites of more local importance. It would be helpful if the Plan included a list of the sites which are statutorily designated and identified what is of special interest in each. I also favour some pruning of the overlapping and potentially burdensome policies on biodiversity. In response to objections to Policies EV49 and EV50 on design in new development, the Council put forward in the PIMS a more detailed, criteria-based Policy EV49. I consider this to be a significant improvement, and to be in accord with the increased emphasis placed on promoting good design in national policy.

Housing

A housing round table session was held shortly after the Inquiry opened, when objections to the strategy for providing new housing were heard. From these discussions and analysis of all the written evidence, I conclude that the County Borough has a requirement for some 9,950 new dwellings to be provided between 1996 and 2016, or 7,957 between 2000 and 2016. Based on allocations for new housing in Policy H1, small sites and windfalls, with an allowance for demolitions, I calculate that the Plan makes provision for some 7,630 new dwellings between 2000 and 2016. I conclude that the estimates of housing requirement and housing supply are sufficiently similar that no new housing sites need to be sought. Objectors argued for a flexibility allowance to be made, in the event that identified housing sites do not come forward as envisaged within the Plan period, but I am satisfied that the JHLAS group is able to eliminate sites with serious constraints. I am anxious to avoid an over-supply of sites, which would enable developers to 'cherry pick' the greenfield sites and leave undeveloped the brownfield ones.

The UDP includes two very large housing sites at Broadlands and Parc Derwen, which were also allocated in the Ogwr Borough Local Plan. Development at Broadlands is well underway, and an outline planning permission has been granted and a development brief approved for Parc Derwen. The allocation at Parc Derwen was the subject of objections at the UDP Inquiry, but I recommend that the allocation for 1,500 new dwellings be sustained. I consider that it will make an important contribution to meeting the requirement for new dwellings over the Plan period.

The Plan provides a variety of other medium-sized and smaller sites for new housing, mostly in the main settlements with, in the case of new housing allocations, many on previously developed land. The allocations are therefore consistent with the UDP's preferred land use strategy and the promotion of more sustainable development. I have concluded that nearly all the 'omission' sites put forward by objectors to the Plan should not be added. A number of objections are made to Policies H1 and H4 on the grounds that insufficient allowance is made for new housing development in smaller settlements. However, I support the Council's stance that sustainable development favours new development in main settlements and, though small scale and infill development may be permitted in smaller settlements, it does not have to take place.

On affordable housing, objectors draw attention to the lack of a recent and objective assessment of housing needs for the County Borough. I consider that this is a weakness in the current Plan, although the Council advises that the results of a Housing Need Assessment are awaited and will be published as part of a Draft Local Housing Strategy this Spring. I recommend changes to Policy H7 on the assumption that some need exists in the County Borough, but consider that further modifications to the UDP may be required when the extent of the need is calculated and policies to meet it are formulated.

Employment

As is conceded in para 5.1.5 of the UDP, the 370 hectares of land allocated for industrial and commercial development is more than adequate to cater for expected future requirements. The PIMS proposes that the site at Wern Fawr (Policy E3(22)) comprising 55 hectares should be deleted, and I favour the abandonment of this site which is located in the countryside. I summarise below my reasons for recommending that the proposed employment site at Sarn Park should also be deleted. I am satisfied that this will still leave an abundance of employment land, and a variety of sites in terms of size, character and location to be offered to

potential investors. I have put forward my recommendations with due regard to the importance of allocating and safeguarding employment land, in order to promote economic success and prosperity.

Sarn Park

I recommend that land at Sarn Park should not be allocated under Policy E2 as a key employment site. Even if Wern Fawr is taken out of the land bank for employment uses, there remains a substantial amount of land available to potential investors in the County Borough. Past take up of employment land in Bridgend and in South Wales, and analysis of structure and change in the economy, confirms that the land supply in the County Borough is generous, even when allowance is made for the need to maintain variety and choice in the land portfolio. I conclude that there is no great need to allocate a key employment site at Sarn Park. The allocation has provoked significant local objection, mainly because of the impact which development would have on local amenity and nature conservation interests. The site is located beyond settlement boundaries where development would not be sustainable, and I am satisfied that the need to safeguard the countryside and the local environment outweigh the site's current value as employment land. Since the site is not needed for employment land purposes, I see no reason to encourage 'enabling' retail development there under Policy R9(2).

Transportation

The UDP is committed to promoting more sustainable travel patterns, and to better co-ordination and integration of transport and land use planning. Many of my recommendations to modify policies in this chapter are designed to achieve greater force and clarity, rather than to achieve a change in direction.

Policy T16 and section 6.9 attracted the largest number of objections in this Chapter. Some objections relate to the justification for individual schemes, and others to the references in the policy and reasoned justification to legal agreements. On the individual schemes, I would have appreciated more detailed evidence from the Council, to explain and demonstrate why each was considered necessary. However, I recommend that all should be retained except for Policy T16(6). Para 6.9.7 explains that all except scheme T16(4) are included in the policy because they relate to significant land use proposals. The proposed Bryncethin link (T16(6)) would border on Sarn Park, which I have recommended should be deleted from the Plan. In addition, there is evidence that a new road here would cause harm to the countryside, landscape and nature conservation, which leads me to the conclusion that the scheme should be deleted from the UDP. For similar reasons and bearing in mind the content of para 6.9.3 of the UDP, the Bryncethin Bypass, shown in the PIMS as scheme T16(17), should not be added to the UDP.

Planning Obligations

Objections are raised to section 6.9 and other parts of the UDP over the Council's approach to planning obligations. The Council provides a defence of its references to 'requiring' entry into planning obligations and agreements in its General Proof 1 and in replies to objectors. However, PPWales and WO C13/97 are clear that planning obligations should be sought through negotiations, on an individual case basis. I recommend a number of modifications throughout the UDP to clarify the approach to planning obligations, and to advise readers that, where there is a choice, planning conditions are preferable to obligations.

Retailing

This chapter begins with Policy R1 which provides for new retail development to be concentrated in established commercial centres, and goes on to Policy R8 which names key retail redevelopment sites in the town centres of Bridgend and Porthcawl. However, the main allocations for new retail development in the Plan are on out of centre sites on land off the Bridgend Northern Distributor Road (BNDR) and at Sarn Park. I consider that the allocation for convenience goods at the BNDR site fails both the qualitative need and sequential tests, and should be re-examined. The allocation at Sarn Park is made for 'bulky comparison goods', though I have no evidence that the local need for this sector of comparison goods has been assessed, nor account taken of the requirement for developers and retailers to be flexible and innovative over format, design and scale. In common with objectors, I am concerned that such a large out of centre allocation would be harmful to the vitality and viability of existing town centres. In my view, it is in serious conflict with Policy R1. I recommend that the retail allocation at Sarn Park, which is described as an 'enabling development' should not be made.

Other Chapters

On tourism and leisure, and sport and recreation, I have drawn a distinction between indoor leisure developments and outdoor tourism, sport and recreation facilities. I recommend that the former should be encouraged to locate in established commercial centres and satisfy the tests of need, sequential search and impact on vitality and viability, whereas the latter need not meet these tests. If this distinction is accepted, a number of changes to policies should be made. An objection was made that land at Island Farm should be allocated for a mixed use development based on a major new sporting facility, but I recommend that the UDP should not be modified to accommodate such an allocation.

I recommend that the identified site at Tondu should be allocated for mixed use regeneration purposes, including a proposed waste transfer facility. I fully support the allocation of a key regeneration site in the heart of Porthcawl, with tourism-led redevelopment and both general needs housing and visitor accommodation. However, I recommend that the boundaries of the regeneration site should be redrawn to exclude Griffin Park, and that the proposed park and ride facility at Nottage should not be pursued in the UDP.

A copy of this letter has been sent to the Welsh Assembly Government.

Yours sincerely

Jill Kingaby

Summary of Recommendations

Part 1

- Paras 1.1.2 and 1.1.5 be modified as proposed in the PIMS.
- Paras 1.1.7 and 1.1.8 be added as shown in the PIMS.
- Para 1.1.9 as shown in the PIMS should not be included.
- Section 1.3 be extended as proposed in the PIMS, with a further modification to para 1.3.8.
- Policy 1 be modified.
- Policy 2 be modified as shown in the PIMS, with a further modification.
- Policy 3 no change.
- A new para 1.2.2 be added.
- Policy 7 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
- Policy 9 be modified as shown in the PIMS, with a further modification.
- Policy 10 be modified.
- Policy 11 be modified.
- Policy 12 be modified.
- Policy 13 no change.
- Policy 14 no change.
- Policy 15 no change.
- Policy 16 no change.
- Policy 17 be modified.
- Policy 18 be modified.
- Policy 19 be modified.
- Policy 20 be modified.
- Policy 22 be modified.
- Policy omission – a new policy should not be added.

Introduction (Chapter 2)

- Paras 2.1.1-2.1.4 title be modified as shown in the PIMS, with a further modification to 2.1.3.
- Para 2.2.1 be modified.
- Paras 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 no change.
- Para 2.2.6 be modified.
- Para 2.2.9 no change.
- Para 2.2.10 be modified.
- Para 2.2.12 be modified.
- Paras 2.3.1 to 2.3.12 (excluding housing) no change.
- Paras 2.4.1 to 2.4.2 no change.
- Paras 2.5.1 to 2.5.3 be modified as shown in the PIMS.

Environment Section 3A

- Paras 3.1.1 to 3.1.4 no change
- Para 3.3.5 no change
- Policy EV1 be modified.
- Para 3.5.3 be modified as shown in the PIMS with further modification.
- Para 3.5.4 be modified.

Para 3.5.5 be deleted.
Proposals Map be modified to show main settlement boundaries.
Policy EV2 no change.
Policy EV3 be modified.
Policy EV4 be modified.
Para 3.5.17 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policy EV6 be modified.
Para 3.5.20 be modified.
Policy EV7 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Para 3.5.23 be modified.
Policy EV8 be modified.
Policy EV9 be modified.
Para 3.5.29 be modified.
Policy EV10 be not modified as shown in the PIMS, but other modifications should be made.
Para 3.5.32 be not modified as shown in the PIMS but should be deleted.
Table ENV1 and the Proposals Map be modified in respect of some EV10(1) and (2) areas.
Policy EV11 be modified.
Paras 3.6.1 to 3.6.3 be modified.
Boundaries of Policy EV11(15) be re-assessed.
Proposals Map be modified in respect of selected EV11 land.
Policy EV12 be modified.
Boundaries of smaller settlements on Proposals Map no change.
Policy EV13 no change.
Policy EV14 and para 3.6.11 be deleted.

Environment Section 3B

Policy EV15 be modified, as well as paras 3.7.6 and 3.7.8
Proposals Map be modified in respect of coastal zone north of Cypress Gardens, Porthcawl.
Policy EV16 no change.
Policy EV17 modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policy EV18 be modified as shown in the PIMS and further modified.
Paras 3.9.6 to 3.9.11 not be modified as shown in the PIMS, but as proposed by CCW.
Proposals Map be modified as shown in the PIMS and with reference throughout to 'candidate SAC'.
Policy EV19 be modified.
Policy EV20 and para 3.9.18 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policy EV21 be deleted.
Policy EV22 be deleted, and paras 3.9.23 and 3.9.24 be modified.
Policy EV24 be deleted.
Policy EV25 no change, but paras 3.9.28 and 3.9.29 modified as shown in the PIMS.
Proposed new policy on Community Woodlands should not be included.
Policy EV26 no change.
Policy EV27 be deleted, and proposed changes to para 3.10.7 in the PIMS not be made.
Policy EV28 no change.
Policy EV29 be deleted.
Policy EV30 no change.
Policy EV33 be modified.
Policy EV34 be modified.

Policy EV35 no change.
Policy EV37 be modified, but not as shown in the PIMS.
Paras 3.13.7 and 3.13.9 be modified as shown in the PIMS, and further modified.
Policy EV38 no change.
Para 3.13.12 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policy EV39 no change.
Policy EV40 no change.
Policies EV41 and EV42 be modified.
Policy EV43 be modified as shown in the PIMS and further modified.
Policy EV44 be modified.
Policy EV45 no change.
Policy EV46 be modified, with changes to paras 3.15.7 and 3.15.9.
Policy EV47 be modified, not as shown in the PIMS, but as in the Council's response to Glamorgan-Gwent Archaeological Trust with further modification.
Policy EV48 be modified as in the Council's response to Glamorgan-Gwent Archaeological Trust with further modification.
Paras 3.16.8, 3.16.10 and 3.16.11 be modified, but not as shown in the PIMS.
Policies EV49 and EV50 be deleted, and replaced with EV49 as shown in the PIMS, with further modification.
Paras 3.17.5 to 3.17.19 as shown in the PIMS should replace paras 3.7.5 to 3.17.8.
Policy EV51 no change.
Policy EV52 no change.
Para 3.18.7 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policy EV53 be modified.
Proposed new policy on pollution be not included.

Housing Land Requirement

The UDP makes satisfactory provision for housing over the Plan period.
Part 1 Policy 4 numbers be modified.
Paras 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.4 - 2.3.7, 2.3.9 be modified.
Paras 4.1.1, 4.3.4 - 4.3.7, 4.4.2, 4.4.8, 4.4.9, 4.4.11 be modified.
Table INT1 and Figures INT 1 & 2 be modified.
Policy H1 be updated in line with the PIMS, Council's General Proof 2 and more recent information on permitted housing sites and commitments.
Policy H1 footnote be modified.

Housing (Chapter 5)

No modifications to Policy H1 sites, with these exceptions:
Policy H1(54) boundaries modified as shown on the Proposals Map in the PIMS.
Policy H1(56) boundaries modified on the eastern border.
Policy H1(59) modified in respect of estimated number of dwellings, and Proposals Map and footnote.
Policy H3 no change, but supporting text shown in the PIMS as paras 4.6.2 to 4.6.4 be added.
Policy H4 no change.
Policy H6 and text in paras 4.9.4, 4.9.5 and 4.9.7 be deleted.
Proposed new policy on new housing for senior management should not be included.
Policy H7 be modified as shown in the PIMS with further modification.

Paras 4.10.6 and 4.10.7 be modified.

Housing (Omission) Sites

None of the objection sites should be added to Policy H1, with these exceptions:

Land at Wyndham Close, Brackla

Ty Draw Farm, Pyle

Employment

Para 5.4.2 be modified as shown in the PIMS.

Policy E2(2) no change.

Policy E2(3) no change.

Paras 5.5.3 to 5.5.6 be modified, but not as shown in the PIMS or agreed with Grantchester Plc.

Policy E2(5) be deleted.

Policy E2(1) Proposals Map be modified as shown in the PIMS - Brackla Industrial Estate.

Policy E3(1) no change.

Policy E3(14) no change.

Policy E3(20) no change.

Policy E3(21) no change, but amend footnote if necessary following further assessment.

Policy E3(22) delete this site and modify numbering as shown in the PIMS.

Policy E3(23) no change.

Proposed new E3 site at Island Farm should not be included.

Proposed new E3 site off Pont George Road, Pyle, should not be included.

Proposed new E3 site east of Rockwool, Wern Tarw, should not be included.

Policy E4(4) be modified as shown in the PIMS.

Policy E6 be modified as shown in the PIMS, and further modifications to policy and reasoned justification, paras 5.6.2 – 5.6.4.

Policy E6(1) no change.

Policy E6(5) be deleted.

Policy E7 no change.

Policy E8 be deleted.

Policy E9 no change.

Policy E10 no change.

Para 5.8.8 proposed changes agreed with Grantchester Development Properties Ltd should not be made.

Policy E12 be modified.

Policy E13 be modified.

Policy E14 be modified and the text of paras 5.9.5 and 5.9.6 be modified as shown in the PIMS.

Policy E15 no change.

Transportation

Policy T1 be modified.

Para 6.3.7 be modified as shown in the PIMS.

Policy T2 be modified.

Policy T3 no change.
Policy T4 no change.
Policy T5 no change.
Para 6.4.8 be modified as shown in the PIMS, and further modified.
Policy T6 be modified.
Para 6.4.12 be modified as agreed with Grantchester Plc.
Policy T7 be deleted, and the reasoned justification be modified.
Policy T8 no change.
Policy T9 no change.
Policy T10 no change, but reasoned justification be modified.
Policy T11 no change.
Policy T12 be deleted, and reasoned justification be modified.
Policy T13 be modified.
Policy T14 no change.
Policy T15 be modified.
Paras 6.8.10, 6.8.14 and 6.8.28 be modified.
Paras 6.9.1 to 6.9.3 modifications put forward in the PIMS should not be made.
Paras 6.9.10-6.9.13 and 6.9.18-6.9.21 be modified.
Policies T16(1) and T16(16) modify names and reasoned justifications as proposed by the Council.
Policy T16(2) no change.
Policy T16(3) no change.
Policy T16 (4) no change.
Policy T16(5) no change.
Policy T16(6) be deleted.
Policy T16(8) no change.
Paras 6.9.24 and 6.9.25 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policy T16(9) no change.
Para 6.9.27 be modified.
Policy T16(10) no change, but reasoned justification should be modified.
Policy T16(12) no change.
Policy T16(17) as proposed in the PIMS should not be included.
Policy T17 no change.
Policy T18 no change.
Policy T19(1) be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policy T20 be deleted.
Policy T21(1) be deleted.
Policy T21(3) be deleted, and a new para 6.11.4 added.
Policy T22 be modified with an expanded para 6.12.2.
Proposed new policy on general aviation should not be added.
Proposed new policy on bus prioritisation should not be added, but para 6.8.28 should be modified.

Retailing

Para 7.1.5 be modified.
Paras 7.1.6 and 7.1.8 be modified as shown in the PIMS, and further modified.
Policy R2 no change.
Para 7.3.10 be modified.

Policy R8 and proposed addition of Maesteg, no change.
Policy R8(1) no change.
Policy R8(3) and the Proposals Map be modified.
Policy R8(4) no change.
Policy R8(6) no change.
Policy R8(8) be added as shown in the PIMS, with a modification to the name of the site.
Policy R8 proposed new site at Embassy Cinema site and adjacent land be added as R8(9).
Policy R9(1) and para 7.5.5 proposed changes in the PIMS should not be made. Proposed changes agreed with Tesco Stores Limited should not be made. Allocation should be re-assessed, and modifications to policy and para 7.5.5 made subsequently.
Policy R9(2) be deleted, with modifications to reasoned justification and Proposals Map accordingly.
Proposed new site under Policy R9 should not be included.
Policy R10 be modified as proposed in the PIMS, and further modified.
Para 7.6.3 be modified as shown in the PIMS and further modified.
Para 7.6.4 not be modified as shown in the PIMS, but be further modified.
Policy R11 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Para 7.7.1 be modified as shown in the PIMS and further modified.
Para 7.7.3 be modified.
Policy R12 be deleted.
Para 7.7.5 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policy R13 no change.

Tourism and Leisure

Paras 8.1.1 and 8.2.1 no change.
Para 8.4.2 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policy TM1 and reasoned justification be modified.
Policy TM2 and reasoned justification be modified, but not as shown in the PIMS.
Policy TM3 be modified.
Policy TM4 no change.
Policy TM5 be modified.
Policy TM6 and reasoned justification be modified as shown in the PIMS, and be further modified.
Proposed new policy on chalets, cabins and forest lodges should not be included.
Policy TM7 no change.
Proposed new policy for visitor accommodation/leisure development at Sarn Park should not be included.

Sport and Recreation

Para 9.2.1 no change
Policy RC1 and reasoned justification in section 9.3 be modified.
Policy RC2 no change.
Policy RC4 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policy RC5 be modified as shown in the PIMS and further modified.
Section 9.4 be modified as shown in the PIMS with further modification.
Policy RC6 and text be modified as shown in the PIMS, to refer to 'public open space'.
Policy RC6(15) no change.

Policy RC6(19) no change.
Policy RC6(20) be modified as proposed by the Council in September 2002
Policy RC6 omission sites proposed at Llangewydd Road, Bridgend; Eastern Porthcawl; Danygraig, Porthcawl; Lock's Lane, Porthcawl should not be included.
Policies RC7 and RC8 be modified to delete the reference to 'Local Plan'.
Policy RC9(1) no change.
Policy RC9(10) allocation be reviewed.
Policy RC9(13) be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policy RC9 omission sites proposed at Park Street Allotments, Kenfig Hill and Pont Rhyd y Cyff should not be included.
Policy RC10 no change, and omission sites should not be included in the UDP.
Proposed new policy on public rights of way should not be included.
Policy RC11 no change to policy, but reasoned justification and Proposals Map be modified in respect of part of route near Maesteg.
Policy RC12 no change.
Policy RC13 no change to policy, but reasoned justification to be modified.
Policy RC14 no change.
Policy RC15 no change.
Proposed new policy for sports' stadia should not be included.
Policy RC16 be modified.
Proposed new multi-purpose hall at Porthcawl should not be included.

Social and Community Services and Facilities

Para 10.2.2 no change.
Policy SC2 no change.
Policy SC3 and reasoned justification be modified.
Policy SC4 be modified.
Policy SC5 be modified, but not in respect of SC5(7).
Policy SC6 and reasoned justification be modified.
Policy SC7 be deleted.
Para 10.12.2 be modified.
Policy SC8 be modified.

Minerals

Para 11.4.4 no change.
Policy M2 no change.
Policy M3 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policy M6 be modified as shown in the PIMS and be modified further.
Para 11.13.2 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policy M8 no change.
Policy M10 be modified.
Policy M11 no change.
Policy M12 and the reasoned justification be modified.
Policy M13 no change.

Waste

Para 12.3.5 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policy W1 no change.
Policy W2 no change.
Policy W3 be modified.
Policy W5 no change.
Policy W6 no change.

Unstable Land

Policy UNS1 be deleted.
Policy UNS2 be modified.

Energy and Utilities

Policy U1 no change.
Policy U2 be modified but not as shown in the PIMS.
Policy U3 be modified.
Para 14.6.9 be modified.
Policy U4 no change.
Policy U5 and reasoned justification be modified as agreed by the Council and National Grid Company/ Western Power Distribution.
Paras 14.8.1 and 14.9.3 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policies U7 and U8 no change.
Policy U9 be modified as shown in the PIMS and be further modified.
Paras 14.10.4 and 14.10.5 be modified.
Policy U10 and the reasoned justification be modified.

Regeneration

Para 15.2.7 no change.
Policy REG1 and para 15.11.3 be modified as shown in the PIMS.
Policy REG3 and para 15.11.10 be modified as agreed between the Council and Macob Projects Ltd on behalf of Coney Beach Leisure Ltd.
Proposals Map be modified to delete Griffin Park from the REG3(2) site.
Proposals Map be modified to delete land in Parc Slip Nature Park from the REG3(3) site.

Implementation, Resources and Monitoring

No change.

Proposals Map

Maps 3 and 12 proposed new housing sites no change.

Map 21 be modified to delete allocations under E2(5) and R9(2) at Sarn Park, and to delete highway scheme T16(6).

Map 26 Landscape Conservation Area boundary be modified, but not as shown in the PIMS.